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The cult of King Charles the martyr: the rise and fall of a political theology ca. 1640-1859.

Andrew Charles Lacey

The cult of King Charles the martyr did not appear out of nowhere in January 1649; rather the component parts were constructed during Charles' captivity and were readily available to preachers and eulogists in the weeks and months after the regicide. However, it was during the Republic that the political theology surrounding the martyr was developed; emphasising the martyr's radical innocence, the crime of regicide and the dangers of bloodguilt. As such the figure of the martyr, and the shared set of images and assumptions surrounding him, contributed to the survival of a distinctly Royalist and Anglican outlook during the years of exile.

With the Restoration, the cult was given official sanction by the inclusion of the Office for the 30th January in the Book of Common Prayer. The political theology surrounding the regicide and a particular historiography of the Civil Wars were presented as the only orthodox reading of these events. Yet from the Exclusion Crisis onwards other, discordant, voices were heard challenging the Royalist Anglican interpretation of the wars and the position of Charles. In these circumstances the cult began to fragment between those who retained the political theology of the 1650s and those who adapted the cult to reflect the changing political and dynastic circumstances of 1688 and 1714.

A study of the cult reveals the extent to which political debate in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was conducted in terms of the Civil Wars. It also goes some way to explaining the persistence of conservative assumptions and patterns of thought.
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Our body is the Bodhi-tree,
And our mind a mirror bright.
Carefully we wipe them hour by hour
And let no dust alight.

Shen Hsiu

There is no Bodhi-tree,
Nor stand of a mirror bright.
Since all is void
Where can the dust alight?

Hui Neng
The cult of King Charles the martyr: the rise and fall of a political theology, ca.1640 - 1859

Chapter I. Introduction.

Chapter II. Habeas Corpus: the foundations of the cult before 1649.

Chapter III. By the waters of Babylon: the cult and the Republic, 1649-1660.

Chapter IV. The return to Zion: the cult and the restored monarchy, 1660-1685.

Chapter V. The madding day: the cult and the 'age of party', 1685-1745.

Chapter VI. Conclusion

Bibliography
Acknowledgements

One of the more pleasant aspects of coming to the end of a piece of work such as this is the opportunity it affords to acknowledge with thanks those individuals who have contributed their time, expertise and resources over the last six or seven years. In particular I should like to mention, with gratitude, my Supervisor, Dr. Marilyn Palmer, for her unfailing dedication and friendship over all the years that this project has been on the stocks; and Prof. Richard Bonney for his assistance, encouragement and insights. Next must come Mr. Brian Jenkins, Ms. Nicola Thwaite, Mrs. Stella Clarke and all the staff of the Rare Books Reading Room at Cambridge University Library; their unfailing patience, helpfulness and humour will not be forgotten.

## List of Illustrations

1. Allegiance to the person of the King. The royal standard raised at Nottingham. (Woodcut, 1642)

2. Behold your King! The imprisoned Charles as a Christ-like figure symbolising the sufferings of the nation. (Woodcut, 1648)

3. The frontispiece to the *Eikon Basilike* by William Marshall. (Woodcut, 1649)


6. The figure of Christ bears a striking resemblance to Charles I. Window in the Chapel of Lincoln College, Oxford. 1630s.

7. Collecting relics? People dipping cloths and handkerchiefs in Charles' blood after his execution. Detail from an anonymous contemporary painting of the regicide.


11. *The apotheosis, or death of the King*. Painted by Mr. Vanderbank, 1728.

Abbreviations

CSP(D): Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)

CSP(V): Calendar of State Papers (Venetian)


Preface

It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a historian of the English Revolution in possession of a good mind, has tended to study the Roundheads rather than the Cavaliers. Compared to the groaning shelves of monographs, pamphlets and articles dealing with almost every aspect of the Parliamentary cause and its implications, the work on the Royalists - with the exception of the King himself - is sparse and patchy and some of the material that does exist is written from an obviously hostile perspective. Yet one of the most telling features of this period is not so much the revolutionary change that engulfed Britain in 1641, 1649, 1688 or 1714, but the persistence of older forms of authority and, more importantly, older assumptions about the ordering of society, its theoretical basis and the relationship, obligations and responsibilities of individuals to their families, their communities and to the state. Despite, or indeed because of, the repeated upheavals of the period a political theology based upon patriarchalism and divine right remained relevant and resilient amongst large sections of the community well into the eighteenth century.

Nowhere were these assumptions more obvious than in the cult of King Charles the martyr. Even before his trial and execution, there is evidence that the imprisoned Charles was being presented to an increasingly anxious and war-weary nation as a symbol of suffering kingship and legitimacy. With his trial and execution in January 1649 Charles was immediately re-presented as a martyr for the Church of England and for settled government. This process of image making was made easier because of Charles' own identification of himself as a martyr, and through the publication of the Eikon Basilike, which purported to be the king’s memoirs, meditations and prayers written whilst in captivity. The remarkable success of this little book throughout the rest of the period, perhaps more than anything else, not only fixed the image of the martyr in the public mind, but also demonstrated the power of conservative, Royalist and Anglican patterns of thought and allegiance which survived the Republic and emerged triumphant in 1660.

The decision to engage in research on this topic was inspired by the fact that although many writers on the Civil Wars and biographers of the King remark on the cult, no-one had undertaken a systematic study. This, I felt, was an omission; for a study of the cult tells us many.

1 With apologies to Jane Austen and H. Jones History Today. Vol.46.9. 1996. p56
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things about the religion, political thought and attitudes of seventeenth and early eighteenth century England. In particular, it helps to explain the survival of Royalist Anglicanism in the 1650s when, faced with an apparently all-conquering Republic, they were able to maintain a distinct, if often precarious, identity. Much of that identity depended upon a shared set of assumptions and images, of which the martyred Charles was one of the most prominent. It was during the exile that the political theology which underpinned the cult was developed, through sermons, elegies and relics and in tandem with the King's own words in the Eikon. By the time the Office for the 30th January was annexed to the Book of Common Prayer in 1662 that political theology had become fixed around a set of concepts, the most prominent being the divine right of kings and non resistance to established authority.

This political theology survived virtually intact into the next century and demonstrates very effectively the longevity of a Renaissance political theology of divine right and providence which could not only survive the deposition of James II and the advent of the Hanoverians, but also the rise of mechanistic and secular philosophy and a scientific revolution associated with Locke and Newton. As late as the 1740s, Charles was presented in Fast Day sermons as an innocent victim of faction and rebellion, who ruled as God's lieutenant on earth, who suffered a martyr's death and whose innocent blood entailed bloodguilt upon the nation. The regicide itself was still available as a text for conservative meditations upon the dangers of rebellion and the blessings of settled government. The persistence of these themes and typologies does not mean that the cult was a reactionary irrelevance; rather it suggests that the divine origins of government and the necessity of subordination in a patriarchal society were thought by sections of the clergy to be as relevant to congregations in the 1740s as they had been in the 1640s. Whilst to suggest that no change had taken place in political and religious theory, or in the assumptions and arguments about the nature of society, would be manifestly absurd, nevertheless I hope this work will go some way to filling the gap which exists in our understanding of the cult and its place in the resilience and adaptability of conservative thought.

Having embarked upon this topic, I soon discovered an enormous amount of relevant literature. Simply to attempt an overview of the extant 30th January sermons printed between 1649 and 1745 is a daunting task, and this may go some way to explaining the lack of attention the cult has so far received! The constraints of time and space required that I set some limits to this thesis;
also it was soon apparent that in researching the cult one was led down many different and interesting path such as iconography and art history, architectural theory, political theory, literature, popular religion, etc. Given these constraints, and the need for specialist expertise in other areas such as art history and literary criticism, I have not been able to explore some areas in the depth I would have wished. Likewise, the thesis presents the cult in detail until the final defeat of the Jacobites, but it was felt that the story ought to continue in outline until the deletion of the Office for the 30th January from the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1859; this is dealt with in the Conclusion. One way through the often bewildering array of sources and the complexities of the period was to focus on the figure of the martyr himself and allow him to lead me through the material. In so doing I hope that I have been able to say something useful about the cult in its first century and to indicate those areas which might encourage others to undertake more detailed work in the future.

**A note on spelling and dates.**

Spelling and punctuation in quotations within the text have been modernised; however, titles given in endnotes, the text and the bibliography have been transcribed as given in the original, except that the year is assumed to begin on the 1st January.
Chapter One. Introduction

That thence the Royal Actor born
The Tragick Scaffold might adorn:
While round the armed Bands
Did clap their bloody hands.
He nothing common did or mean
Upon that memorable scene.
(Marvell. A. An Horation Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland).

That memorable scene in 1649, on a January day so cold that the lake in St. James Park had frozen over, stands as one of the climactic events in British history. It was the culmination of a decade of war and strife throughout the British Isles; a time of division between parties, factions, friends and within families; a time of disappointed hopes and failed ambitions. For three years Parliamentarians and soldiers, victorious on the battlefield, had endeavoured in vain to reach a settlement with the King, until, to cut the Gordian knot of their failure, the Army and its Parliamentary allies brought the King to public trial and, having condemned him to death for waging war against his own people, he was executed outside the Banqueting House of his palace of Whitehall. Something momentous and terrible had taken place, the stain of which could never be removed. Thomas Fairfax, ostensibly the King's enemy, consoled himself by writing bad poetry in which he begged, "Oh let that day from time be blotted quite." But that day could not be blotted out, the deed was done, the King was dead. It is reported that within half an hour of the axe falling Whitehall had been cleared of spectators and souvenir hunters, but the repercussions of the act could not be so easily removed and 'King Charles' head' was to be a potent factor in British politics for at least the next one hundred and fifty years. Yet despite the contemporary concern with the figure of the martyr, and the vast amount of literature the cult generated in the first two centuries of its existence, surprisingly little scholarly attention has been devoted to it. Apart from a chapter by John Kenyon on the political use of the cult after 1688, and a few articles on the content and significance of January 30th sermons after 1660, the cult is usually mentioned rather than studied.\(^1\)

There are a number of detailed studies of the *Eikon Basilike* in relation to Milton's attack upon it in *Eikonoklastes*, but these are principally concerned with Milton rather than Charles and are written from the point of view of literary criticism rather than political or religious history. Likewise Francis Madan's definitive bibliographic work on the *Eikon Basilike* tells us next to nothing about the social, religious or political setting from which it grew, nor why it should have proved such a singular success. The exception to this neglect is to be found among the stalwart members of such organisations as the Royal Martyr Church Union and the Society of King Charles the Martyr who, over the last hundred years or so, have attempted to keep the cult alive and to maintain the honour accorded to Charles within the Church of England. By definition the motivation of members of such organisations differs from that of the academic historian; they are concerned to remember and restore, whereas the historian's aim should be to investigate and to explain. To explain why, for instance, a not particularly successful or popular king should become one of the few English monarchs to be canonized. Why a consistent and sophisticated set of images, parallels and themes should have become associated with the defeated king so quickly and with such conviction; and why, in the two centuries after his death, those themes and images remained remarkably consistent.

---


4 Madan, F. F. *A new bibliography of the Eikon Basilike of King Charles the first with a note on the authorship*. 1950.
In a wider context, as Stephen Wilson has remarked, the study of saints, martyrs and cults can "reflect important features of the societies in which they occur." For example, the *Eikon Basilike* reveals the conceptual framework of both author and audience, a framework which can be reconstructed - or deconstructed - through examination of the text. Charles' death is important not just because he was the first British king to be publicly tried and executed, but for the success of the image of martyrdom constructed by Charles and others, and a study of both the presentation of the image and the subsequent response reveals, as Weiner and Wilson suggest, a great deal about the social, political and religious perceptions and assumptions of the period.

A central feature of these perceptions was a political theology based upon the great chain of being and patriarchalism. As recent work on Sir Robert Filmer has suggested, the patriarchalist view of society and politics was so pervasive within the governing classes that John Locke felt it necessary to devote the first of his *Two Treatise of Government* to a detailed refutation of Filmer's work. Whilst Locke may have pretended to despise Filmer as "a mere stupid idea dressed up in good sounding English," nevertheless the very fact that he went to such trouble to refute the 'stupid idea' and to provide an alternative grounding for political power suggests that the idea may not have been considered so contemptible by many of Locke's contemporaries. Today, whilst there is almost a cottage industry of Lockian scholarship, Filmer is largely ignored. Yet if we are to understand the world in which the cult of the martyr flourished it is to Filmer rather than Locke that we should look, for he articulated a view of divine right and social obligation which was at the heart of the Royalist vision during the Civil Wars, and which sustained the cult after 1649.

Yet this Royalist political theology could not exist without the presence of the flesh and blood human being at its centre. The King was in a very real sense the fulcrum of Royalist thought; the centre of his realm, the fount of law, justice, honour and all legitimate right. He was the point at which the divine and mortal met. In him was blended an authority both secular and sacred, a process revealed in Charles' priestly conception of his duties, his position as head of both church and state, by his God-given powers to heal the King's Evil; and in his claim that he died for the
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maintenance of a known and legal authority. To the men and women of the seventeenth century, bled up on the duties of obedience, the intricacies of the great chain of being, the divine right of authority and the virtues of constancy and patience, the spectacle of Charles imprisoned on the Isle of Wight, or stepping out onto the scaffold at Whitehall must have seemed profoundly shocking.

For the King was the pivotal point around which their world revolved and from which it derived much of its meaning. As the axe fell and severed not only Charles' neck, but also the hierarchy of powers, they must have feared the collapse of their known world.

The power of his political theology is reflected in another theme which runs through this work; that of the image. This chapter begins with Marvell's well-known reference to Charles as 'The Royal actor', and the imagery and terminology of the stage runs through Charles' life, from his appearance in the masques of the 1630s to the description of him stepping out onto the scaffold, 'as one would step onto a masquing stage', and the subsequent appearance of the King's Book under the title of the *Eikon Basilike* - the image of the King. During the 1630s, though art, architecture and the masque, Charles was presented as both warrior King, loving husband and bringer of harmony and peace. During the first Civil War the imagery suggested a righteous King fighting for the maintenance of legitimate authority in church and state against a rabble of schismatics, atheists and rebels. Whilst in the period between 1645 - 8, - from the point of view of the cult, arguably the most creative period - Charles and others successfully built up a series of images of suffering kingship, with overtones of Christ's passion; images which were successfully transposed into a full-bodied cult of martyrdom in 1649.

When contemplating Charles' life, one is struck by the number of time climactic events happened on a public stage. His coronation, for instance, where the central space for the ritual is referred to as 'the theatre'; the great set-piece battles of the Civil war, a sort of armed theatre where Charles was called upon to play the role of warrior and king, and of course the trial in Westminster Hall and the events on the scaffold, great dramatic events where the 'audience' witness a piece of political theatre - not for nothing are such events called 'show-trials'. It is very easy, when looking at Charles' life and thought to slip into language and imagery associated with the theatre, and one is
left wondering, with Kevin Sharpe, where the real person ends and the image begins.\(^7\) In a sense this is a misleading question, for it assumes a dishonesty in the image, that somehow the image is not the 'real' person. It is a dishonesty which the seventeenth century would not have recognised, schooled, as they were, in the concept of the world as a stage on which one acted out ones life before God and ones fellows in the particular sphere assigned by His providence. Likewise, the virtues personified in the masques were not simply 'nice ideas' which the players hoped might provide edifying role models for the audience; neither was the masque purely a diversion for bored Cavaliers. Rather it was believed that the platonic virtues could be made real in the kingdom by their recreation in the masque; thus 'image' and 'reality' are fused together and made real through the ritual of the masque and the dance. Likewise the discussion concerning the extent to which Charles actually 'believed' the principles he died for is largely irrelevant in that these principles were so much a part of his character and personality that he lived them to the full. His 'mighty conscience' sprang precisely from this total identification of himself with the principles for which he fought and died. Indeed, it was that very identification which cost him his life and made compromise and negotiation so difficult. The man who could admit to his inability to defend a bad cause or give way in a good, is not a man to negotiate away the most sacred principles of church and state.\(^8\)

Yet this use of imagery took place in the context of Protestant iconoclasm, and it was this aspect of the cult which Milton exposed with devastating power in *Eikonoklastes*. Protestantism resolutely turned its back on imagery and sought to purge it out of the church through the systematic destruction of all images, whether in stone, wood, glass or paint. Laud's altar policy was condemned as idolatrous because he had encouraged the honouring of a man-made object. As Margaret Aston has recently demonstrated, iconoclasts could call upon Old Testament precedents in their destruction and praised Edward VI's image breaking policies by comparing him with King Josiah, who had destroyed the images of the Philistines and cleansed the religion of Israel of any
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taint of idolatry. In this tradition, Milton saw the image of Charles created by Marshall and set forth in the *Eikon Basilike* as yet another example of a false god, designed to distract the people away from their own liberties and the service of the truth. Irrespective of any controversy over the authorship of the book, or the relative literary merits of *Eikon Basilike* and *Eikonoklastes*, it has to be said that Milton failed in his task of iconoclasm. Except among those already ideologically committed against the King, Milton's work did nothing to stem the popularity or dissemination of the King's Book, nor the 'image' of Charles presented therein. It is a contention of this work that a major reason for this success was that the image, whether artificially contrived or not, corresponded to the view of significant sections of the community in the 1650s and after, who saw in Charles the martyr confirmation of their own sufferings and a hope for a future return to normality.

Moving on from a consideration of imagery and iconoclasm in a general sense, we need to consider the specific reference to Charles as a Christian martyr and the sources from which this particular martyr cult sprang. Florence Sandler has suggested that the *Eikon Basilike* presents an particularly Anglican form of piety, grounded in Donne's *Devotions*, Herbert's *The Temple* and James I's *Meditation upon the 27. 28. 29. Verses of the XXVII chapter of St. Matthew*. Whilst it is true that the image of Charles the martyr was one recognised by a generation raised on Foxian models of heroic death, whether this can be called a peculiarly 'Anglican' form of piety is debatable. If there is one thing which can be said with confidence about the early Stuart church it is that every assertion concerning it can also be denied! Thus, for example, it is impossible to claim that a consciousness of sin was a peculiarly 'Puritan' characteristic, one only has to read Laud's private devotions to realise that. Likewise George Herbert's reputation as an 'Anglican' and an 'Arminian' is largely based upon his elevation to the high church pantheon by the Tractarians; it is usually forgotten that Herbert was ordained and supported by Bishop Williams of Lincoln, an episcopal Calvinist in theology and consistent critic of Laud's policies.

---

What the success of the cult of Charles the martyr does demonstrate is that the theology and iconography of martyrdom it drew upon was the common property of English Protestant Christians in the seventeenth century, whether 'Anglican' or 'Puritan,' 'Calvinist' or 'Arminian'. Foxe was read by the Ferrers at Little Gidding, by Charles in his imprisonment as well as the separatists in their conventicles; and in this respect it should not be forgotten that the Book of martyrs ends with the consummation of the elect under the rule of Elizabeth, a godly Prince and England's Constantine. Foxe was quite emphatic that the true faith included, and indeed depended upon, the Royal Supremacy, and Elizabeth's own sufferings for her faith and her eventual accession to the throne constitutes the climax of Foxe's narrative. It was this commitment to the Royal Supremacy which later, more radical, Protestants chose to ignore; identifying the persecuting papist rulers and lordly bishops of Foxe with their own governors and kings. Yet Charles could read this narrative in quite a different way; he could read Foxe as a confirmation of his own role as the head and protector of the church, and here it may be possible to distinguish between an 'Anglican' and a radical 'Puritan' reading of Foxe. The radical, identifying exclusively with the sufferings of the saints for the true faith, would emphasise the corruption of the worldly church and the impossibility of a coercive, episcopal church to teach the truth. Whereas the 'Anglican' reader could draw from the same text a justification not only of the Royal Supremacy and bishops, but of a hierarchical, national church as a necessary bulwark protecting the faithful from persecution by heretics and idolaters. Yet although they might differ profoundly over the nature of truth and the signs of the visible church, both 'Anglican' and 'radical' would be united in their reading of models of heroic death in the service of that truth.

It might be worth asking at this point whether Charles could have compromised his views and reached a negotiated settlement with his enemies after 1646? Or were his views so fixed and rigid that such a compromise became impossible? Lurking behind this question is the possibility that Charles, by his intransigence, brought his own death upon himself; that it was a form of suicide rather than a martyrdom. The very formulation of such a question in such a way merely demonstrates a contemporary problem with what Droge and Tabor call 'voluntary death', and the
ambiguities many feel over the question of suicide.\textsuperscript{12} The question concerning the invitation of death is applicable to any 'martyrdom' or voluntary death in the service of another, or a cause. If we define suicide as a retreat from the realities of life, then martyrdom is not suicide, as the martyr chooses a course of action and takes responsibility for the penalties society will inflict. They can be said to have not run away from a situation, but rather faced a situation in the knowledge that it is a very dangerous thing to do. The motivation for such a stance may be deluded, but such a delusion does not necessarily invalidate the courage required to make such a sacrifice.

But suicide may also be considered as a protest against a situation which is considered intolerable; or as a duty to a higher authority - I am thinking here of the Buddhist monks who immolated themselves during the Vietnam war, the Roman tradition of suicide as political protest; or the kamikaze pilots of Japan, who went to their deaths in the service of the Emperor. Yet here again we meet the problem of terminology. Suicide and voluntary death still arouse heated debate, and for over a thousand years the church condemned suicide as a mortal sin. As late as the 1870s attempted suicide was still a capital offence in this country, and for many it still suggests failure, despair and tragedy. The media use of the term 'suicide squads' when referring to the actions of certain Islamic groups in the Middle East, or the common translation of the term kamikaze to mean suicide pilot, suggests that these individuals commit suicide because of irrational fanaticism. It forgets that the term kamikaze means 'divine wind' in Japanese, and has no pejorative meaning. Likewise, as Droge and Tabor demonstrate, the condemnation of suicide was a development of late antiquity, associated particularly with Augustine; and as they point out, those concerned to condemn suicide and voluntary death had to contend with one of the most influential voluntary deaths of all time, that of Christ on the cross!

For the seventeenth century the issue of suicide in the death of a martyr simply did not arise, for the martyr died as a witness to the truth and not by his own hand. His death pointed to a greater reality. Yet herein lies the central dilemma of martyrdom, namely what is truth? From Clement of Alexandria to Luther and Milton, false martyrs were condemned because the cause

\textsuperscript{12}Droge, A. J. & Tabor, J. D. \textit{A noble death: suicide and martyrdom among Christians and Jews in antiquity.} 1992.
they died for was false. As Augustine said, 'Martyres veros non facit poena sed causa'.

In Luther's earliest writings he ponders deeply the question of martyrdom, seeing heroic death in the cause of the gospel as the highest calling to which a Christian can aspire, and a sure gateway to heaven. Also, significantly, he saw martyrdom as the confirmation that the cause was true: only a true cause produces martyrs, ergo a cause which produces martyrs must be true. Luther wrote hymns and memorials in honour of the earliest Protestant martyrs and daily expected to share their fate. However, the fact that he was not called upon to make the supreme sacrifice, and the emergence of John of Leyden and the Anabaptists, forced him to reassess his view that the willingness of individuals to suffer and die is in itself is a sign of a true church; for if heretics suffered 'martyrdom' with courage, sometimes at the hands of orthodox Protestants, did that courage and suffering qualify them as true martyrs? Luther's answer to this question was a resounding 'no', yet he was obliged to formulate a number of unconvincing expedients to explain the courage in death shown by 'false' martyrs. If heroic death is not always a true martyrdom, how is one to distinguish between truth and falsehood? In addressing this question Luther took a great interest in the examinations and interrogations of 'heretics' by the authorities, hoping to find last minute recantations and confessions. When these did not emerge he fell back on the claim that it was Satanic inspiration which sustained the 'heretic' in facing death. Whether consciously or not, in this Luther mirrored the excuses and evasions of his Catholic opponents, who where also trying to account for the courage of 'false' martyrs as they went to their deaths. Yet the most convincing rebuke Luther directed at the Anabaptists and other 'false' martyrs was that of Augustine, already quoted, that the courage and constancy of the individual in facing death is irrelevant in the ascription of martyrdom; it is the truth of the cause which makes a martyr, not the courage of the victim.

Luther went on to define this further by claiming that martyrdom is a grace from God and anyone who actively seeks or courts martyrdom must be excluded from that grace; an argument taken up by Milton in *Eikonoklastes* when he claimed that no true martyr bore witness to himself. Yet
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13 Suffering does not make true martyrs, but the reason for the suffering.
it does not take a great deal of reflection to recognise the contradictions within these arguments. Quite apart from the fact that Luther's reflections reveal his own guilt over not being called upon to face an heroic death whilst so many fellow Protestants were, is the obvious question of who decides what is true or false martyrdom? If, as Augustine argues, the definition of martyrdom depends not upon the fact or manner of death, "but upon the cause died for", it must also depend upon the presence of an apologist who can record and present the cause and the martyr in a way which is acceptable to the potential audience. Hence the importance of Foxe in not only recording the sufferings of the Marian martyrs, but also in recreating their deaths to emphasise the truth of the cause for which they died. In this Charles, and his collaborators, acted as his own apologist through the *Eikon Basilike*, and very successful he was at it. The audience not only recognise the 'truth' of the martyrdoms presented, but go on to then redefine their present experience and sufferings in the light of the model the apologist provides; thus is the process one of creation and re-creation as the events, the chronicler and the audience react and interact together. In chapter two, I attempt to show how Charles and his supporters in the last three years of his life, consciously tried to present an image of patient suffering and Royal constancy which they hoped would be recognised as the actions of one suffering for the truth. Perhaps this is the root of Milton's vehemence against the image of the martyr he found in the *Eikon Basilike*; he recognised the "Protestant guise" of the King's image, and that in using what Milton considered to be a perversion of the Foxian tradition, Charles and his supporters were employing a weapon of great power against the fledgling Republic. It was powerful precisely because significant numbers of people chose to recognise in Charles' life and death the authentic features of a Christian martyr.

But what exactly were the parallels and correspondences which the *Eikon Basilike* presented and which were so readily received that it went through thirty-nine editions in 1649 alone and became the best selling book of the seventeenth century? This question will be considered in chapter three, suffice to say at this point that the Book consisted of two tiers of imagery. The first concerns what could be called the drama of the trial and execution, and here we see elements such as the defendant speaking the truth boldly at his trial, but faced with judges who are deaf to his

---

arguments. A process found repeatedly in Foxe and one which looks back to the protomartyr
Stephen whose proclamation of the gospel at his trial caused his judges to 'stop their ears'. Likewise this deliberate echoing of biblical themes reaffirms the Reformation conviction that what was taking place was a restoration and a returning to the practice and doctrine of the early church. Peter Hughes has remarked that in Foxe the Marian martyrs are "transformed" into biblical figures, using scripture as the blue-print and script for their own lives, sufferings, responses and deaths. This Protestant tradition was consciously adopted by both Charles and Archbishop Laud as they approached their own deaths, by claiming that the purity of the primitive church had been restored in the Church of England and the *Book of Common Prayer*. Thus did they attempt to vindicate themselves against Milton's contention that no martyr ever died for a church which was established by showing that established or not, the primitive doctrine and practice of the Church of England consisted of the same 'truths' for which the early Christian martyrs died.

Moving on from the trial, the verdict is usually a foregone conclusion, with the court dependent upon a spurious worldly authority, a verdict the defendant invariably greets with equanimity. Next we witness the epideictic nature of the genre; a rhetorical technique whereby the physical and emotional suffering of the martyr is used to enlist the sympathy of the audience. There is usually an affecting leave-taking with family and friends, such as Charles' heart rending farewell from his younger children on the morning of his death. Such a meeting also serves the purpose of allowing the martyr to witness yet again to the truth of his cause, although the main purpose of the epideictic narrative is to arouse sympathy for the individual, not discuss the merits of a political or religious programme. It must be admitted that in such circumstances the epideictic technique is very effective in winning sympathy for the victim, irrespective of one's opinion of the cause, and was to be employed repeatedly in the literature of the cult.

The second tier of parallels works on a broader level, emphasising the patience, steadfastness and constancy of the martyr in the service of truth, and that such constancy results in the receipt of supernatural aid in their sufferings. This receipt of grace effectively confirms the truth

---

16 Acts 7:57
of the cause, as constancy in the truth is rewarded by grace. Thus in Marshall's frontispiece to the *Eikon Basilike*, the representation of the rock symbolises this quality of constancy as it stands unmoved in the midst of a stormy sea.19 Thus the storms of the persecutor's rage break powerlessly over the rock of the martyrs constancy, and hence the martyr wins supernatural help, symbolised in the *Eikon Basilike* by the shaft of heavenly light falling on Charles' upturned face; in turn, this grace brings with it the assurance of ultimate victory over his enemies. All confrontations of this type, between persecutor and persecuted, consists of a series of ritualised battles or contests in which words and actions take on a significance beyond the apparent, and transpose the earthly battles onto a heavenly plane. It is a process rooted in the transposition of values noted by Droge and Tabor, whereby the suffering and defeated prisoner becomes the glorious martyr and the elect of God; a reversal of values which compliments the belief that heroic death is the entry into the fullness of life.20 Here it may be possible to suggest another distinction between 'Anglican' and 'Puritan' piety referred to earlier by Florence Sandler. The Calvinist conviction of election tended to posit the fact of salvation squarely into this world, whereas the non-Calvinist could only hope for the possibility of salvation in the world to come. Thus although both 'Anglicans' and 'Puritans' emphasised the depravity of the world and the power of sin, the 'Puritan' looked to the cross as a symbol of election and salvation already attained; whereas the 'Anglican' saw only a confirmation of the suffering of this world and the hope of resurrection after death. This awareness of the ultimate unsatisfactory nature of the mundane world encourages one to look upon death as the entry into something better, into greater life, and thus as something to be welcomed. Milton on the other hand, taking the Puritan assurance to its logical conclusion, came very close in his later writings to arguing a mortalist view. Charles, in contrast, on the morning of his execution, could greet it as, "my second wedding day; I would be as trim today as may be, for before tonight I hope to be espoused to my blessed Jesus."21 As John Knott has observed, the greater the suffering and abuse heaped upon the martyr the greater the display of constancy, fortitude and forgiveness the martyr is

19 The symbolism of the rock was borrowed from earlier Puritan works and is a common Renaissance symbol of constancy
able to display, likewise, "the more telling the contrast between the abused body of the martyr and the glorified body of the saint."\textsuperscript{22}

One element of the cult surrounding Charles which is absent from earlier martyrologies are the deliberate parallels drawn between the life and death of Charles and Christ; parallels which critics of the cult, from Milton onwards have found particularly objectionable. In a sense all Christian martyrdom is \textit{imitatio Christi}, as it depends upon the achievement of spiritual victory through suffering; the overcoming of worldly strength through apparent weakness, the reversal of earthly values, the conscious setting of one's face towards 'the truth', and following through the implications of that commitment with fortitude. Yet if Christ's passion prefigures the experience of most Christian martyrs, the explicit identification of Charles with Christ is virtually unique in the annals of martyrology. Sermons and printed works before and after the execution present the parallels boldly and without apology, drawing out the particular ways in which both Charles and Christ were kings, how they were both rejected by their people, how they were both 'men of sorrows', hunted, betrayed, imprisoned, abused etc. How the scaffold in Whitehall became Charles' Calvary, how like Christ, he forgave his enemies and prayed for his persecutors, how he remained constant in his commitment to the truth, setting his face towards his eventual death through obedience to his vocation; how he was tried by an illegal court and by a self-righteous religious faction, and how, having been faithful unto death, he received the crown of life.\textsuperscript{23} In chapter three, I discuss in greater detail some of the implications of this parallel in the establishment of the cult, as well as the parallels drawn between Charles and other biblical kings such as David and Josiah; particularly in the \textit{Eikon Basilike} where Charles becomes a modern day psalmist. Yet although Milton and those of his persuasion could condemn such parallels as blasphemous, nevertheless we are again presented with the fact that many people responded favourably to the image of Charles as a Foxian martyr, Christlike in his suffering and a king standing in the tradition of the godly kings of the Old Testament. It was that reception which made the cult a reality, and the remainder of the thesis addresses the ways in which this image, and the political theology which sustained it, farred

\textsuperscript{22} Knott, I. R. \textit{Discourses of martyrdom in English literature. 1563-1694}. 1993. P. 10

\textsuperscript{23} See, for example: Symmons, E. \textit{Vindication of King Charles}. 1648. Leslie, H. \textit{The martyrdom of King Charles, or his conformity with Christ in his sufferings} 1649. And others which will be considered in greater detail in chapters two and three.
after 1660 when 'Charles, King and martyr' was incorporated into the Calendar of the Church of England.

Turning, in conclusion, to the question of sources, in a sense the problem of sources is that there are both too many and at the same time not enough! For example, a glance at the number of January 30th sermons on deposit in any large research library immediately presents the researcher with a daunting task. At first sight many of these sermons appear to be saying very much the same thing, yet on closer investigation they reaction with and reflect contemporary events and can be read as a commentary upon those events. However, the majority of printed sermons belong to the period after 1660, when the cult was part of the official cycle of observance of the established church. Most of the surviving printed sermons were delivered either at Westminster Abbey, St Margaret's Westminster, St Paul's, or in one of the great cathedrals, in other words, they represent the official view given on state sponsored occasions. Another feature of the sources is their patchiness. There is a great deal of material relating to the 1640s, the outpouring of tracts on every conceivable subject, which is such a feature of the period, includes a sizeable quantity devoted to the person of the King and the Royalist cause. Whilst this is of interest, nevertheless it has to be borne in mind that these tracts were written to persuade and encourage, and if many of them dealt with subjects such as divine right or the duty of obedience this was because the author felt that such qualities were conspicuous by their absence. Political tracts do not need to defend what is taken for granted, only ideas and institutions which are under attack. What is of particular interest are writings on the cult for the decade 1649 - 59; in other words, the period when the Royalists were on the defensive and it was often dangerous to produce works explicitly praising the martyr. Such material is available, but is often coded to avoid or deceive the Republican authorities. Sermons purporting to discuss the Jews and the Passion were infact Royalist reflections on the regicide, and works of theology and devotion contained digressions on the divine right of kings and the sin of rebellion. Therefore, in chapters two and three, an attempt has been made to draw together enough of this material to demonstrate that the imagery, typology and political theology of the cult were established in parallel with Charles' imprisonment, trial and execution.
In contrast to this period of creativity, the plethora of 30th January sermons illustrates that there were no substantial additions made to the typology or political theology of the cult after the Restoration, even though the ways in which that typology was applied and glossed did change over the years to reflect political changes. Yet the Church of England was determined to claim the martyr as their exclusive property over and against the Presbyterians. What this meant was that the martyr became harnessed to a Royalist Anglican and later Tory historiography of the Civil Wars, which effectively excluded all those who did not accept this particular reading of recent history.

With the Exclusion Crisis voices were already being raised in criticism of the cult. In particular, the opposition focused on what they called ranting high church clergy who were using the Fast as an excuse to preach overtly political sermons. From there, chapter five details the fragmentation of the cult between those who retained the traditional political theology, and those who adapted the cult to accommodate the events of 1688. Also discussed in this chapter is the way in which the cult became part of the 'triumph of conservatism', particularly after 1714, where Charles the martyr becomes an image of reasonable and settled government, and the victim of fanaticism and enthusiasm.

Whilst this is a wide ranging and multi-disciplinary work, nevertheless at its heart stands the figure of Charles I, both as an individual struggling to cope with the various traumas of the 1640s, and as the King and martyr of popular belief. The lack of attention the cult has received reveals a gap in our reading of the seventeenth century which I hope this work will go some way to filling; for the cult takes us into a world of sacred monarchy, patriarchalism, popular religion and the martyr cults, areas which may be foreign to our contemporary experience but which provide valuable insights into the beliefs and assumptions of the period. The origins and persistence of the cult reveals how such a political theology could inspire and sustain Royalist and later conservative political beliefs and action.
Chapter two. Habeas corpus: the foundations of the cult before 1649.

If you play the Jews, you shall be paid like Jews, you and your posterity shall groan under the curse of God and men for ever.
(Symmons, E. Messages of peace. 1648, p121)

I confess his sufferings make me a Royalist that never cared for him.
(Sedgwick, W. Justice upon the Armie remonstrance. 1649, p31)

What subject can give sentence on his king?
(Shakespeare, W. Richard II. Act IV. Sc.1)

It is not the intention of this thesis to dwell upon the events of the 1640s except insofar as they are relevant to the development of the cult. The literature on the English Revolution is now vast, yet the question of the antecedents of the cult has not been fully investigated, for the cult of Charles the martyr did not spring into being out of nowhere in January 1649. On the contrary as the preparations between Charles, Edward Symmons and John Gauden over the Eikon Basilike demonstrate, the component parts of the cult were known and fully available to the eulogists and preachers well before the execution obligingly provided them with a body. Perhaps more importantly, there was a substantial body of the nation who by 1647-48 were ready to receive such images and who could increasingly identify their hopes and fear with the figure of the defeated King. Although the twentieth century is familiar with the 'cult of personality', it is impossible to speak of a martyr cult in the traditional Christian sense, before there has been a killing. However, this chapter will attempt to demonstrate that it was in the period 1646-48 that the imagery, typology and ideology of the cult was created. This typology, and the political theology which underpinned it, developed principally out of the confusion and anxiety of the late 1640s. Fears over the rise of religious radicalism; dislike of the high taxation necessary to keep the army in the field, and the 'new men' who had come to prominence in the County Committees; as well as anxieties over the propriety of opposing the Lord's anointed and the precedents this established in a hierarchical and patriarchal society, were some of the negative factors contributing to a reassessment of attitudes towards the King in the period after his military defeat. On a more positive note, the Royalist war effort had always been rooted in a sense of personal allegiance to the person of the King, dismissing as treasonous sophistry Parliamentary attempts to invoke the doctrine of the Two Bodies to justify their opposition to the person of the King as opposed to the
office of kingship. This identification with the King's person was encouraged through the use of the royal Touch, the presentation of Charles as the representative of the 'good old laws', and through the image of suffering kingship associated with the period of confinement after 1646. In particular, the image of suffering kingship successfully encouraged all those who hated or feared the victorious Parliament and its radical allies to identify their sufferings with those of Charles. He became an icon and representative of the suffering nation, a Christ-like figure suffering for his people, and one able to claim with some justification that he was a true 'martyr of the people'. It was an image capable of surviving even the negative propaganda of The Kings cabinet opened, Charles' propensity for dissembling and his Engagement with the Scots.

The meeting of the Long Parliament in 1640 and the slide into armed conflict over the next eighteen months was accompanied by a sustained propaganda campaign by both the King and Parliament as each side tried to justify their actions and win support. Parliament claimed it was defending true religion and traditional liberties against a faction of papists and malignants who had captured the King and misled him by their 'evil counsels'. The King claimed he was defending the Church of England, the royal prerogative and the traditional constitution from a rabble of sectaries and anarchists whose secret design was to pull down all order and property in the state. Both sides engaged in a pamphlet war before the actual fighting broke out, putting forward their own position and trying to blacken that of the enemy.

At the beginning of the Civil Wars, when many believed that Charles could win a military victory over his enemies, Royalist propaganda was conducted on four broad fronts. First of all there was the appeal to a traditional, personal loyalty to the King. The pamphlet recording the raising of the Kings standard at Nottingham has the royal standard decorated with a picture of the King as well as the royal arms, and Royalist invective was directed in particular at the Parliamentary appeal to the two bodies theory to justify their opposition (See fig. 1). As Dudley Digges put it, the Parliamentarians, by their use of the two bodies theory, created the logical absurdity of 'the King in his army fighting against himself in the opposite army.'

1 Kantorowicz, E. H. The king's two bodies: a study in mediaeval political theology. 1957.
3 Digges, D. The unlawfulness of subjects taking up arms against their sovereign, in whatever
A true and exact Relation of the manner of his Majesty's setting up of His Standard at Nottingham, on Monday the 22. of August, 1642.

First, The forme of the Standard, as it is here figured, and who were present at the advancing of it.

Secondly, The danger of setting up of former Standards, and the damage which ensued thereon.

Thirdly, A relation of all the Standards that ever were set up by any King.

Fourthly, The names of those Knights who are appointed to be the Kings Standard-bearers. With the forces that are appointed to guard it.

Fifthly, The manner of the Kings coming hift to Country.

Sixthly, The Cavaliers resolution and dangerous threats which they have uttered, if the King concludes a peace without them, or hearkens unto his great Council the Parliament: Moreover how they have shar'd and divided London amongst themselves already.

1. Allegiance to the person of the King. The royal standard raised at Nottingham. (Woodcut, 1642)
Secondly, during the summer of 1642 Charles made repeated use of the idea that he alone represented the known laws of England. He told the gentry of many counties that in his possible downfall they would witness their own; for the hand that was raised against him would soon move on to attack all hierarchy and property. The fear of social radicalism and the consequences of setting dangerous precedents regarding property rights has been identified as an important factor in the growth of royalism after 1641, and again, the fear of social anarchy was to become a major factor in the late 1640s in encouraging support for the now captive king. The remaining two factors may appear to be mutually contradictory. On the one hand, as David Smith has demonstrated, there was within the Royalist movement throughout the 1640s a continuing tradition of constitutionalism. It is significant that at his trial Charles chose to defend himself as the representative of lawful authority and not as a divine right monarch in the grand Filmerian tradition. The identification of Charles as a martyr for the 'good old laws' struck a responsive chord in people frightened by the lawless depredations of soldiers, sectaries and County Committees. Yet many of the sermons preached and printed throughout the same period - and the fourth aspect of Royalist propaganda - presented the ideology of divine right patriarchalism and non-resistance and it is apparent that many who responded favourably to the image of Charles as the defender of constitutional authority simultaneously retained a view of monarchy rooted in divine right.  

4 Constitutional authority included patriarchalism and the belief in the sacredness of
an anointed king; it was not necessarily a question of either/or. The seventeenth century
conservative did not have to choose between constitutionalism or divine right, the two aspects were
united in the traditional constitution which Charles claimed to represent and defend. The
individual who honoured a king who could heal scrofula by a touch and was God's viceregent on
earth, was at the same time honouring the traditional constitution and the 'good old laws'.

Although Charles himself might try to present himself as a constitutionalist, many of the
clergy who tried to give an ideological underpinning to royalism tended to stress the patriarchalist
view. Matthew Griffith, who described himself as 'a lover of the truth', preached a sermon in
London in 1643, entitled Touching the power of a king, and proving out of the word of God, that the authority of
a king is only from God and not of men. Griffith was rector of St. Mary Magdalen in the City and a
committed follower of Charles. He was eventually sequestered from his living and his daughter was
killed at the siege of Basing House. Griffith survived the Republic to be restored to his living in
1660 where, according to the Dictionary of National Biography, he ruptured a blood vessel whilst
preaching and died in 1665.5 Griffith's views and experiences during the Civil Wars and Republic
are typical of many Royalist clergy who declared their allegiance to the King, were ejected,
sequestered or imprisoned and finally restored in the early 1660s. As such he is representative of
his caste and the political theology it preached.

Their view of monarchy, its origins and prerogatives, the duty of subjects and the right
ordering of society, whilst in no way original, came to be accepted as the orthodox ideological
underpinnings of the cult. It was essentially the same political theology of patriarchal absolutism,
divine right, non-resistance and adherence to the fundamental laws of the kingdom, found in
Filmer and Bodin and reasserted by the Tories during the Exclusion Crisis, when many Royalist
sermons and tracts from the 1640s were reprinted. It was the same political theology which caused
so much anxiety to Tories after 1688 and which was to turn so many of them into either
non-jurors or Jacobites and which divines like Luke Milbourne trumpeted forth from their pulpits
each 30th January in the first decades of the eighteenth century.

5 DNB: Vol.8, p. 677. In 1660, immediately prior to the Restoration, Griffiths published a sermon
entitled Fear God and the king, dedicated to General Monck. This sermon reiterates the same
political theology of divine right and non-resistance found in the 1643 sermon. Milton addressed a
short reposte to this tract entitled Brief notes upon a late sermon.
Fundamental to this creed was the belief that "kings are not the offspring of man but the generation of God". And that this power from God is established in the King in the same way that it is established in every father and was originally invested in Adam.

Honour thy father, as God alone rules the whole world, and as the sun gives light to all creatures, so the people of one land do most naturally yield obedience to one head, one king.

Thus sovereignty, as Bodin had said, cannot by its nature be divided, for, 'if a body have two heads they will not easily agree upon motion. Sovereignty in one person is most natural, most reasonable, most honourable, most necessary, most divine.' A sovereign king who is the Lord's anointed may rule in equity and justice, or degenerate into tyranny, yet he must be obeyed in all things. Whilst Griffith accepted that, 'their sceptres are not given them to dash out the brains of their innocent subjects', nevertheless the people may not resist their king under any circumstances, for to accept any grounds of resistance implied that the people might judge the actions of their king; a situation contrary to both the divine appointment and an undivided sovereignty. The ban on resistance was as absolute as the power of the king: no pretext, no excuse, can justify active rebellion, even if the actions of the king should lead to the destruction of the whole nation. God alone raises up a king whether good or bad, and the bad are there to punish the sins of the people. To resist a tyrant merely compounds the sin which put him there in the first place. The only concession allowed is that of passive obedience, one may refuse to obey an order which contravenes natural or divine law, but having done so one must passively accept whatever penalty the king might inflict. Griffith claims no originality for this doctrine, on the contrary, it is, he claims, a doctrine rooted in the very creation itself as set forth in Genesis, and was the orthodox teaching of the church until corrupted by papists and Puritans. He took an Erastian view of the church and asserts that it had no independent prerogative of its own and must not only be submissive to the Crown herself, but teach due submission to the people. Thus he announces

---

6 Griffith, M. *A sermon preached in the citie of London by a lover of the truth* 1643, p. 16.
7 ibid pp. 16, 4
8 ibid p. 8
Oh, that our popular clergy either or could look beyond Luther. They might then learn more manners towards kings, from Irenaeus, Tertullian, Chrysostome, Basil, and to qualify their ignorant zeal or their malicious knowledge.

Such views are repeated in a tract of 1643 by Edward Symmons entitled *A loyal subject's belief*. Symmons was an Essex parson who, according to his own account, was forced out of his living in favour of a weaver of Nottingham who was 'of no university' because he endeavoured to maintain the king's honour according to my duty and protestation. This produced me the name of Royalist, yea a rank Cavalier, and I should have a buff coat and a scarlet pair of hose bought me presently to make me complete.

Symmons may not have been quite the innocent victim of social confusion and Roundhead bullying his tract claims. To begin with the tract was printed at the Royalist headquarters at Oxford, and a glance at the chapter headings reveals that he is here presenting the same ideology of patriarchal power and non-resistance as Matthew Griffith. His chapters deal with the fact that the king is the Lord's anointed, the supreme magistrate accountable only to God. That all lawful authority is of divine right and that resistance in any form is against God, His law, His gospel, and the tradition of orthodox Christianity; as well as against the laws of reason, nature and prudence.

On the question of monarchy, Symmons is in complete agreement with Griffith when he states that of all government it is the best, and most perfect; it being most opposite to anarchy, most agreeing to well ordered nature it being that which God set up among his own people, and hath the nearest resemblance of himself; for where Majesty is all concentrated in one, there is a more complete image of God who is but one.

Monarchy is thus established by God in society and nature as the surest and safest form of government. The implication being that to weaken or overthrow this God-given order is to invite anarchy and divine judgement.

---

9 ibid p. 11
11 ibid p. 7
12 Symmons was a prolific author in the Royalist cause. Apart from *A loyal subject's belief*, he published a sermon preached before Prince Rupert's regiment of cavalry, as well as *The King's messages for peace*, and *The vindication of King Charles*, both published in 1648 and discussed below.
Like most other Royalist authors who wrote on the origins and prerogatives of monarchy, Symmons complements his theory of divine and natural law with that of non-resistance and passive obedience. Half his book is devoted to this subject, although Symmons tends to stress the Christian virtues of humility and meekness and the example of Christ who did not oppose the powers that be, rather than the usual injunctions against the sin of resistance. Yet even Royalist authors who could accept some sort of contract in the origins of government could still go on from there to construct arguments of divine right monarchy and non-resistance.

In a curious work, again of 1643, entitled *Christus dei, the Lord's anointed*, Thomas Morton, the ejected Bishop of Durham, rehearses again the familiar arguments concerning the power of kings and 'proves' from the Old Testament that monarchy is rooted in divine and natural law and is complemented by the duty of submission and non-resistance in the subject. Yet unlike Filmer, Griffith, Symmons and many other Royalist writers, Morton does not root the origin of royal power in any original donation of God to Adam, nor in the patriarchal imperative of undivided male sovereignty. Morton's argument is that civil society is rooted in man's need for mutual help and order for his self-preservation. Also, in contradiction to Hobbes, the faculties of will, reason and speech make man a sociable creature who can only be truly himself in relationship with others. Since all these needs and faculties are implanted by God, civil society has its origins in and was foreseen by God. In a reworking of Aristotle, Morton is arguing that the coming together of men into society, although inspired by God for his purposes, originates in the will and needs of man for civil society, so that in a sense 'the people' are the originators and creators of their own society.

Having come together in society, the people may choose to give the supreme power to whomsoever they will. But having done so neither they nor their successors can revoke that choice. If the people invest a king and his heirs with this supreme power they can never change their minds and take back the supreme power unto themselves. ¹³ Morton arrives at the same conclusion as Griffith and Symmons, that there is only one supreme power in the state as there is only one God, and that power is vested in the king who must therefore be absolute because a house divided against itself will fall. The election of the people is much inferior to the investing power of God.

¹³ Morton, T. *Christus dei, the Lord’s anointed* 1643, p. 11.
and the king, once installed, is above all other members, laws and institutions of the state. Yet in this work, which on the one hand presents a very high view of monarchy, and which rehearses all the usual arguments from the Bible and nature as to why a king should be supreme and unfettered, there remains this anomaly of the original contract between free men who came together in civil society for mutual protection, prosperity and comfort and who in so doing 'create a king'. This qualification most other theorists of royal power during the Civil Wars rejected, both on principle and as an unnecessary complication of what was essentially a very simple doctrine of divine donation, patriarchal succession and social subordination. Indeed it is the very simplicity of this ideology which made it so powerful and such a threat to those who rejected the whole structure of Royalist political theology.

As we have seen, for the seventeenth century conservative belief in the divine right of kings and respect for the fundamental laws were not mutually exclusive and both figured prominently in Royalist propaganda throughout the 1640s. Charles himself made this point powerfully both at his trial and on the scaffold by demanding to know how power without law can make law. The reaction to the lawlessness and innovations in English life both during and after the first Civil War and the desire for a return to known and settled ways in church and state were undoubtedly an important factor in the swing back to the King after 1646. This yearning for a return to 'normalcy' was prepared to forget the fears of innovation and arbitrary government aroused by the royal policies of the 1630s; instead the King became an icon of established ways and settled laws, under threat from forces which sought to turn the world upside down. As Charles Dallison put it in The Royalists defence of 1648, 'Those men at Westminster have usurped both sovereignty and the justice seat, and by our woeful experience, we find, they make their own will the law of the land.' Thomas Alleyn's Old Protestants letanie of 1647 echoes the same sentiment when he prays

That thou wilt be pleased again to restore
All things in due order, as they were before,
That the Church and the State may be vexed no more.

---

Dallison, C. The Royalists defence: vindicating the King's proceedings in the late warre made against him. 1648, p. 3.
Te rogamus audi nos

Dallison's tract contrasts with the writings we have considered so far in that instead of an abstract justification of patriarchal absolutism, it is a measured presentation of the balanced or mixed constitution. As such he may be responding to the growing desire to see the King as the representative of lawful, as opposed to arbitrary, authority. He claims that the state is only truly governed when the component parts of the constitution work harmoniously together under the law. It is the triumph of private judgement and ambition over submission to lawful authority which is the cause of the Civil Wars. By its victory over the King, Parliament has invested itself with an arbitrary power and by declaring itself the source of sovereignty, the sole agent of law making and the focus of loyalty, if has effectively reduced the people to slavery, for

   if the major part of the Members require from thee, thy life, thy estate, thy fortune, thy friends, or whatever else is most dear unto thee, it is, say they, a breach of privilege of Parliament not to submit thyself to the block, and render all to their lusts.

This sorry state of affairs must remain until the King is restored to his full rights and prerogatives, 'for 'till then, although we have as many new governors as new moons, it is but so often changing the thief.' Dallison is insistent that all power, even royal, which is exercised without law is arbitrary. Although the King has an absolute power in his negative voice and in his dispensing power, nevertheless even this absolute power operates within a legal and constitutional framework.

It must be said that Dallison's view of the sovereignty of the King is modest and quite contrary to both Bodin and Filmer. He distinguishes between the power to make laws, the power to expound the law and the power to govern; only the last of these powers belongs exclusively to the crown.

---

15 Alleyn, T. *The olde Protestants letanie* 1647, p. 3.
16 ob cit p. 7
17 ibid p. 6
18 For a discussion of the limitations on 'absolute' monarchs, see Henshall, N. *The myth of absolutism: change and continuity in early modern European monarchy.* 1992.
neither the making, declaring, or expounding the law, is any part of sovereignty. But regulating the people by commanding the laws be observed and executed, pardoning the transgressors thereof and the like, are true badge of a supreme governor. All such are kings.¹⁹

This 'true badge of a supreme governor' inevitably demands a measure of independence on the part of the crown if it was to execute this dispensing and regulating power. However, the interface between the rule of law and the crown's prerogative freedoms provided fertile ground for conflict and confrontation, indeed it was precisely at this interface that the Civil Wars originated. Yet Dallison is insistent that it is because of the upsetting of the balanced constitution that this desolation is come upon the whole kingdom. Had the King been suffered to enjoy his lawful power of sovereignty; the judges of the realm their office of declaring the law, by which the King governs, and the Parliament its proper authority had the divines, the lawyers, and especially the members of the two Houses, kept themselves within their own spheres and everyone submitted unto and obeyed his lawful superior, the known law of the land had continued in force and consequently we had still been a most flourishing people.²⁰

Here we see again that strain of constitutional royalism which David Smith traces through Charles' replies to the Nineteen Proposition, and to Hotham outside Hull. It is the same approach Charles was to use to such good effect at his trial, shortly after Dallison's tract was published. But it was a constitutionalism rooted in a view of sovereignty and submission which differed little in essence from the more strident concepts of Griffith, Symmons and other Royalist writers. What Dallison was trying to do was to make the royal prerogative and the position of Charles as the defender of that prerogative, more palatable by appealing to precedent and the growing war-weariness of the people. Dallison is insistent that power without law can never be a sure foundation for a state and reflected the hopes of many when he stated that, 'as the Members could not have usurped this power but by war, so they cannot hold it but by force. Instantly upon

¹⁹ ob cit p. 70
²⁰ ibid p. 8-9
the law having its free passage their kingdom is at an end'. Here he encapsulates, even before the death of Charles, the continuing dilemma of the various Republican and Protectoral regimes and their attempts to find a legitimate basis of power other than that of the drawn sword. Dallison presages a decade of growing calls for a 'free Parliament' after 1649, a Parliament which, as everyone was aware, would move to restore the monarchy.

Apart from theoretical defences of monarchy, there emerged after 1646 a greater emphasis upon the person of Charles, now a prisoner of either the Parliament or the Army. Increasingly Charles' predicament is presented as representative of the kingdom; as the king suffers, so the kingdom also suffers. As the various factions refuse to respond to Charles' offers of peace, so the nation continues under arbitrary rule and confusion. In a one act play published anonymously in 1647 entitled, *The Levellers levell'd*, the narrator declares

O England, dost thou yet want eyes to see
How many rogues are digging graves for thee?
Doth not thy very heart consume with pain,
When thou considerest thy sovereign
Even with chains unto the earth is held,
His sufferings being unparalleled?
Seest thou not his religious constancy,
His patience, care and zealous piety,
And canst thou still give credit to these elves,
Who suck thy blood for to make fat themselves.

---

21 ibid p. 141.
22 Tracts putting forward the full Filmerian doctrine of divine right, non-resistance and passive obedience continued to appear, such as *Foure apologicall tracts*, published during the king's trial, wherein the author declares that he will continue to respect the sacredness of an anointed king, 'And if this be treason, I shall live and die a traitor; and so will true Christians all'. (p. 29)
23 Anon. *The Levellers levell'd*. 1647, p. 6. The author is already considering the possibility of Charles' death, for the play ends with the prayer, 'Let heaven shower upon his head / The blessings of the day, / And when his soul is thither fled / Grant that his son may sway.' P. 14
This identification allows the Royalists to then insist that only when the king is restored to his rightful place will peace and prosperity return to England. Whether that 'rightful place' meant 1641 or 1639 is never discussed in any detail.

The volume of such writings rose to a crescendo during 1648 with widespread popular opposition to the rule of Parliament, the Army and the sectaries. The outbreak of the second Civil War must have encouraged many to hope that the King might again have the military option at his disposal. Royalists such as Paul Knell and Edward Symmons, Presbyterians like William Prynne, and 'reformed' Independents like William Sedgwick, all denounced the continuing imprisonment of the King and, after the Army's victories in the autumn, the increasing threat that the king might be tried for his life. Even the Army's Remonstrance acknowledged the power of the King's presence, his rising popularity and the threat this posed to their victories.

Edward Symmons, whom we have already met as chaplain to a regiment of Prince Rupert's cavalry, reflected in his writings of 1648 many of these hopes and fears. He published in that year two works, The Kings most gracious messages for peace, and a personal treaty, in which he attempted to demonstrate that Charles had been striving for peace and a just settlement since the outbreak of the first Civil War; and A vindication of King Charles: or, a loyal subjects duty, which was a lengthy reply to The king's cabinet opened, and an attempt to limit the damage caused by Parliament's exposure of Charles double-dealings. Both these tracts included the by-now familiar recitation of Royalist political theology and inveighed against what he saw as the faction of evil and ambitious men who have brought such a calamity upon King and country. But what is significant is that Symmons included substantial sections both in Messages for peace, and the Vindication on the personal qualities of Charles and in particular his identification with the sufferings of his people and the numerous parallels between Charles' predicament and the Passion of Christ; indeed, this parallel is presented on the title page of the Vindication. In an attempt to elicit a sympathetic response from his readers Symmons repeatedly points to the figure of the suffering Charles, 'Have you no feeling of his sufferings?' he demands.
no share in his sorrows? Is it not for your sakes that he endures all these hard and heavy things? Can there be named any other reason for them than because he will not yield you up to be slaves and bond men?24

This is an early example of a technique which was to become central to early cult writing. As we will see when we move on to look at the elegies and sermons produced in the wake of the regicide, this epideictic technique of dwelling upon the personal integrity of Charles and the pathos of his predicament removed the need to discuss the political and constitutional issues at stake. Charles becomes the type of a Christian martyr and as such his actions and his cause are under God's favour and beyond reproach. Likewise, his opponents can have nothing to recommend them.

The Christ-Charles parallel appeared again in *Messages of peace*, where Symmons called Charles' various offers of negotiation, 'his Majesties gospel to his people,' and just as the Roman Senate would not have condemned Christ if they had read his gospels, so the modern Senate, Parliament, would never have passed the Vote of No Addresses if they had read Charles' messages, 'with a right eye'.25 But the rebels never had any intention of finding a just settlement, according to Symmons, the only settlement they could consider was their own usurpation; and the only offer they would accept from Charles was his self-destruction. Yet they had not bargained for Charles' constancy, 'Our Saviour would rather suffer himself to be no man, than yield himself to be no king; he would rather part with his life, than his kingship, and so will our sovereign'.26 The scandal of the King's treatment should arouse all, 'in whose manly breasts doth yet remain any true spark of right religion, or ancient honour'27 to fight in his service. But of greater significance than the desire for revenge is the Christ-like parallel to be drawn from Charles' example, for, 'He that reads his Majesty in these his messages and declarations, and considers well the discovery made therein of his disposition, must needs conclude that never [a] king since Christ's time was induced with more of Christ's spirit.'28 Charles' imprisonment at Holdenby is compared to Christ's time in the

---

24 Symmons, E. *A vindication of King Charles* 1648, p. 107.
25 Symmons, E. *The King's most gracious messages of peace* 1648, a3v.
26 ibid p. 50
27 ibid p. 107
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wilderness; like Christ, Charles' true nature was, 'shadowed much from vulgar eyes by the black
clouds of slander and reproaches.' Like Christ, Charles has a charisma which was able to convert
his enemies, or at least obliged them to acknowledge his good qualities; a truth the Army's
Remonstrance also complained of. But for all that, Symmons fears that the rebels will still bring
Charles to his death, for he solemnly warns his readers to reflect upon the fate of the Jews after the
death of Christ, 'Will you crucify your king, as the Jews did theirs?' He asks

How doth the curse cleave to that nation for that act unto this day? So may it not be said
to you (O people of England) will you murder your King? Will you suffer your most pious
and gracious King, after all these unspeakable abuses which he hath already endured (for
your sakes) at the hands of your servants to be destroyed by them? If you play the Jews,
you shall be paid like Jews, you and your posterity shall groan under the curse of God and
man for ever.  

The Vindication of King Charles repeats much of the same arguments of Messages of Peace concerning
the nature of authority, the perils of rebellion and in justifying Charles' actions. Of particular
interest is chapter twenty-six entitled A true parallel between the sufferings of our Saviour and our sovereign in
divers special particulars. The themes discussed in Messages appear again, but in a more explicit form.

Symmons declares that

I will set him forth in Christ robes, as clothed with sorrows that never Prince has a more
perfect fellowship with the Son of God in this worlds miseries than yours hath. Never was
Christ's yoke better fitted for any, never did any bear a greater measure of His burden.
And if nearness in condition here foreseeps a nearness of conformity in the life to come
then think with yourselves, from what you observe, how superlatively glorious above
other kings will yours be at Christ's appearing.  

Whilst this may be the most complete exposition of the Christ-Charles parallel to appear before
the regicide, it is apparent from the preface to the second edition of the Vindication that this parallel
had been criticised and Symmons accused of blasphemy and flattery, for he takes some trouble to
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vindicate himself as well as Charles. He argues that the New Testament teaches that a Christian should take up his cross, should die and rise with Christ and that he only meant to show how Charles was a sincere Christian in the way he conformed his sufferings to those of his Saviour. Symmons was at pains to point out that he had not made Charles sinless, nor a partaker of the divine attributes, nor a medium of grace, and naturally Charles' sufferings have not the saving power of Christ's, on the contrary.

I have only noted their likeness in kind. And declare historically, in an observational way what a specific similitude there is or hath been betwixt them.  

The charge of flattery Symmons dismisses more easily: why should he flatter a king who was in no position to reward him, and when loyalty to Charles had resulted in the loss for Symmons of his position and income? In the circumstances of late 1648 it was a telling point.  

Having refuted his critics to his satisfaction, Symmons offers fourteen parallels between Charles and Christ in the Vindication; including the way he was driven from his home, to the fact that both the rebels and the Sanhedrin claimed to act in the name of the people, 'thus were their dealings with our Saviour. And thus also have our English Jews in all respects, dealt with their sovereign' (See fig.2). Like Christ, Charles was forsaken by his people, maligned, his words and actions twisted and misrepresented by his enemies. His followers paralleled the Apostles in the persecution they suffered, and Charles even had his Judas in those who abandoned his cause. Essentially, Charles was radically innocent and did not deserve the sufferings which were heaped upon him, but which were borne with stoical meekness, patience and constancy.

In a word, as Christ was belied, slandered, betrayed, bought and sold for money, reviled, mocked, scorned at, spit on, numbered among transgressors and judged to be such a one from his great misery and from the success his enemies had against him and at last put to death; even so hath the King been used in all respects by his rebellious people who have

---

32 ibid. L12v

33 The eulogists and preachers did not invent the parallel of Christ's passion specifically for Charles' predicament. It had been used previously by Shakespeare in Richard II when Richard says of the courtiers who have betrayed him: 'Did they not sometime cry 'All hail' to me?' So Judas did to Christ, but he in twelve/Found truth in all but one, I in twelve thousand none'. King Richard II. Act IV.1.

34 ob cit p. 249
2. Behold your King! The imprisoned Charles as a Christ-like figure symbolising the sufferings of the nation.
(Woodcut, 1648)
already acted all the parts which the Jews acted upon the Son of God, the last of all excepted which may also be expected in the end from them, when opportunity is afforded.  

Other Royalist writers and preachers also made use of the Christ-Charles parallel at this time. Paul Knell, in three sermons published in London in 1648, placed the parallel in the context of condemnation and hope. Knell, who proudly announces on the title-pages of his sermons that he had been chaplain to a regiment of Cuirassiers in the King's army, not only dedicated his works ‘To all those that are friends to peace and to King Charles,’ but also composed a prayer for the King in which Knell asked that Charles might be restored, his enemies scattered, and ‘Let us no longer see servants upon horses, and Princes walking as servants upon the earth’. His sermons make the usual biblical allusions to the sin of rebellions and the ingratitude of the people of England in bringing down ‘a prudent and most pious Prince.’ Thus in A looking-glass for Levellers, Knell uses the New Testament parable of the vine-yard to illustrate his reading of contemporary events. Knell is convinced that the rebel’s aim and ambition is quite simply

the inheritance, the kingdoms wealth is what they aim at, they seek not the kingdom of God but the riches of this kingdom, that the revenues of the crown and the patrimony of the mitre and the estate of every loyal subject may be theirs.

The fact that the parable of the wicked tenants is usually glossed to foretell the rejection of Christ by Israel and his Passion, is another example of the way the Christ-Charles parallel was being drawn before the regicide, for Knell asserts that ‘Our text is a plain conspiracy against our Saviour
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35 ibid p. 246. Richard Wilcher discussed Symmon’s presentation of the Christ-Charles parallel and the extent to which, in the early months of 1648, the King’s own writings - which later formed the basis of the Eikon Basilike - were intended as part of a campaign to re-establish the image of Charles in the eyes of the nation. See: "What was the King’s Book for? : the evolution of Eikon Basilike”. The yearbook of English studies. Andrew Gurr, ed. 1991, vol.21.

36 Knell, P. Israel and Egypt parallell’d: The life guard of a loyal Christian; A looking-glass for Levellers. All 1648, these, along with two other sermons, were reissued in 1660.
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and the conspiracy of Levellers against our sovereign will match it right.\textsuperscript{41} As we will see in the next chapter, the Christ-Charles parallel was to become a commonplace of cult literature and iconography after the regicide, through one that never lost its controversial edge. As such it gained official sanction by its inclusion in the Office of the 30\textsuperscript{th} January, annexed to the \textit{Book of Common Prayer} in 1662.

At this point it is necessary to move on from the typologies and images being created and publicised in printed sermons and polemics to consider the ways in which Charles was able to draw significant political capital out of traditional views of sacred kingship throughout the 1640s. In particular through his use of the royal Touch for scrofula; that most mysterious expression of the divinity and 'otherness' of the king's person which for over 700 years had been an indispensable prerogative of the French and English crowns,\textsuperscript{42} and as such was a particularly potent expression of the power popularly believed to reside in the person of an anointed king.

The origins of the Touch are lost in the mists of folk-lore and legend, but most modern commentators are content to posit the origins of the English royal Touch for scrofula to the miracle performed by Edward the Confessor. In France the origins of the Touch go back even further, to the early Capetians, if not to Clovis himself; and survived into the nineteenth century when Charles X Touched 121 sick people at his coronation in 1821. Today, scrofula is defined as tuberculous adenitis, or an inflammation of the lymph nodes caused by the bacillus of tuberculosis. However, before the advent of modern medicine any swelling or inflammation of the face or neck tended to be termed scrofula. With its attendant pain, disfigurement and unsightly sores the disease was greatly feared and was, as Bloch remarks, so common as to be at times almost endemic.\textsuperscript{43}

Whatever the origins of the rite of healing, throughout the medieval and early modern period it
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was believed that the kings of England and France had the power to heal this disease through touching the afflicted parts. Crawfurd argues that the final version of the rite in England was devised by Henry VII who restored the rite after the Wars of the Roses, partly to bolster his own claim to the throne, and partly, one suspects, to challenge the popularity of that other late medieval royal healer, Henry VI; whose relics, whether at Chertsey or Windsor, were drawing a steady stream of pilgrims. It was at this time that a standardised rite or ceremony to accompany the Touch was devised; this rite survived, with one or two modifications, until the reign of George I.

On the whole, the Tudors were enthusiastic Touchers. Even when the demands of Protestantism destroyed the healing power of the saints, that of the king remained unaffected. In Queen Mary's Manual, the Queen is shown touching the swollen neck of a scrofulous boy, and her sister Elizabeth continued the rite, though shorn of its more Catholic aspects. Elizabeth was generally informal about when she would perform the Touch; this could occur on Sundays, feast days, or at anytime when a crowd of sufferers were waiting and she had the time. Likewise when on progress, many sufferers would wait upon her for healing. The only restrictions were in periods of hot weather, when, to lessen the danger of infection, healings were not held.

Undoubtedly the power of the Touch was used by Elizabeth to bolster her sovereignty and the cult of Gloriana in much the way that her grandfather Henry VII had restored the rite to underline his claim to the throne. After Elizabeth's excommunication by Pius V in 1570, the ceremony of the Touch was held to demonstrate that the Queen remained a true and anointed monarch. Whatever the Pope might say or do, the continued gift of healing proved that Elizabeth was still, in God's sight, the undoubted Queen of England. In a dedicatory poem to William Clowes at the end of Elizabeth's reign, Thomas Parkin hymns the universal healing qualities of the Queen thus

The happy sacred hand, of our dread sovereign Queen

The Princely loving zeal, of her most royal heart,

Throughout her Highness' land, her loving subjects all have seen

To cure, to help, to heal, our care, our harm, our smart.

Crawfurd. 1911, p. 48
To God all glory for her gracious reign,

To her all blessings, that on earth remain.45

With the advent of James VI of Scotland in 1603 however, the ceremony was in danger of falling out of use. James, unlike Elizabeth, was a Calvinist; bred in the harsher air of Knoxian religion which was zealous in discarding any ceremony or ritual suggestive of idolatry or superstition. As such the rite of healing was not only alien to the royal house of Scotland, but deeply suspect from a doctrinal point of view. Raymond Crawfurd quotes a letter dated October 1603, shortly after James arrived in London, which illustrates the new King's problem.

At this time the King began to take interest in the practice pertaining to certain ancient customs of the kings of England respecting the cure of persons suffering with the King's Evil. So when some of these patients were presented to him in his ante-chamber, he first had a prayer offered by a Calvinist minister, and then remarks that he was puzzled as to how to act. From one point of view he did not see how the patient could be cured without a miracle, and nowadays miracles had ceased and no longer happened: so he was afraid of committing a superstitious act. From another point of view, however, inasmuch as it was an ancient usage and for the good of his subjects, he resolved to give it a trial, but only by way of prayer, in which he begged all present to join him, and then he touched the sick person. It was observed that when the King made this speech, he several times turned his eyes towards the Scotch ministers around him, as though he expected their approval of what he was saying, having first conferred with them.46

This account suggests both unfamiliarity with the rite and scruples over its orthodoxy, yet James apparently satisfied himself on both these scores for the ceremony of the Touch continued throughout his reign, despite the fact that James himself viewed the ceremony with some cynicism; dispensed with the signing of the cross over the patients sores, and he was at pains to stress that any healing came from God, not through any innate virtue in himself.

45 Clowes, W. A right fruteful and approved treatise for the artificial cure of that malady called in Latin Struma, and in English, the Evill, cured by Kings and Queens of England. 1602. Dedication.
His son exhibited no such scruples on his accession in 1625. Charles was happy to perform the ceremony and no doubt readily believed in his God-given power to heal. Charles also continued the practice of his father of minting special healing coins, called Angels, which each supplicant received, and the ceremony of the Touch was an opportunity for Charles to demonstrate the sacredness of his kingship. In many respects the Touch provided an occasion when the King and his subjects met each other under ideal conditions. The King would be seated in majesty in the Banqueting House at Whitehall, attended by his clergy and gentlemen. The people would be presented as suppliants, seeking a supernatural healing from an anointed king. The ceremony would duly unfold, emphasising that what was taking place was both solemn, divine and mysterious, underlying the sacredness of the King and the people's dependence upon him. As such the relationship between king and people was both political and theatrical. It was theatrical in that all were involved in a scripted ritual, where each had a part to play. This theatricality was a recurring theme throughout Charles' life, whether in the masques, a great canvas by Van Dyck, at his trial or on the scaffold, the King, the 'royal actor', is at the centre of the drama, and, depending on the circumstances, the bringer of life, animation or healing. To this extent the ceremony of the Touch was a masque come to life, with real people seeking a positive cure. As such it is not difficult to see how this ceremony, redolent as it is with the imagery of sacred kingship and life-giving monarchy, could be used as a powerful propaganda weapon during the Civil Wars.

Although Charles was an enthusiastic Toucher the demands of order, regulation and decency which characterised many areas of the Court in the 1630s also affected the royal Touch. Strict instructions were issued that sufferers where only to approach the King at specified time of the years, and never when the King was on progress, unless permission had been obtained beforehand; Charles would have none of the informality of Elizabeth's reign. As the country slid into civil war in 1642 such regulation broke down and the King was frequently besieged by sufferers after he left London. Whilst there is no evidence that any of these petitioners were turned away, wartime conditions could prevent as well as facilitate access to the King. Thus in 1643 a tract appeared in London addressed to the King, it purported to be, The humble petition of divers

[In the Shetland Isles, coins bearing the image of Charles I. were held to be cures for scrofula well into the nineteenth century, see: Bloch 1973, p. 223.]
Majesties absence they have no possibility of being cured, wanting all means to gain access to his Majesty, by reason of his abode at Oxford. This petition claimed to be nothing more than a complaint that the war stopped people living in areas controlled by the Parliament from having recourse to the King for healing. But beneath this there is a thinly veiled attack upon the 'transgressions and iniquity of the times' which had brought a sickness over the whole land. There was a relationship between the individual sufferer and the sufferings of the nation, and both could only be healed by the miraculous touch of the King through his return to London.

Where we all wish your Majesty, as well for the cure of our infirmity as for the recovery of the state, which hath languished of a tedious sickness since your Majesty departed from thence, and can no more be cured of its infirmity than we, 'till your gracious return thither, which, that it may the sooner be affected, we your Majesties loyal subjects and humble petitioners, shall ever pray.  

This theme, of the King healing the nation, was at the heart of the political use of the Touch during the 1640s. As we have seen, it had always been a ritual which had served to bolster a high view of monarchy, but in the context of the Civil Wars it acquired a specific function, as the authors of this petition well knew. If the King could still perform the royal miracle then he was still the King, God was still favouring him with his presence. As John Browne put it later in the century

As he takes in him the ruling power of his people, by which he governeth by an hereditary right from his royal ancestors, so he confirms the same to us by his balsamick and sanative power, derived to him from his royal forefathers inherent in him.

The corollary of this view was to throw any resistance to the Lord's anointed into doubt, and to underline the belief that such resistance must be contrary to the will of God and a great blasphemy. Beyond that, is the assertion that England was suffering a 'tedious sickness'; the war was not an heroic fight for true religion and the liberties of the subject, but a symptom of something profoundly wrong with the body politic, a great disease of the kingdom. Lurking behind
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such statements was a semi-conscious belief, akin to that detailed in *The Golden Bough*, concerning the health of a nation being dependent upon the treatment of its king. The sickness expressed through the 'unnatural' Civil Wars could only be healed when Charles was allowed to 'enjoy his own again', or when, as in the masque, all the component parts of society danced in harmony around their king, who alone could provide perspective and meaning. This was a view reiterated in 1660 when William Sancroft, preaching at the consecration of seven bishops and the restoration of the church, asked

Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? Yes, there is: and therefore let us hope well of the healing of the wounds of the daughter of our people, since they are under the cure of those very hands, upon which God hath entailed a miraculous gift of healing, as if it were on purpose to raise up our hopes into some confidence, that we shall owe one day to those sacred hands, next under God, the healing of the Church's and the peoples evils, as well, as of the kings.\(^5\)

The Touch became not only the signature of legitimacy but a justification of the Royalist cause.

Naturally the Parliamentary authorities were not going to allow such a powerful piece of enemy propaganda to be propagated without a challenge, although having said that there seems to be few if any printed sources devoted to the systematic denial of the royal miracle. What Parliament did do was endeavour to stop people seeking out Charles for healing. This obviously became easier after 1646, when Charles was their prisoner, and the Commons Journal for the 23rd March 1647 contains details of a letter received from the Commissioners at Holmby complaining about the numbers of people arriving to be Touched. The House voted to convene a committee to prepare, 'a declaration to be set forth to the people, concerning the superstition of being Touched for the healing of the King's Evil'.\(^5\) Unfortunately the declaration does not survive, as it would be illuminating to see what arguments Parliament put forward against the Touch.

It is also evident that Parliament was unsuccessful in keeping people away, as there are a number of accounts, mainly gathered after the Restoration by John Browne, of Charles healing whilst in captivity where the Touch could still be used to score propaganda points against the

---

victorious Parliament and Army.\(^5\) Indeed, so many people came to Charles to be Touched that his guards nick-named him 'Stroker'. For instance, whilst being held at Hampton Court, Charles was visited by a Quaker woman who had been blinded by the Evil, but who had affected to disbelieve in the royal miracle and had sought a 'conventional' cure. When she failed in this she was persuaded to wait upon the King who administered the Touch and hung a silver coin about her neck on a white silk ribbon. Naturally, according to the story, she recovered and regained her sight, 'and did then fall down upon her knees, praying to God to forgive her for those evil thoughts she had formerly had of her good King, by whom she had received this great blessing.'\(^54\) Likewise, a dissenting gentlwoman who suffered from the Evil also had little faith in the Touch but was persuaded, having exhausted all 'conventional' medicines to go to the King at Hampton Court. There she was Touched, received a silver Angel and was healed. However, as Browne tells the story, on the day of Charles' execution her sores erupted again, only healing themselves slowly after this. It is claimed that the lady was living in the country, away from London, and that it was only later that she was able to make the connection between the King's death and the reappearance of her sores.\(^55\)

The King's straightened circumstances in the late 1640s resulted in many instances not only of faith in the royal miracle, but of a do-it-yourself approach to the ritual. Whilst Charles was at Holmby, he was visited by one Mistress West, whose parents had spent a great deal of money on doctors in an effort to cure her of the Evil. She came to the King with her father and, knowing that the receipt of a gold coin was an important part of the ritual, but also knowing that the King had very little gold with him, they decided to take their own. The King duly took the gold, touched Mistress West and hung the crown on a ribbon which he then placed around her neck, 'she leaving off her plasters she formerly made use of, and keeping her sores clean as she was directed by his Majesties order, her sores soon healed of themselves, and she speedily grew strong and well'.\(^56\) In a

\(^53\) Browne published his work on the royal miracle during the Exclusion Crisis, and it was intended to boost the royal cause. Many of the healings recorded have an obvious propaganda content and recount doubting sectaries and rebels who affected to despise the royal miracle being converted to the King after being cured by the Touch.

\(^54\) Browne. Bk3. 1684, p. 141.
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footnote to this incident, Browne relate that Mistress West subsequently lost the coin, whereupon
the Evil returned until the Angel was found and she wore it again, upon which the Evil left her.

Many healings reveal, like the one just recounted, the importance attached to the gold coin, or Angel, received by those who had been touched. Browne tells of a father and son who both suffered from the Evil. The father had been Touched and had received an Angel from Charles, whereas the son had never been Touched, but could obtain relief from his illness by borrowing and wearing his fathers Angel. Apparently the father and son passed the Angel between them whenever one of them felt the need for it. Likewise a lady was healed by Charles and given an Angel before marrying a merchant and moving with him to Russia; whereupon the husband was afflicted with the Evil. Daunted by the prospect of returning to England to be Touched, the wife lent her husband her Angel, which he wore and was cured. Yet the Angel was not essential to the effectiveness of the royal miracle, as the following two incidents prove and which throw some light on Charles' own involvement with the miracle.

The first concerns one Helena Payne, who approached the king in some distress as he was entering his coach at Windsor to be taken into London to stand trial. She had been made blind through the effects of the Evil and in her despair grabbed Charles by his coat as he entered his carriage and begged him to Touch her. "The good King tells her he has no gold; she still begs for Christ Jesus sake, that he would grant her his gracious Touch; the which she having received, within three days after she grew well and recovered, and did after that retain her sight to her dying day." The second incident occurred on the Isle of Wight during the negotiations for the Treaty of Newport. Charles was returning to Carisbrooke one evening when he was approached by a Mistress Stephens to be Touched for the Evil which had made her blind in one eye; the King performed the Touch and then moved on to prayers. Whilst at prayer the woman recovered her sight and in telling her mother, who was with her, proclaimed a miracle. She was then questioned by the King's surgeon and affirmed that she had indeed been blind in one eye, but that now it was healed and she could see. This disturbance caused the King himself to question the woman
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and in my hearing ask'd her how long her eye had been closed; she answered, above a fortnight. Do you see now, said the King? To which she replied (putting her hand on her other eye) I see your Majesty; I see everything about the room; at which his Majesty paused awhile, with a look of venerable admiration, took her by the hand and kiss'd her.

What is striking about these incidents is their informality compared to the 1630s and the restrictions of time and place imposed upon those who would approach the King for healing. These healings are almost casual by comparison. It is apparent that Charles was solicited for the Touch at any time, whether returning from Newport or even on entering his coach. Likewise the ceremony surrounding the pre-war event is completely absent. Gone are the chaplains intoning the prayers, gone are the obedient lines of hopeful sufferers; instead, Charles is accosted and grabbed by the coat by a woman who begs him for the Touch. Likewise, although the receipt of an Angel had traditionally been an indispensable part of the healing ritual, and despite the ambiguity over whether the gold was merely a sign of the King's charity or an indispensable part of the healing process, the incidents here recounted confirm that when stripped to its essentials the royal miracle depended upon nothing but the physical presence of the King. The chaplains, the Angels and the ceremonies were simply 'things indifferent' and not strictly necessary for the effectiveness of the Touch.

The incidents of the Touch recorded during Charles' captivity also reveal an increasing interaction between Charles and his people. Robbed of the barrier of ceremonial, Charles was confronted directly with petitioners, in one case almost being pulled out of his coach by one of them.61 We meet Charles advising Mistress West to remove the bandages from her sores and to keep them washed and cleaned; commiserating with Helena Payne when he had no gold to give her, or interrogating Mistress Stephens as to her alleged recovery of sight at Carisbrooke. In all these situations we observe a paradox; namely that on the one hand there is a direct relationship with his people such as rarely existed prior to the wars, whilst the context within which
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61 This incident recalls that at Holmby when a rather pompous Parliamentary Colonel tried to enter Charles' carriage and was literally thrown out by the king who remarked that, 'We haven't reached that point yet!'
this meeting takes place confirms the 'otherness' of monarchy; namely its sacredness and wonder-working properties. The Touch confirms the extent to which kings are separate from and elevated above ordinary men and women. These meetings were an intrinsic part of the phenomena of 'popular royalism' after 1646, when as Charles' political and military fortunes declined, his personal following increased, this is matched by Charles' growing appreciation of the loyalty and service offered by those around him who remained loyal.

These healings and the expressions of popular sympathy for the King in his sufferings and misfortunes may have gone some way to confirming Charles' understanding of his role as King and the sources of his authority. It may also have encouraged Charles in his policy of prevarication and double-dealing with the Army and Parliament in the hope that this popular support signified a revival of armed royalism. Certainly, as Crawfurd puts it, 'Parliament could deprive Charles of his crown, it could rob him of his life, but it was powerless to arrest his gift of healing.' A point advocates of the cult where also quick to make after the regicide. The circumstances under which Charles was obliged to offer the Touch in the 1640s, and the fact that cures were recorded almost until the time of the trial, were remarked upon as evidence not only of the justice of the cause and the infamy of his opponents, but primarily as an indication of Charles' sanctity. Even in his wretchedness and preoccupation he did not forget his duty to his subjects; as John Browne put it in 1684, Charles

performed these cures in a very strange and miraculous manner, with and without gold, by prayer and benediction only, by his sacred touch, as also by his sacred and precious blood. Of each of which in their order, where for remark, blessing and cure, none ever of his predecessors were able to be named in the hour with him. A point

It seems appropriate to end this section on healings attributed to the living Charles with perhaps one of the strangest examples of the royal miracle ever recorded; namely a healing where no physical touch actually occurred, a healing which, as Browne says, took place 'by his prayers and benediction only'. Browne includes it in his Adenochoiradelogia in the form of a letter dated the 31st October 1682 from Dr. John Nicholas, Warden of Winchester College. The sufferer in this case

63 Browne Bk. 3. 1684, p. 131-2.
was one Robert Cole, a publican, who suffered from the Evil with swellings on his face and neck. When conventional medicine failed to help him he decided to go to the King and receive the Touch. The problem was that Charles was by this time a prisoner on the Isle of Wight and so beyond Cole’s reach. However, Cole learnt that the King was to be brought through Winchester en route to London to stand trial, and so he decided to wait upon the King as he passed through the town. Charles, however, was not on a royal progress, he was a prisoner under escort and when he arrived in Winchester Cole realised that the crowd of soldiers and officials around him made it impossible to come near enough to received the Touch. According to John Nicholas’ letter, Cole began to shout ‘God save the king’, and ‘May the king live forever’, which produced a predictable reaction from Charles’ escort; they struck him and tried to drag him away. But the rumpus had succeeded in attracting Charles’ attention and seeing that Cole was denied access to him said, ‘Friend, I see thou art not permitted to come near me, and I cannot tell what thou wouldest have, but God bless thee, and grant thy desire’.64

With that Charles was moved on and Cole returned home, where, having failed to be Touched he bathed his sores with water from a bottle he had been given. Over the next few days he noticed that the water in the bottle began to disappear until there was nothing left, than scabs and swellings began to appear on the side of the bottle and as they got bigger so the scabs and swellings on his face and neck got smaller, until they finally disappeared and he was cured. Cole believed that if he lost or broke the bottle the Evil would return, so to prevent this and, out of fear of the Republican authorities, who would not look kindly on any healing involving the reputed intercession of the dead King, Cole hid the bottle carefully. It was kept hidden until after his death, whereupon his widow displayed it after the Restoration and publicised the story of her husband’s miraculous cure, and as Dr Nicholas concludes, ‘the bottle is until this day in the hands of his widow here in Winton, where there are many other witnesses of this’.65

Part of the importance of these healing stories for the development of the cult lies in the fact of the King’s presence, the increasing significance of which is the subject of this chapter. Without the King there could be no healing, as the authors of the 1643 tract knew well. It was the

---
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power of his presence which, when coupled with growing frustration over the lack of settlement after 1646 and the increasing threat of social anarchy and high taxation, accounts for the changing perception towards Charles in the late 1640s. Certainly there is enough evidence from the time of Charles' captivity to attest to the personal charisma of the King and his ability to charm, impress and generally disarm his opponents by the grace, dignity and moderation of his personality. Even Cromwell and Ireton were not immune from this charisma; Ogilvie records how Charles charmed them during the negotiations at Hampton Court in 1647. Certainly Cromwell warned John Hammond, the governor of Carisbrooke Castle, against being weakened in his resolve through Charles' mild disposition. 'Look to thy heart' Cromwell warned, 'Thou art where temptations multiply'.

Commentators who knew Charles in his captivity agree with Ogilvie's comments that at this time a 'new dignity had come to rest upon him, not any more the gesture of the Court, but something sacred, the recompense of suffering'. The creation of a martyr was gathering pace!

Certainly members of Parliament and the Grandees were increasingly concerned at the renewed popularity of the defeated king, the power of his presence and charisma, and the extent to which regard for the person of the King could be read as a rejection of the victorious Parliament and its Army. Not only were people flocking to the King to be Touched when he was lodged at Holmby, Hampton Court or Carisbrooke; his movements around the country were often accompanied by expressions of popular support, and these journeys often took on the appearance of a royal progress. For example, during the King's journey from Newmarket to Windsor in the summer of 1647 in the train of the Army they approached the town of Baldock in Hertfordshire. As Charles and his escort approached the town they were met by a procession led by the parish priest, who was vested in full canonicals and leading his parishioners out to greet the King. The priest, one Josias Byrd, 'deeply moved by the misfortunes of the king' had brought with him the communion cup which he had filled with wine. Byrd greeted Charles by crying, 'May God bless your Majesty' and offered the King the cup of wine for his refreshment. On discovering the name of the priest the king remarked, 'I did not think I had so good a bird in all my kingdom'.

---


67 Kingston, A. Hertfordshire during the great Civil War and the Long Parliament. 1894, p. 92. I am grateful to Dr. John Morrill for this reference. On the subject of the survival and significance of Prayer Book Anglicanism in the 1640s see: Judith Maltby. Prayer Book and people in
What is noticeable about this incident is the lack of response from Charles' army escort who cannot have felt very comfortable at this expression of militant Royalist Anglicanism from Mr. Byrd, nor the significance of the King taking refreshment from the cup which held the consecrated wine at Holy Communion. That the Grandees were treating Charles with great respect is evidenced by his reception in St Albans a few days later. Here his entry became something of a triumphal progress with cheering crowds and ringing bells. On Sunday, Charles attended a Prayer Book service at Hatfield Church conducted, 'with divers superstitious gestures', by Henry Hammond, the King's chaplain, and with the permission of the puritan Earl of Salisbury and Richard Lee, rector of Hatfield. The Presbyterians in Parliament were outraged by this incident, the Fast Day preacher demanding to know, 'If the wheel turns thus, I know not whether Jesus Christ or Sir Thomas Fairfax be the better driver'. The Army's accommodating attitude to the King in 1647 allowed popular royalism to manifest itself, as well as providing the opportunity for Charles to show himself to the people in such a way as to call forth their loyalty.

But as relations deteriorated between Charles and the Army in 1648 they soon came to appreciate the threat posed by Charles' person. Indeed his charisma was considered potent enough to be included in the Remonstrance of the Army where the possible dangers of Charles' steadily rising popularity and its political implications were clearly seen. Charles, according to the Remonstrance, is increasingly seen by the people as the party who had made most of the concessions in the search for a settlement; as the party who is actively seeking a settlement against the apparent vindictiveness and self-seeking of the Army and the Parliament, 'with the people he carries these and the like points of reputation before him, and wants not trumpets everywhere to blaze them sufficiently to his renown and your reproach'. Charles is successfully portraying himself and more ominously increasingly being seen as the only true father of his people. He, rather than the Army or the Parliament is 'the restorer of their beloved peace, ease, freedoms the restorer of their trade and plenty'. The authors of the Remonstrance warn against this charismatic image of the suffering Charles and delineate quite accurately the qualities which the people increasingly saw in the King, thus he is presented as
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a conqueror in sufferings and patience, a denyer of himself for the good of his people, and what not that’s glorious and enduring? And thus would the people be lulled (and indeed cheated) into a security as to any further apprehensions of evil from him; yea possest with acknowledgement and expectation of all their good from him, and their jealousies awakening against you and your adherents only. 69

Here the authors of the Remonstrance pin-point precisely the factors which were eventually to sustain the cult, and nearly all the elements of the cult - Charles' patience, his sufferings on behalf of the people, the Christ-like parallel etc - are here revealed. Like Milton, the Remonstrance sees them as fictions, images and sophistries manipulated cynically to fool the people and produce concrete political results. What the Remonstrance could not accept was the fact that many individuals chose to see Charles as 'a conqueror in suffering' because it seemed to fit their present experience and anxiety. The Remonstrance talks of the people being 'lulled' and 'cheated' by this spurious image of Charles, yet, as Milton realised to his growing frustration, 'the people' increasingly chose the image presented by Charles and the Royalists; they chose to be lulled and cheated, and it was that choice which the authors of the Remonstrance fear will undo all the victories of the Civil Wars if the victors do not look to themselves. Ironically if those self same victors had been a little less blinded by ideology and a little more trusting of the people's instincts they might not have been so ready to provide the Royalists with a ready-made martyr in January 1649, a martyr whose image eventually contributed to their overthrow.

The Remonstrance demonstrates that Charles’ growing popularity and the potency of the image of suffering kingship was not just the invention of Royalist propaganda but corresponded to a genuine shift of public opinion towards the King in the two years preceding his death. Other evidence not only confirms this, but suggests that by the end of 1648 former Independents and members of the Army, to say nothing of the Presbyterians were growing increasingly anxious for the future and suspected that the Grandees had decided to remove the King completely. From the Presbyterian camp came many shrill condemnations of the radicalism and Independency of the Army and its civilian allies. Of particular use to the Royalists was the death bed repentance of Alexander Henderson, the Scottish Commissioner with whom Charles had debated church

69 A remonstrance of His Excellency Thomas Lord Fairfax 1648, pp. 36-7.
government in 1646. Henderson had been prominent in the Scottish Covenanting cause and now, apparently, not only repented of his opposition to Charles but also spoke of his piety and learning in glowing terms. In making this testimony Henderson declared his intention to be that

all those who have been deluded with me, may, by God’s grace and my example not only be undeceived themselves but also stirred up to undeceive others with more alacrity and facility, that the scandal may be removed from our religion and profession and the good King be restored to his just rights and truly honoured and obeyed as God’s vicegerent upon earth.\footnote{Memoirs of the two last years of that unparallell’d prince, of ever blessed memory, King Charles I. 1702, p. 226.}

Henderson declares that Charles was learned, polite and well-informed, but above all he was devout and constant and, in a now familiar vein, the disappointments and indignities he was obliged to endure only served to make ever more apparent ‘his undaunted courage and transcendent wisdom’.\footnote{ibid, p. 230} At first sight such a convenient repentance seems almost to good to be true, and the Scottish General Assembly denounced it as a clumsy Royalist forgery. But for all Henderson’s personal endorsement of the King, he is careful not to condemn the Covenant, merely saying that it had been misused as an excuse for rebellion, and Henderson reminds his readers that the Covenant is explicit in its support of monarchy. As such Henderson is here consistent with his moderate Calvinism and with the growing Presbyterian fears of the social disintegration which must accompany the continued conflict.

These fears are rehearsed in a number of English Presbyterian tracts and pamphlets denouncing the Army, sectaries, Pride’s Purge and the trial of the king.\footnote{See A serious and fruitful representation of the judgements of ministers of the gospell within the province of London. 1649. Prynne, W. A. A brief memento to the present unparliamentary juncto touching their present intentions and proceedings to depose and execute, Charles Steward, their lawfull King. 1648.} They repeat the biblical injunctions to submission and obedience found in their Royalist and Anglican equivalents and vainly endeavour to remind the Grandees, the country and, perhaps, themselves that although the Parliament took up arms to defend itself, it had never been their intention to harm the King or diminish his authority. Now, however, they see the King brought low, the country turned into a
wilderness, religion in tatters and, after Pride's Purge, the Parliament, 'made contemptible and torn in pieces.'

Whilst the disillusionment and anxiety of the Presbyterians may have aided Charles' cause, nevertheless these Presbyterian tracts - with the exception of Henderson - are noticeably cool in their treatment of Charles as an individual. As the Vindication of 1649 put it, they cannot easily forget his 'woeful miscarriages [which we cannot but acknowledge to be many and very great].' As Charles II was soon to discover, the Scots Presbyterians were singularly lacking in that reverence for the person of kings which distinguished their English Anglican counterparts. Nevertheless, as we have seen, it was to be a personal identification with Charles in his predicament which lay at the heart of his increasing popularity in 1647-48 and which the Remonstrance identified as a particular threat. It was to be that same personal identification which inspired William Sedgwick to denounce the Remonstrance and affirm the power and charisma of the King's person.

Sedgwick had been an Independent and a soldier, a man who had shared in the Cause 'with as much exactness, faithfulness, power and comfort as any of you.' He now repudiated the Army and wrote in favour of the King and settlement. Indeed in a phrase which sums up this chapter, Sedgwick declared that 'I confess his sufferings make me a Royalist that never cared for him.' He was writing in response to the Remonstrance, in particular to the identification of Charles as 'that man of blood', and the growing demand that he be brought to trial. Sedgwick argues that Charles is not only the rightful king, but that

the people of England desire peace, settled religion, established truth, freedom of trade, and this with his Majesty, under their King, that he may govern them according to their honest and known laws, that they may live in prosperity and honour.

---
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The chief threat now to this prosperity and honour is the Army, who seek to exploit the continuing confusion to make themselves supreme in the state and that having condemned Charles for setting his own will above the law, the Army now plays the same game; establishing its own arbitrary will and desire as the only law. They are attacking 'the eye of the kingdom,' so that they can lead the body of the kingdom, 'whether you please.'\textsuperscript{78}

Yet in a theme which we have met already, and which is a commonplace of Christian martyrdom, Sedgwick asserts that Charles' greatest strength lies in his weakness and as he is stripped of his worldly power so his divine nature is revealed and becomes ever more attractive to those with eyes to see:

The King and Parliament cry unto God in their distress though you in the greatness of your faith, and confidence in your privilege do not know them, yet the Lord owns them, and will hear their cry and deliver them.\textsuperscript{79}

It is the familiar inversion of worldly values discussed in the Introduction, the Catholic Christian belief that God has a special regard for the humble and meek and repudiates the vain glorious and powerful; and that in losing ones life, one gains it. In the circumstances of late 1648 Charles has, according to Sedgwick, been humbled, 'he is coming down, you and others are getting up. He is falling, you rising. He is a sufferer, you inflictors of suffering.'\textsuperscript{80} Therefore the greater Charles' humiliations and persecution the more acceptable he becomes to God, and the more sympathy he evokes from those who are not blinded by ideology, ambition or treason. As Sedgwick puts it in a passage redolent with cult symbolism and typology

The more you crush him, the sweeter savour comes from him; and while he suffers the spirit of God and glory rest upon him. There is a sweet glory sparkling in him by suffering, though you see it not. You do but rend away his corruptions from him, and help to waste his dross and draw forth that hidden excellency that is in him, and naturally men are ready to pity sufferers. He that doth and can suffer shall have my heart, you had
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it whilst you suffered; now you are great and need it not; the poor suffering oppressed
King and his party have my compassion.\textsuperscript{81}

And in a passage reminiscent of the parallel between Charles with Christ, Sedgwick asserts that
suffering only serves to 'refine and improve him that he will appear in that excellent spirit of love
and goodness as shall freely forgive your violence against him and rejoice in his sufferings, being
the certain way to a true Throne of Glory.'\textsuperscript{82}

This chapter is entitled Habeas Corpus because before one can realistically construct a
cult, one must have a body! The body in question was simply the last component which the Army
obligingly supplied on the 30\textsuperscript{th} January 1649 to a corpus of typology, political theology and
popular mythology which crystallised around the person of the King after 1646. This corpus was
already speaking of Charles as a martyr for the Church of England, the 'good old laws' and the
people before his death. This image was a potent weapon against the victorious Parliament and
the Army and part of its potency derived from its inherent simplicity. Charles, so the message
went, was the Lord's anointed; as such he should be honoured and obeyed; yet through faction,
ambition and treason he has been brought low. His sufferings mirrored and represented the
nation's sufferings and the nation's healing was only to be achieved through the restoration of
Charles to his rightful position.

What would be the judgement of God upon a nation that treated His anointed so vilely?
For many, raised in the theology of divine right, this question weighed increasingly heavily, and
Royalist and Presbyterian preachers and apologists rarely let them forget it. This unease as to the
treatment of the king and its implications, simply compounded existing fears of social anarchy and
religious radicalism occasioned by the wars and the failure to come to a settlement. Many became
receptive to a message which told them that the restoration of the King's 'just rights' was the only
way to return to 'normal' and to safeguard their lives, liberties and property. More particularly it
encouraged an identification of individual sufferings and anxieties with those of the King, who
suffered for and with each individual. This identification produced a level of popular sympathy
and support for the King which was unknown in the days of his power.
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In a society moulded by the imagery and language of the Bible it was inevitable that all sides in the conflict should use biblical language and imagery to articulate their hopes and fears. For the Royalists and their sympathisers this meant that the origins of the war lay in the sins of the individual, such as pride, ambition, jealousy and so on; the sufferings of the nation were judgements for these national sins and the rebellion which was their inevitable result. Only deep and genuine repentance could now remove the stain of rebellion and sin. In the midst of this the figure of an innocent and suffering King being led out to die for his people was so reminiscent of Christ’s passion that the exaggerated comparisons were probably inevitable. Thus the cult did not appear out of nowhere in January 1649, it was ready and awaiting its central figure; its martyr. Edward Symmons had written as early as 1643 that

he who is faithful to God will sooner part with life itself than suffer that which he by Him is entrusted withal to be violated, undermined or diminished.  

In stepping out onto the scaffold on that cold January day, Charles could be said to have fulfilled both Symmons’ injunction and the text used at his coronation, ‘Be ye faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life’.

It was in the meeting of this political theology with the person of Charles, and the readiness of many to read this meeting in a way sympathetic to Charles, that the principal motivation of the cult lies. In the three and a half years between his military defeat at Naseby and his death, and despite his own propensity for political ineptitude, double-dealing and evasion, the King and increasing numbers of his subjects had the opportunity to identity themselves with this political theology. Therein lies the reason why the corpus of themes and images associated with the cult were identified and made available before Charles went to his death. Therein also lies the reason why the image of the royal martyr, and the political theology which supported it, was to become such a potent symbol in the struggle against the Republic and in the Restoration church.
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Chapter three. By the waters of Babylon: the cult under the Republic

Here is a saint more great, more true than e’re
Came from the triple crown or holy chair.
We need no further for example look
Than unto thee, thou art the only book;
Thou art the best of texts.
(Thomas Forde. Second anniversary on Charles the first, 1658. In Virtus rediviva, 1660)

Being dead, he yet speaketh
(Hebrews 11:4)

Thomas Fuller was busy with his Worthies of England when he heard the news that Charles was to be tried for his life, at which, so his biographer records

Then indeed such an amazement struck the loyal pious doctor when he first heard of that execrable design intended against the King's person, and saw the villainy proceed so uncontrollably, that he not only surceased, but resolved to abandon 'that luckless work', as he was then pleased to call it. 'For what shall I write' said he, 'of the worthies of England, when this horrid act will bring such an infamy upon the whole nation as will ever cloud and darken all its former and suppress its future rising glories?'

The biographer goes on to record that on learning of the execution Fuller was distracted with grief, 'until such time as' his prayers, tears and fasting, having better acquainted him with that sad dispensation, he began to revive from that dead pensiveness to which he had so long addicted himself. Fuller was not the only Royalist to be amazed at the execution of the King, John Sharp Sr vowed never to cut his beard again as a sign of mourning for Charles; and Jeremy Taylor observed in An apology for authorised and set forms of liturgy, against the pretence of the spirit of 1649, that during the Republic God had

snuffed our lamp so near, that it is almost extinguished; and the sacred fire was put into a hole of the earth, even then when we were forced to light those tapers that stood upon the altars, that by this sad truth better than by the old ceremony we might prove our

succession to those holy men, who were constrained to sing hymns to Christ, in dark places and retirements.\textsuperscript{2}

Taylor's most famous work, *Holy Living*, was published in 1650 to help Anglicans maintain a Christian life, and perhaps prepare themselves for martyrdom, now that their liturgy was proscribed, the Church of England dismantled and heresy and irreligion triumphant. For, as he says in the Preface, he had 'lived to see religion painted upon a banner and thrust out of churches'.\textsuperscript{3} John Evelyn recorded that the news of the execution, 'struck me with such horror, that I kept the day of his martyrdom a fast.'\textsuperscript{4} In spontaneously observing the 30\textsuperscript{th} January as a fast and a day of mourning Evelyn followed the practise of many Anglicans and not a few Presbyterians, and the themes of affliction, loss, endurance, repentance and constancy which characterised the church during the Republic laid the foundations for the Office of the 30\textsuperscript{th} January annexed to the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1662 and much of the ethos of Restoration Anglicanism's moral and political theology.\textsuperscript{5}

In many respects the period of the Republic is the most important for the development of the cult for the obvious reason that the cult had to survive in an hostile environment. After 1660 one is always aware that observance of the cult entailed no risk; indeed it was advantageous to one's reputation for political orthodoxy to be seen to observe the Fast, particularly in the period before 1688. Yet in the 1650s to do so could be dangerous. Whilst the attitude of the Republic to the Royalists shifted between severity and attempted accommodation, nevertheless it would not have been politically expedient to make too grand a show of ones grief on the 30\textsuperscript{th} January.\textsuperscript{6} Whilst many no doubt joined John Evelyn in keeping the day as a fast, they did so behind closed doors as the Republican authorities could, in their periodic bouts of anxiety about the activities of the
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Royalists, react with great severity. As Evelyn himself discovered at Christmas 1657, whilst he and his wife joined Peter Gunning and other Anglicans in the chapel of Exeter House to celebrate the Christmas liturgy. The chapel was suddenly surrounded by soldiers and the congregation kept prisoner until the afternoon when came

Cols. Whalley, Goffe and others from Whitehall, to examine us one by one; some they committed to the Marshall, some to prison. When I came before them they took my name and abode, examined me why, contrary to an ordinance made that none should any longer observe the superstitious time of the Nativity (so esteemed by them), I durst offend, and particularly be at Common Prayer, which they told me was but the Mass in English, and particularly pray for Charles Stuart, for which we had no scripture. I told them we did not pray for Cha. Stuart, but for all Christian kings, princes and governors. They replied, in so doing we prayed for the K. of Spain too, who was their enemy and a papist, with other frivolous and ensnaring question and much threatening; and finding no colour to detain me longer, with much pity of my ignorance, they dismissed me. These were men of high flight and above ordinances, and spake spiteful things of our Lord's Nativity. So I got home late the next day blessed be God.

These wretched miscreants held their muskets against us as we came up to receive the Sacred Elements, as if they would have shot us at the altar, but yet suffered us to finish the Office of Communion, as perhaps not in their instructions what they should do in case they found us in that action.\textsuperscript{7}

Whilst the memory of Charles was kept alive by Royalists and Presbyterians and the cult of the martyr propagated, it is often difficult to prove from direct evidence, simply because the cult only existed to some extent underground and often covered its tracks. Therefore, in this chapter I have tried to construct a body of evidence from sources as diverse as accounts of healing miracles, elegies, and sermons, which will hopefully demonstrate not only that the cult flourished in the 1650s but that it inherited a fully matured political theology, typology and imagery created before the regicide.
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In an attempt to make sense of what is otherwise a large and rather incoherent body of sources, I have divided this chapter into a number of areas corresponding to the different types of media used to communicate and propagate the cult. Thus we will look initially at the most obvious and probably most potent aspect of the cult during the Republic, the *Eikon Basilike*, not only in the context of the image of the King presented therein, but also in the context of its reception by the public and Milton's attack upon it. Secondly we will look at some of the elegies and commemorative verse composed in honour of the late King and the extent to which they reiterate themes and typologies found in other areas of cult literature, such as the subject of the third section; the sermons, a number of which were preached and printed during 1649. From there we will move onto consider reports of healing miracles associated with relics of Charles and the extent to which these accounts follow on from the propagandist use of the royal Touch in the 1640s. Finally we will consider the position of the Presbyterians and 'loyalists' such as Andrew Marvell, the attitude of the exiled royal family, and the works of such Royalist biographers and controversialists as Heylyn, Sanderson and L'Estrange. It is hoped that this method will demonstrate that behind the diversity of forms there existed a high degree of uniformity in the typology and political theology presented. From the earliest days of the cult, indeed before Charles was even dead, the manner in which the martyr was remembered and celebrated, the historiography of the Civil Wars, the nature of the Republican regime, and the conclusions drawn about government, authority and society were remarkably consistent.

i. *The 'Eikon Basilike', Milton and Salmastius*

On February 9th 1649 Charles I. was buried in a snow bound St George's Chapel, Windsor, attended by the Bishop of London, William Juxon, and a handful of nobles who had remained loyal. The army governor of the Castle refused Juxon's request to read the burial service from the *Book of Common Prayer* as this had been proscribed by order of Parliament in favour of the Presbyterian *Directory of Worship*; refused the Anglican liturgy and unwilling to use that of the enemy, Charles was laid to rest in total silence. Whilst this mourning scene was taking place at Windsor, back in London appeared for sale a small book which was to become the runaway best-seller of the seventeenth century and whose appearance provoked a spirited attack from the greatest literary figure of the age, John Milton. Milton was also called upon to answer the work of
Claude de Saumaise, otherwise known as Salmasius, whom Charles II commissioned to counter the attacks on the *Eikon* and expound the official Royalist response to the Republic. Together these tracts, accusations, counter-accusations, arguments and counter-arguments resounded around Europe as each side tried to justify its own actions and condemn that of their opponents. In contrast to the silence of Charles' burial, his death provoked prolonged and noisy debate, not just about the regicide, but the whole nature of government, the responsibilities of the governors and the duties of the governed.

The modest looking octavo which provoked all this and which had been circulating in manuscript even as Charles stepped onto the scaffold, was entitled *Eikon Basilike. The portraiture of his sacred Majestie in his solitudes and suffering*, and purported to be written by the King whilst a prisoner. In it Charles reviewed the course of the Civil Wars, from the calling of the Long Parliament in 1640 to the period of his imprisonment, in twenty-eight chapters each one seeking to exonerate himself from the charge of Parliament that he sought to establish a tyrannical government in England, that he was a secret papist and that he had committed treason by waging war on the people. Each chapter ended with a series of prayers and meditation and the whole was fronted by an engraving by William Marshall which shows Charles kneeling before an altar in a chapel bathed in a beam of heavenly light (See Fig. 3). In his right hand he grasps a crown of thorns, at his feet lies the crown of England, laid aside in favour of a heavenly crown of glory, the martyrs reward, upon which he fixes his gaze. To the left of this scene is represented a rock, buffeted by a stormy sea which represents constancy and steadfastness in the midst of troubles; whilst beneath that is a palm tree laden down with weights, signifying that characters develop through opposition. This engraving, more than anything else, established that image of Charles as a Christian martyr and saint among a large section of the community, and it drew upon a body of emblems and typologies which were already established by the time of the king's death. John Gauden, who is now credited with editing the *Eikon Basilike* from notes and drafts left by the king, writing after the restoration summed up the book's impact thus

---

3. The engraved frontispiece to the *Eikon Basilike* by William Marshall, 1649.
When [that book] came out, just upon the king's death, good God! What shame, rage, and despite filled his murderers! What comfort his friends! How many enemies did it convert! How many hearts did it mollify and melt! What preparations did it make in all men's minds for this happy Restoration! In a word, it was an army and did vanquish more than any sword could.  

Writing in 1946, Douglas Bush remarked that the *Eikon Basilike*, judging by its positive effect, might rank as one of the greatest books ever written in English. Bush was not referring to its literary merits, but to its impact and significance and it is a curious fact that historians have consistently neglected the *Eikon Basilike* as a political manifesto. In recent years the work of Lois Potter, T. N. Corns, S. N. Zwicker and others has reclaimed the literary significance of the King's Book, whilst Kevin Sharpe has discussed the constancy of Charles to an ideal of the royal conscience formulated by his father in *Basilikon Doron* and reflected in the *Eikon Basilike*. But on the whole the *Eikon* as an historical text, is mentioned rather than studied.

One of the principal strengths of the *Eikon* is that it operates on a variety of levels and presents a variety of themes. On one level it is simply a memoir, a retelling, from the King's perspective, of the narrative of the 1640s. This narrative is not presented in a chronological order, the account of the Irish Rebellion does not appear until chapter twelve and the discussion of the Scottish covenant is reserved for chapter fourteen. Yet Charles' intentions in preparing the book must have been to achieve more than just a memoir of the wars, and it is often forgotten that Charles never lived to witness the success of the *Eikon Basilike*, nor the extent to which it provided the model for the political theology of his cult. Yet the involvement of Gauden and other

---


prominent Anglicans might indicate that the links between the *Eikon* and the cult were not as accidental as might at first appear.

For the sake of this discussion, we can divide the themes in the Book into political and spiritual. Thus Charles repeatedly refers to the fact that his rule is sanctioned by God, and the Common Law, 'hath He graven such characters of divine authority, and sacred power upon kings, as none may without sin seek to blot them out.'\(^{12}\) From this fundamental fact, Charles repeats the renaissance commonplace of himself as the head and conscience of the nation; the father of his people, whose paternal regard is always aware of what is best for his people - even if they themselves do not! In the twenty seventh chapter 'To the Prince of Wales', Charles counsels his son to be a good Christian, protect the prerogative, the Church of England and to beware of faction masquerading as godly reformation. In particular Charles is concerned to warn against the secret motives and ambitions of sinful men, being convinced that the Civil Wars were rooted in divine judgement for the sins of the nation and in particular Charles' own complicity in the death of Strafford; a view which becomes a commonplace in the elegies and Fast Day sermons.

As Kevin Sharpe has observed, 'the idea of the royal conscience makes no distinction between the King's private conscience and his public duty.'\(^{13}\) Although James I had been willing to use 'reason of state' and the *arcana imperii* to justify prerogative actions, his son obviously had greater difficulty in separating out the actions of the Prince from that of the private individual. Consequently the *Eikon* is replete with allusions to the fact that in maintaining an unspotted conscience, Charles was fulfilling not only his duty as a Christian before God, but that of a virtuous King before his people. Thus chapter two of the *Eikon* is devoted to Strafford's death and repudiates the idea of 'reason of state' by equating Charles' individual conscience with government policy; Charles views it as unacceptable

\[\text{to wound a man's own conscience, thereby to salve state sores; to calm the storms of popular discontents, by stirring up a tempest in a man's own bosom.}\]

---

\(^{12}\) *Eikon*. 1904. p. 141  
\(^{13}\) Sharpe. 1997.
Nor hath God's justice failed in the event and sad consequences to show the world the fallacy of that maxim, Better one man perish (though unjustly) than the people be displeased, or destroyed.\(^{14}\)

Charles' guilt over Strafford's death appears repeatedly in his correspondence throughout the 1640s, and in his speech on the scaffold he expressed the hope that in some way his death would expiate the guilt of Strafford's innocent blood. Guilt, in particular bloodguilt, is a neglected feature of the Civil Wars and was to be a prominent feature of the cult, as we shall see.\(^ {15}\) Charles uses the concept in two ways in the *Eikon*, first he acknowledges himself guilty of the shedding of innocent blood in allowing Strafford's death; but more importantly he attributes innocence to himself in the causes and conduct of the war and thus imputes bloodguilt to his enemies. This allows Charles to combine both a Christ-like forgiveness and a reminder of the penalties for bloodguilt. Thus at the end of the Book he states that

> I can both forgive them, and pray for them, that God would not impute my blood to them further than to convince them, what need they have of Christ's blood to wash their souls from the guilt of shedding mine.\(^ {16}\)

And in the final prayers he repeats the implication, asking God that

> When thou makest inquisition for my blood, O sprinkle their polluted, yet penitent souls with the blood of thy Son, that thy destroying angel may pass over them.\(^ {17}\)

This technique allows Charles to assert simultaneously his own innocence and magnanimity whilst at the same time condemning his enemies. In chapter eight, Charles dwells at length on the sinfulness of his enemies, both to remind the reader of their iniquity and to make the contrast of his offered forgiveness all the more apparent.\(^ {18}\) And in 'To the Prince of Wales' he uses the same

\(^{14}\) *Eikon*. 1904, p. 8

\(^{15}\) Patricia Crawford has an article on the Army and bloodguilt, but there is nothing so far written on Royalist uses of the concept. Crawford, P. "Charles Stuart, that man of blood". *Journal of British Studies*. 1977, vol. 16(2).

\(^{16}\) *Eikon*. 1904, p. 271

\(^{17}\) ibid p. 280

\(^{18}\) ibid p. 55
technique; as his innocent blood 'will cry aloud for vengeance to heaven' so Charles will intercede for his sinful people not just before his son, but before God Himself.\(^{19}\)

Earlier Charles had been concerned to absolve the majority of the nation from complicity in his downfall, identifying the enemy as a small group of evil men not representative of the nation. He could petition that God would 'let not my blood be upon them and their children, whom the fraud and faction of some, not the malice of all, have excited to crucify me.'\(^{20}\) Here again, Charles asserts his innocence, condemns his enemies and absolves the majority. But he also links his act of forgiveness with that of Christ, whose Passion he is repeating. Also, whilst Charles, from the depth of his piety, may offer forgiveness to his enemies, he is at the same time careful to suggest that God may chose to ignore his implications and hold the nation to its debt of bloodguilt.

The Christ-Charles parallel, which was to become such a controversial feature of the cult, is present in the *Eikon*. Charles himself draws the parallel in such incidents as his 'sale' by the Scots to Parliament where he regrets that

> if I am sold by them, I am only sorry they should do it; and that my price should be so much above my Saviours.\(^{21}\)

Charles identifies himself with Christ both through his Kingship and through his constancy. Like Christ, he is a king brought low, and like Christ, he is resolved not to run away from his duty but to set his face resolutely towards Jerusalem; as he writes to his son

> If I must suffer a violent death, with my Saviour, it is but mortality crowned with martyrdom: where the debt of death which I owe for sin to nature, shall be raised, as a gift of faith and patience to God.\(^{22}\)

Part of this process was the maintenance of dignity and fortitude in the face of

\(^{19}\) ibid. p. 261.

\(^{20}\) ibid. p. 242

\(^{21}\) ibid. p. 210

\(^{22}\) ibid. p. 276. Charles often referred in the *Eikon* to the Passion when discussing his own predicament, as in 'Meditations on death', where he writes, 'My enemies will, it may be, seek to add (as those did, who crucified Christ) the mockery of justice to the cruelty of malice.' p. 268. He also offers the parallel of himself and David in chapter twenty five.
adversity and death - something Charles turned into an art form and which was remarked upon by all commentators whether during his imprisonment, his trial, or in his preparations for death. As such, Charles was well aware of the public spectacle in which he was engaged, and, as the royal actor, he knew his part well, whether on the scaffold at Westminster Hall or outside the Banqueting House. The *Eikon Basilike* was another such performance on a public stage, and as such is replete with references to his own fortitude which springs from the assurance of the justice of his cause and a rejection - which was both traditional in a Christian sense and fashionable in a platonic - of earthly comfort in favour of heavenly peace. So in the best tradition of martyrdom, Charles could turn military defeat and human failure into a spiritual triumph when he wrote that

> They knew my chiepest armies left me, were those only which the ancient Christians were wont to use against their persecutors, prayers and tears. These may serve a good man's turn, if not to conquer as a soldier, yet to suffer as a martyr.  

Thus did the King's Book build upon and exploit many of the images and typologies explored in the previous chapter; it also confirmed a particular historiography of the causes of the Civil Wars and the events of the 1640s. That this view of events was popular is evidenced by the book's success; forty English editions within a year, of which three were printed in Holland and one in France; as well as twenty foreign language editions, including Dutch, Latin, French and German. In all over sixty editions in just under two years, with a further seventeen editions being produced between 1662 and 1907.

Apart from all these full editions of the text, numerous sections of the book were printed separately, particularly the prayers and meditations at the end of each chapter, and the last two chapters of the book, the *Letter to the Prince of Wales*, and *Meditation upon death*. Parts of the text were even set to music! In 1653, Thomas Stanley used themes from the *Eikon* as the basis for a series of meditations for three voices and organ called *Psalterium Carolinum*. Milton obviously heard that the *Eikon* was 'to be 'rendred in verse' as he remarked, rather sourly, in *Eikonoklastes* that, 'there wanted only rhyme, and that, they say, is bestowed upon it lately.' As well as the *Eikon* in 1649,

---

23 ibid p. 70
24 Stanley, T. *Psalterium Carolinum. The devotions of his sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings, rendred in verse.* 1657
25 Milton, J. *Eikonoklastes in answer to a book intitl'd Eikon Basilike, the portrjure of his sacred*
the following year saw the publication in The Hague of *Reliquiae sacrae Carolinæ*, the collected works of Charles I, containing letters and speeches by the King bound together with a copy of the *Eikon Basilike* and with poems and elegies written in his praise after his death. This work went through five English editions between 1650 and 1658, before being reprinted by Richard Royston in a splendid two volume folio edition in 1662. Taken together these works proved to be the most popular English books of the seventeenth century, and it was precisely there popularity and the fact that they provided, as John Kenyon says, 'a mixture of pietistic moralising and shrewd historical revisionism'26 which accounts for the urgency with which Milton was commissioned by the new Republic to write a reply. The relative failure of Milton, and others, to dent the reputation of the martyr can be seen as part of the same process which contributed to the formulation of the cult in the first place; namely a profound fear of innovation, identification with a suffering king, and a deep rooted anxiety about the possible implications of challenging a divinely ordained hierarchy.

What the *Eikon Basilike* and the *Reliquiae* succeeded in doing was consolidating the political theology and typology of sacred monarchy and martyrdom already discussed, by giving it the seal of royal approval. Whatever Charles' followers might have said about him, here was the authoritative word of the King himself. Here Charles may have admitted making mistakes, and may not speak of his opponents with quite the venom of most of his followers; yet the outlines of the image of suffering kingship and radical innocence, the historiography of faction and national sins is here repeated. The whole being summed up in Marshall's frontispiece.

Throughout the text Charles adopts a detached, almost eirenic attitude to the events he is recording; vainly protesting his good intentions at every turn and lamenting the intransigence and rage of his enemies who would not listen to reason. His enemies emerge as either gullible and naive - easily mislead by their more cunning colleagues - or as violent extremists intent on his and the kingdoms destruction. Charles stresses his willingness to negotiate and to appear the moderate, and throughout the *Eikon* there is a combination of paternalist concern for the true welfare of his people with an absolute conviction that the King must govern as he sees fit and that, as he said on

*Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings*. 1649

the scaffold, it is not the peoples place to have a share in government, 'that is nothing pertaining to

7 them, a subject and a sovereign are clear different things.' The prayers and meditations are

written in the style of Psalms; imploring God's assistance in his struggle, vindicating his belief that

he was defending truth against falsehood and preparing himself for the ordeal of martyrdom. The

prayers, along with the frontispiece, help set the tone of Charles' martyrdom, composed as they are

in a style familiar to a generation raised on the King James Bible and Foxe's Book of Martyrs. Thus,
as A. N. Wilson observed, 'the little king, so tactless, ruthless and charmless in life, so little loved by

his people, was loved in death.'

As we have seen, the typology presented throughout the Eikon is that of suffering kingship

in the tradition of David and Christ, based upon the King's radical innocence. One of the principal

features of this tradition was the immutability of the divine process, for the principal way in which

God's will is expressed in history is through godly kings and princes, this is the basis of Foxian

political theology. In adopting and re-presenting this tradition Charles succeeded in constructing a

view of monarchy as being both stable and rooted in the enduring power of God. For Charles as

much as his puritan opponents, history was neither mindless nor arbitrary; rather it was the

constant unfolding of God's will, and the drama created between those who submit to that will and

those who oppose it. 'Therefore the King identifies himself with continuity, stability and

providence, whilst condemning reformation, rebellion and innovation as striking not only at his

own power but ultimately at God himself, the source of his authority. Thus Charles seeks to place

his experience in the context of divine providence and biblical and early church history, confident

that through constancy to his principles and trusting in the providence of God, history will

vindicate his position and that

Although by my sins, I am by other men's sins deprived of thy temporal blessings, yet I

may be happy to enjoy the comfort of thy mercies, which often raise the greatest sufferers

to be the most glorious saints.'


28 Wilson, A. N. The life of John Milton. 1983, p. 165. Given the fears of the Army radicals at the
debilitating effect of Charles charisma on those who served or guarded him detailed in the
previous chapter, I would question Wilson's assertion that Charles was 'charmless'.

29 Eikon. 1904, p. 34.
It is hardly surprising that the new Republican regime should have sought to suppress the
King's Book and refute the image of Charles the martyr which was so damaging to their new won
power. In retrospect, and given the experience of twentieth-century totalitarianism, it may seem
odd that the *Eikon, Reliquiae* and Salmasius' *Defensio regia* should have been allowed to go through so
many editions almost under the noses of the authorities. Yet with no effective police force,
surveillance techniques or censorship it was possible for Royalist books to be printed, sold and
circulated. William Sancroft, the future Archbishop of Canterbury, may have complained to his
father after the regicide that Anglicans now had to take refuge in, 'caves and dens of the earth, and
upper rooms and secret chambers,' yet within the month he was writing to Richard Holdsworth
about getting six copies of the King's Book and being warned by Holdsworth that they were, 'so
excessively dear, that I believe you would not have so many of them at their price if they be
Royston's, they will be above six shillings.' But Parliament did make some attempts to suppress
the printing both of the King's Book, *Reliquiae* and *Defensio regia* and, all too aware of the power of
the image of Charles the martyr, commissioned Milton to publish a suitable riposte.

This he did in a book published in October 1649 entitled *Eikonoklastes*, and the title sums
up Milton's objective; he attempted to pull down the false image of the King which he saw erected
in the *Eikon* and expose the absurdity and dangers of a fraudulent political theology. Milton sought
to awaken the people to the 'liberties' that had so recently been won on their behalf, to encourage
them to stand upon their own two feet and throw off subservience to old tyrannies, and to warn
them against a revival of royalism through the seduction of the image of the martyr. The urgent
need to answer the *Eikon* sprang also from the fact that the Royalists had invested so much
importance in it and there was a distinct danger that

some men have by policy accomplished after death that revenge upon their enemies,
which in life they were not able and how much their intent, who published these
overlate apologies and meditations of the dead King, drives to the same end of stirring up

---

30 Letter: Sancroft to his father 10:2:1649, in Cary, H. *Memorials of the great Civil War in
the people to bring him that honour, that affection, and by consequence, that revenge to
his dead corpse, which he himself living could never gain to his person.\textsuperscript{32}

The \textit{Eikonoklastes} is constructed as a blow by blow reply to the twenty eight chapters of the \textit{Eikon Basilike}, a technique in which we do not see Milton's genius at its best. The point by point refutation of the King's Book quickly becomes turgid and the style has been described as reminiscent of, 'a civil servant sending back a report to his Minister'.\textsuperscript{33} Nevertheless at the heart of Milton's attack was his condemnation of idolatry and an imagery which was set up, 'to catch fools and silly gazers.'\textsuperscript{34} He commended Charles in at least having the honesty to entitle his work the \textit{Eikon Basilike} for, 'by the shrine he dresses out for him, certainly, would have the people come and worship him.' And the danger was that the people, 'exorbitant and excessive in all their emotions, are prone oft-times to a civil kind of idolatry in idolizing their kings.'\textsuperscript{35}

Milton stood in the radical Protestant tradition of iconoclasm, the destruction of all images of wood, stone, glass or paint which a worldly and corrupt power had intruded between the people and the pure truths of God. What Milton condemned in the King's Book was the revival of religious and secular imagery designed to win by stealth the war the Royalists had lost on the battlefield. Milton's outrage at this attempt mirrored that of many Army commanders during the second Civil War and stemmed from their belief that the providence of God had been clearly visible in the Royalist defeat and their continued resistance signified not just a rejection of the statistics of the battlefield, but God's providential dispensation as well.

Milton condemns what he calls, the popish and prelatical prayers of the \textit{Eikon}; they are merely pious sounding words designed to mask tyranny and ultimately signifying nothing, 'the lip-work of every prelatical liturgist, clapped together, and quilted out of scripture phrases.'\textsuperscript{36} For Milton the true worship of God is entirely inward and does not need or depend on any external human rite; \textit{all true prayer must be spontaneous}. Indeed he went further and stated that all those

\textsuperscript{32} Milton, J. \textit{Eikonoklastes in answer to a book intitl'd Eikon Basilike}. 1649. Preface, p. 4-5.
\textsuperscript{33} Wilson, A. N. \textit{The life of John Milton}. 1983, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{34} ob cit, p. 5
\textsuperscript{35} ibid, p. 6
\textsuperscript{36} ibid, p. 10
who advocate liturgies and rites were engaged in a devilish design to seduce the people away from the truth into slavery; and the chief means of achieving this was monarchy, which, with its ceremonies, mysteries and rituals, its 'civic idolatry' and customs, dazzled the eye and hid the fact that underneath the pomp and circumstance was tyranny and falsehood.

This 'new vomited paganism of sensual idolatry' is compared to a theatrical spectacle, 'quaint emblems and devices begged from the old pageantry of some Twelth-night entertainment at Whitehall.' James I had observed that a king is 'set upon a public stage, in the sight of all the people; where all the beholders eyes are attentively bent to look and pry in the least circumstance of the secretest drifts', whilst we have already considered the 'theatricality' of Charles' life; from the scaffold of the masques to that of the execution and the whole renaissance preoccupation with the idea that 'the world is a stage'. Milton, however, shared the puritan hatred of the theatre, only for him the theatre was not merely a source of entertainment and a breeding ground for vice, but a powerful weapon by which the enemies of God and liberty were empowered to uphold their rule.

Yet, like a Whitehall masque, this show of power was essentially void of content, it was merely the froth of tyranny, signifying nothing, and, perhaps with James I's allusion in mind, Milton in the First Defense says that a tyrant is 'like a king upon a stage but the ghost or mask of a king.' To that extent the tyrant is dead, only capable of borrowing life from others, like a parasite. Milton always had a profound respect for the written word and spoke of a book as a thing almost alive, in contrast the Eikon Basilike, as merely the product of theatricality, plagiarism and illusion, was dead.

Because it was dead, it was easy for the masses to assimilate. The imagery, metaphors and allusions were commonplace and familiar, thus they were easy to understand and this, coupled with the glamour of the King's name, accounts for the success of his book. This 'givenness' of the book results in what Lorna Cable calls 'reciprocal complacencies,' it is easy literature because the

38 Eikonoklastes. P. 5
39 James VI & I. "Basilikon Doron. Or his Majesties instructions to his dearest son, Henry the Prince", In: The political works of James I, edited by C.H. McIlwain. 1918. P. 5
writer and reader collude in a set of images and assumptions which require little or no mental effort. Such laziness on the part of the people ensures the success of the image and their subsequent enslavement by those peddling illusion rather than reality. Milton's respect for the living word made him particularly vehement against the way the King's Book constructed an image of suffering monarchy, Christ-like constancy and Christian martyrdom out of what Milton saw as a base manipulation of language; and one of the ways in which Milton's work rises above the tawdry tracts and pamphlets produced by both sides in the controversy over the *Eikon* is the way in which he is able to use language to undermine the King's metaphors. As Cable says, Milton objected to

Words exploited for purposes alien to their original intent, words devitalised and dispirited by rote recitation, words distanced from the tensive impulses of thought and feeling that generated them, become, like their exploiters, slaves to idolatry.

From what has been said, it should come as no surprise to learn that Milton had very little time for the claim of Charles and his followers that he died a martyr's death. Indeed he says of the frontispiece of the *Eikon* that the image of Charles the martyr was only there 'to fool the people'. Milton's objections were threefold and mirror the discussion of 'true martyrdom' in the *Introduction*; namely that no true martyr can bear witness to himself alone, but to the truth; that no martyr ever dies for a sect or denomination which was already established, and that constancy and courage alone do not make a martyr, but only the truth or otherwise of the cause died for. Just as the theatricality of the King's posturings hide the fact of his tyranny and emptiness, so the image of the martyr hides the fact that he was only dying because he had endeavoured to subsume into himself the honour and obedience which was primarily owed to God, for, 'he who desires from men as much obedience and subjection as we may all pay to God, desires not less than to be God.' Likewise Milton rejects Charles' claim to die for the preservation of the Church of

---

42 *Eikonoklastes* was prefigured by the publication anonymously of *Eikon Alethine. The pourtraiture of truths most sacred Majesty truly suffering, though not solely. 1649*. And Royalist attacks on Milton include *Eikon Epistes, or, the faithfull pourtraiture of a loyall subject, in vindication of Eikon Basilike. 1649*. *And, The image unbroken. A perspective of the impudence, falshood, vanitie, and prophannes, published in a libell entitled Eikonoklastes against the Eikon Basilike. 1651.*
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England, for if to die for what Milton calls, 'an establishment of religion', makes a martyr, 'then Romish priests executed for that, which had so many hundred years been established in this land, are no worse martyrs than he.'

Yet it is on the last count - that the truth of the cause rather than the courage of the individual makes a true martyr - that we see the true ground of Milton's rejection of the King's Book, and of those who, as he would see it, allowed themselves to be hoodwinked by it. For we are presented again with the question considered in the *Introduction*; what is truth and who decides where truth lies? As Milton said, the man dying in obedience to the dictates of his conscience may believe he is dying in the service of the truth; yet if we allow this, 'what heretic dying for direct blasphemy, as some have done constantly, may not boast a martyrdom?' As we have seen, this problem of definition had exercised Christian thinkers from Clement of Alexandria to Luther. Augustine had first suggested that it was the truth or otherwise of the cause which must be considered in defining a 'true' martyrdom. But we are still left with the question; what authority defines truth from falsehood? It was precisely this question of authority which Claude de Saumaise, known as Salmasius, discussed at length in *Defensio regia pro Carolo I*.

Born around 1593 in Burgundy of a Catholic father and Huguenot mother, Salmasius came to adopt the Protestantism of his mother, resisting his father's wish that he follow in his footsteps both as a barrister and a Roman Catholic; a resistance to patriarchal authority that seems ironic given Salmasius' later services to the Royalist cause. After a distinguished academic career at Heidelberg, Salmasius eventually settled in Leiden, where he remained for the rest of his life, apart from a return visit to his native France in 1640 where he resisted the blandishments of Richelieu and Mazarin to remain, and an extended visit to Sweden as the guest of Queen Christina in 1650. Charles II probably commissioned Salmasius to refute Milton because he was considered one of the foremost Protestant scholars of his day, with a European wide reputation. The book he produced is a scholarly refutation of the principle of rebellion and a systematic re-presentation of the theory of divine right monarchy, non-resistance and passive obedience.

---
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Defensio regia was actually commissioned in response to Milton's *The tenure of kings and magistrates* and in turn provoked Milton to publish *Pro populo Anglicano defensio* in 1651.\(^{48}\) Thomas Hobbes declared that of the two he did not know which had the best language or the worst arguments; whilst Samuel Johnson remarked that Salmasius' pride and reputation caused him to undertake a venture for which he was not adequately equipped, not having a thorough grounding in political philosophy.\(^{49}\) Certainly Salmasius added nothing new to the debate on the origins and prerogatives of kingship, or the questions concerning the nature of authority and the justification or otherwise of resistance. He simply re-presents the familiar theory, a la Filmer, of the vesting of patriarchal power in Adam which is subsequently inherited by all kings and fathers. Active resistance to this patriarchal power is forbidden, as it is resistance to a divinely appointed authority. Such resistance is bad enough when the ruler degenerates into tyranny, but in killing a good king like Charles the people have shed innocent blood which cries out for vengeance.

If the arguments put forward in *Defensio regia* are not new, neither do they have the popular appeal of the elegies, or even the sermons. Salmasius was writing in Latin specifically for an educated, European audience who were discussing the implications of events in England. His significance lies more in the fact that his work was commissioned by Charles II and as such can be said to represent the official, Royalist theoretical response to the regicide. In taking on Milton, Salmasius was competing for the philosophical 'high ground' in the debate. But for all Salmasius' lack of popular appeal, thirteen editions of *Defensio regia* were published between 1649 and 1652, including editions in Dutch and French. But what is particularly noticeable are the number of editions published which incorporate the text of both Milton's *Pro populo Anglicano defensio* together with *Defensio regia*. Four Latin and one Dutch edition of the joint texts were published in London in 1651, and a further Latin version in 1658. On the continent, one Latin joint text was published in Utrecht in 1650 and three Latin editions in Amsterdam in 1651. In the wake of the 'Glorious Revolution' two English editions of the joint texts were published in London in 1692 and 1695 respectively.\(^{50}\)

\(^{48}\) Salmasius was preparing a reply to *Pro populo* when he died in 1653. His notes were published in 1660 as *Ad J. Miltonum responsio opus posthumum*.


\(^{50}\) Figures from Madan, F. F. *Milton, Salmasius, and Dugard*. 1923.
The number of editions which combine *Defensio regia* with *Pro populo* indicates the level at which the political and philosophical debate was being conducted. Here, presented together, were two principal texts, commissioned on the one hand by the victorious Republic and on the other by the exiled Charles II, arguing the case for and against regicide, resistance and the new regime. Here were assembled the arguments from scripture, the classics and natural law, marshalled and arranged to contest two opposing viewpoints. The very fact that these two texts appear together, as one book, suggests debate; suggests the traditional method of academic disputation, with one proposition being examined and challenged by another. It suggests the reader weighing and comparing the arguments, comparing the biblical and classical precedents, the appeals to natural law, natural right and precedent. More than anything else these joint editions suggest individuals making up their own minds about where authority lies.\(^{51}\)

Salmassius, and by implication the exiled court, is arguing strongly for the traditional view that authority is vested by God in lawful, patriarchal power. Milton, like most revolutionaries, based his convictions and actions upon his own conviction that he has the truth and that he knows best. For all his brilliance in exposing the conceits of the King's Book, it is undertaken from the certainty that he and his followers had a God-given duty to struggle against spiritual wickedness in high places and to usher in the rule of the saints. In the preface to *Eikonoklastes*, Milton lambasts his fellow countrymen who allow themselves to be enslaved by popish monarchy, 'excepting some few, who yet retain in them the old English fortitude and love of freedom.'\(^ {52}\) These happy few, who have remained pure and unsullied in the truth he describes as being the only sound and uncontaminated parts of the kingdom. It is an argument depressingly familiar from later revolutions whether French, Russian or Chinese, where an elite of 'truth-bearers' take power on behalf of 'the people' and then seeks to dragoon them into freedom. Yet unlike Rousseau, Robespierre, Marx, Lenin or Mao, Milton's motivation grew out of a profound belief in the providence of God which had shown itself in the success of their armies and the utter defeat of the King. As such those who were privileged to do this mighty work must be rare individuals indeed,


\(^{52}\) *Eikonoklastes*, p. 6
'for when God shakes a kingdom with strong and healthful commotion to a general reforming true it is, that God raises to his own, men of rare abilities.\textsuperscript{53}

But what happens when 'the people', in whose name this 'general reforming' is undertaken, spurn the men of rare abilities and run after their old rulers, images and beliefs? For Milton it was a constant source of irritation that 'the people' did not greet the restoration of their liberties with joy and thanksgiving, and there is more than a touch of bitterness and contempt in his remarks about 'fools and silly gazers'\textsuperscript{54} who would rather honour the memory of Charles than embrace the brave new world ushered in by the regicides. These people Milton condemns in the first edition of \textit{Eikonoklastes} as 'an inconstant, irrational, and image-dotting rabble.'\textsuperscript{55} In the next edition he goes even further, calling them a 'credulous and hapless herd, begotten to servility, and enchanted with these popular institutes of tyranny.' These people would not recognise freedom when offered and so must be obliged to be free whether they like it or not.

Thus Milton may stigmatise the King's Book as a tawdry conceit, yet his venom against his enemies belies this contempt. After all, the fact that he has to produce \textit{Eikonoklastes} at all proves the success of the \textit{Eikon Basilike}, and iconoclasts seek to tear down images not because the images are useless, but because they are too powerful. Milton's weakness is, ironically, similar to that of Charles, namely that he hates a compromise; there is no middle ground, no concession to the necessity of political and social negotiation. For both Charles and Milton saw the world in black and white terms; either the King ruled or Parliament, either Christ or Satan, either light or darkness. These qualities appear in both the \textit{Eikon Basilike} and \textit{Eikonoklastes}. By 1649 many saw the threat to God's law, their consciences and property as coming not from the defeated and suffering King, but from the Rump in Parliament and the swords of the Army outside. As we saw in the previous chapter, Charles had certainly encouraged this perception by becoming at his trial the spokesman for all those who feared and resented the saints in arms who seemed intent on turning the world upside down, and it is all too easy to forget how extreme and unrepresentative Milton was in his own lifetime. His stature as one of the great figures of the English language has obscured the
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fact that in his lifetime the majority of the political nation rejected his ideas, were horrified by the
regicide and were content to see the Republic overthrown and Charles II restored in 1660. Yet for
Milton, legality consisted in putting oneself in the way of God's will and acting upon it, in those
circumstances no act, however violent, could be wrong.

Ultimately 'the people' preferred the image of Charles the martyr to Milton's vision of
liberty and godly reformation; which accounts for the forty English editions of the *Eikon Basilike* to
the three of *Eikonoklastes*. The King's Book was the best seller of the age and reflects the rejection of
the 'Puritan revolution', an honouring of a King whom many saw as genuinely pious and
dedicated to the true interests of his people, and a yearning for a return to known laws and
customs. This is the reason why the King's Book is important and why its neglect as a
contemporary source is so regrettable. By its very success it tells us so much more about the
attitudes and assumptions of contemporaries; about their mental and emotional world, and about
their understanding of monarchy, authority and social relationships than any reading of Milton
can ever achieve. In the end it was time and changing intellectual fashions rather than iconoclasm
which destroyed the image of Charles the martyr.

**ii. Elegies and commemorative verse**

After the *Eikon Basilike*, the most obvious literary Royalist response to the regicide of
January 1649 were the elegies and commemorative poems, large numbers of which found their
way into print.\(^5^6\) John Cleveland had set the tone of such elegies as early as 1644 in his
commemorative poem on Laud where he declares that, 'life is since he is gone / But a nocturnal
lucubration.'\(^5^7\) He followed this up in 1649 with *Majestas intemerata. Or, the immortality of the King*. We
have already seen how this material reflected Royalist opinion and frustration in the period leading
up to the regicide and as such the elegies are an important indication of responses to the death of
the king. John Draper has argued that it was in the two years preceding the regicide, as the
Royalists lost ground on all fronts, that they turned to the broadside elegy as a way of presenting
the familiar themes of suffering kingship and anxieties over social breakdown, as well as trying to

\(^{5^6}\) The British Museum lists about fifty such elegies in its catalogue in English, French, German,
and Latin.

\(^{5^7}\) Cleveland, J. "On the Archbishop of Canterbury". In: *Poems. With additions, never before
printed*. 1653, p.60.
drum-up support for the King. The edition of the *Eikon Basilike* published in mid-March 1649 contained a dedicatory poem and an epitaph, and in the same month Henry King, Bishop of Chichester, poet and friend of Jonson and Donne, published *A deepe groan fetch'd at the funerall of that incomparable and glorious monarch, Charles the first, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland*; soon joined by *An elegy upon the most incomparable K. Charls the I. Persecuted by two implacable factions, imprisoned by the one, and murthered by the other, January 30th 1648*. Also in March appeared a collection of elegies and epigrams in English, French and Latin entitled *Vaticinium votivum: Or, Palaemon's prophetick prayer. Lately presented privately to his now Majestie in a Latin poem; and here published in English. To which is annexed a paraphrase on Paulus Grebnerus's prophacie. With several elegies on Charles the first, the Lord Capel, the Lord Francis Villiers. This has been attributed to George Withers, but the ascription is unlikely in that the Dictionary of National Biography describes him as "a convinced puritan" who raised a troop of horse for the Parliament and wrote in favour of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. It is far more likely that *Vaticinium votivum* is an anonymous collection of elegies collected from several authors, as was a further collection of eight elegies published anonymously in June 1649 under the title *Monumentum regale, or a tombe erected for the incomparable and glorious monarch, Charles the first, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland etc.*. In select elegies, epitaphs and poems. This included a reprinting of King's *A deepe groan* and others have been attributed, probably falsely, to John Cleveland. In late March, early April appeared John Quarles' *Regale lectum miseriae: or, a kingly bed of misery. In which is contained, a dreame. With an elegie upon the martyrdom of Charls, late king of England, of blessed memory. And another upon the right honourable the Lord Capel. With a cure against the enemies of peace, and the authors farewell to England.* John, the son of the better known Francis Quarles, had fought in the Civil War as a member of the Oxford garrison and been banished by the Parliament. In Flanders at the end of 1648 he wrote, *Fons Lachrymarum; or a fountain of tears: From whence flow England's complaint, Jeremiah's lamentations paraphras'd, with divine meditations; and an elegy upon that son of valor Sir Charles Lucas. As this is dedicated to the Prince of Wales it is likely that it was being published immediately before the regicide and

---


59 The author of King's entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* calls the ascription of this elegy to him 'doubtful'.
Within six months of the regicide, Charles was already commemorated by a sizeable body of literature (See fig.4).

Draper argues that the Royalist elegy declined after 1650-51, partly owing to the response of the Republican authorities to this concerted literary attack on their rule. The government, conscious of the power of the image of royal martyrdom being presented in both the elegies and the *Eikon*, soon bridled the press, and sought to ensure that only broadsides and elegies favourable to themselves found their way onto the streets. With this tightening of the censorship and the adoption by puritan writers of the genre, the Royalists found it easier to produce mock elegies and parodies such as *The president of presidents: Or, an elegie, on the death of John Bradshaw* of 1659. The problem with parodying the elegies of one's adversaries was that it became difficult to then use it seriously to praise one's own heroes. However, Draper notwithstanding, whilst it is true that the majority of these eulogistic works were published within two or three years of Charles' death, nevertheless they did continue to appear and were reprinted throughout the 1650s and on into the Restoration era. One of the most famous being Owen Felltham's *An epitaph to the eternal memory of Charles the first, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, etc. Inhumanely murthered by a perfidious party of his prevalent subjects. Jan. 30*, 1648; in which he refers to Charles as "Christ the second". This was printed in the 1661 edition of Felltham's *Resolves*, although it was probably in circulation some years before that. The previous year Thomas Forde had published *Virtus rediviva: Or, a panegyrick on the late K. Charls the I. Second monarch of Great Britain*. This was a prose celebration of Charles, with which were printed three elegies on the royal martyr, including two written to commemorate the Fasts of 1657 and 1658, together with a poem celebrating Charles II's entry into London in 1660. Indeed Forde feels that some explanation should be offered for waiting eight years before writing an elegy on Charles' death, and claims that, "he who well would write thine elegy / Must take an ages time to study thee" There was even a play published in 1649, *The famous tragedie of King

---

60 *Fons Lachrymarum* was reprinted in 1655 and 1677, whilst *Rectum lectum miseriae* was reprinted three times before the Restoration and again in 1679.
61 Two Royalist elegies, replete with the typologies of the 1650s, appeared in 1683, during the Exclusion Crisis, and another in 1709, which re-presented the Christ-Charles parallel.
63 Forde, T. *Virtus rediviva*. 1660. C5r.
Charles I basely butchered, which covered the period between the siege of Colchester and the King's death. In it Fairfax is portrayed as the honourable and moderate man outwitted by the Machiavellian Cromwell who is seen seducing Lambert's wife whilst Charles goes to his death. As Susan Wiseman has observed, the ploy was part of the continuing attempts of both Royalists and Republicans to come to terms with and articulate the momentous events of January 1649.64

Another favoured device of the Royalist literary assault on the Republic was the satirical litany. Both Robert Herrick and John Cleveland produced them during the 1640s and a number of anonymous examples survive from the 1650s.65 The satirical litany had the advantage of being offensive to the enemy both in content and in form; for the litany was part of the ordered liturgy of the church retained in The Book of Common Prayer, but excluded from the Directory and anathema to the more advanced puritans. Thus within six months of Charles' death the mourning Royalist could immerse himself in a sizeable body of commemorations and elegies.

Lois Potter and others, have touched upon this material and there is no need to cover that ground again.66 However, their primary interest was either literary criticism written under the auspices of Departments of English, or primarily the literature of the Parliamentary and Republican cause. I wish to look at some of this eulogistic and commemorative material to see what it tells us about the perception of the Civil War and defeat current amongst Royalist sympathisers; the way it reflects themes and images found in polemical tracts and sermons, and the extent to which it confirms or refutes the thesis put forward in the previous chapter, namely that by the time of the King's death a consistent political theology of divine right and suffering kingship had already been formulated.

What we will find in this commemorative literature is that under the impact of defeat and the regicide a number of consistent ideas emerged to explain the position of Charles, the reasons for the Civil Wars and the nature of the opposition. Many of these views were current before the

65 Examples of this form can be found in Henry Morley's The King and the Commons : Cavalier and Puritan songs. 1868, and in W. Walker Wilkins. Political ballads of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. 1840.
King's death, but now they were consolidated and became fixed. As such they constitute a cult ideology which will appear in its most obvious public form in the Fast Day sermons after 1660. The elegies take up themes found in the Eikon Basilike, in Salmasius, Lotius and in the sermons of Leslie, Warner and Brown to be considered shortly, about the nature of monarchy, the war and the defeat of the King. As such the elegies, sermons and the King's Book speak to each other, sharing and acknowledging themes and ideas. As Henry King puts it

Thy better parts
Lives in despite of death, and will endure
Kept safe in thy unpattered portraiture.  

In Serenissimae Majestatis Regiae claims that if we would see Charles after his death

Then look
Upon his resurrection, his book:
In this he lives to us; his parts are here
All encompassed in the best character.  

For the author of Caroli the King's Book becomes part of a political manifesto justifying the royalist cause

His book, his life, his death, will henceforth be
The Church of England's best apology.  

In this the author looks forward to the Restoration Church's use of the Eikon Basilike and Charles' death as justification for the Restoration settlement.

What the Eikon Basilike did, according to the eulogists, was to underline the fact that Charles, unlike his enemies, would never be forgotten; in it he, "triumphest more by thine all-conquering quill".  His life and death would in themselves confirm his place in the pantheon of heroes and martyrs, yet the existence of "that incomparable book" made that remembrance doubly sure. As John Quarles puts it in Regale lectum miseriae

---

68 Vaticinium votivum. 1649, p. 90
69 Monumentum regale. 1649, p. 23
70 Vaticinium votivum. 1649. C6v
His glory shall survive with fame, when they
Shall lie forgotten in a heap of clay
That were the authors of his death.\textsuperscript{71}

This assurance and memory was something the defeated Royalists could cling to; however much
the rebels tried to wipe out Charles' name they could not invade the memory of his loyal followers.
Thus in \textit{The requiem or libertie of an imprisoned royalist. G.M.}, the captive glories in the fact that whilst
his body is confined his memory is free

\begin{quote}
What, though I cannot see my King
Either in his person or his coin,
Yet contemplation is a thing
Which renders what I have not mine;
My King from me what adamant can part,
When I can wear engraven on my heart\textsuperscript{72}
And though rebellion may my body bind,
My King can only captivate my mind\textsuperscript{72}
And though immured, yet I can chirp and sing
Disgrace to rebels, glory to my King.\textsuperscript{72}
\end{quote}

In a phrase which calls to mind a theme from the masque, Henry King in \textit{A deepe groan}, compares
the very name of Charles to a refreshing and medicinal herb, reflection on which revives the senses

\begin{quote}
Meantime the loyal eye
Shall pay her tribute to thy memory.
Thy aromatic name shall feast our sore,
'Bove balmy spiknards fragrant redolence.'\textsuperscript{75}
\end{quote}

Yet here is one of a number of paradoxes found in the elegies. If Charles is to be remembered and
celebrated as 'a saint, martyr and hero, then the instruments of that martyrdom cannot be
forgotten. In excoriating the regicides the eulogists wished to blot them out; their crime was so

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Regale lectum miseriae}. 1649, p. 41
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Vaticinium votivum}. 1649, p. 85-6
\textsuperscript{73} King, H. \textit{A deepe groan}. p. 35
enormous that one could not bear to look upon them. Yet they were the cause and the means of the triumph of Charles and thus could not be forgotten.

This literary ambiguity is found throughout the elegies, perhaps most obviously in the oft repeated claim that mere words cannot convey the horror and grief felt by the writer when contemplating the fate of Charles. The author of Caroli ponders whether he is capable of writing of the regicide

I come, but come with trembling, lest I prove
Th' unequal greet of Semele and Jove.
As she was too obscure, and he too bright,
My themes too heavy, and my pen too light.
And can I
Who want myself, write him an elegy?74

The author of On the martyrdom of his late Majestie, would agree, claiming

Tongues cannot speak; this grief knows no vent,
Nothing, but silence, can be eloquent.75

Whilst Henry King asks whether

The trivial offerings of our bubbling eyes
Are but fair libels at such obsequies.76

And Thomas Forde begs the muse to help him, "weep or sigh an elegy". After all, Charles himself had spoken through his, "rare portraiture", and

In such a strain,
Our wits are useless, and endeavours vain.
Silence and admiration fit me best,

Let other try to write, I'll weep the rest.77

74 Monumentum regale. 1649, pp. 20-1
75 Vaticinium votivum. 1649. p. 76
76 King, H. A deepe groan. p. 31
77 Forde, T. Virtus rediviva. 1660. C4r, C6v. Forde also uses the contrary device in another elegy in an attempt to underline the subjects dramatic quality. In The second anniversary on Charls the first, 1658 he contends that the grief over Charles' death is so great that it, "would fill a dumb mans mouth with words." Virtus rediviva. 1660, C6r.
But a stunned silence was to be far from the actual reaction of these eulogists. Despite their disclaimers, they were to be very vocal in condemnation and celebration. Yet many must have been aware of the tensions which are evident in their work. How to describe the indescribable, think the unthinkable? How to craft language into an acceptable memorial and how to be simultaneously prostrate with grief, ravished by the contemplation of Charles' heavenly virtues, whilst at the same time full of hatred for his enemies and ready for vengeance in the cause of Charles II. The author of *Memoriae sacrum optimi maximi Caroli I* acknowledged these problems when he wrote

My dwindling-dwarf-like-fancy swells not big,
Nor knows to wear a borrowed periwig
Of metaphors, nor from Parnassus rise
To ransack far-fetched phrases from the skies;
Since all those piddling epithets are too brief,
Great Charles, to show thy glory, or my grief.78

Lois Potter has discussed the problem these authors had not just in finding appropriate language, but in avoiding the charge of being weak and effeminate in their grief, as the author of *The bloody court* observed, his intention was not 'to catch women's affections, but to inform man's judgements.'79 Potter reminds us that women were often used as a literary device to signify hysterical grief or swooning horror; reactions the Royalists may have felt were not 'manly' enough to be ascribed directly.80 Another familiar device was to concentrate on evoking the reader's sympathy by focusing on the patient suffering of Charles and the courage with which he faced his predicament. As the author of the play *The famous tragedie* puts it

He that can read the play and yet forbear
For his late murdered Lord, to shed a tear,
Hath a heart framed of adamant and may

78 *Vaticinium votivum*. 1649, p. 52
79 *The bloody court*. 1649, p. 5
Pass for an atheist the Reformed way.\textsuperscript{81}

As such the elegies reflect a central theme running through all cult literature, namely the epideictic technique of evoking the reader's sympathy and identification with the central character rather than discussing the events and issues which brought that individual into crisis in the first place. A dispassionate discussion of the causes of the Civil Wars or Charles' downfall was probably impossible for most people caught up in these events. Certainly it was impossible in cult literature as it required a level of detachment incompatible with the ideological conviction that Charles was a virtuous and saintly Prince, whilst his enemies were all black hearted villains.

Yet some reason had to be given for the downfall of the monarchy, and here the elegies reproduce the explanations found in innumerable sermons; namely, that the wars were caused by the sins of the people and the ambition of the rebels. Such an explanation absolves Charles from any responsibility, he is merely the victim, almost passive apart from his resolution not to give in to the rebels.

That Charles' cause is just is taken for granted, yet it was felt necessary to counter the puritan belief that worldly success denotes God's approval. Three methods were employed to achieve this; in \textit{Regale lectum miseriae}, John Quarles has Charles declare

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
God knows my cause was just
And yet he laid my armies in the dust.
Shall I repine because I daily see
My foes prevail, and triumph over me?
No, no, I will not, they shall live to die,
When I shall die to live and glorify
The general in heaven, within whose tent
I hope to rest, where time will ne'er be spent.\textsuperscript{82}
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

In other words the defeat of the Royalists was the necessary preliminary to the glorification of Charles, an explanation which is only possible with the benefit of hindsight; when history is read

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{The famous tragedie}. 1649, A2v.

\textsuperscript{82} Quarles, \textit{J. Regale lectum miseriae}. 1649, pp. 25-6
backwards from the regicide. As Forde puts it in addressing Charles, "spite of the sword and axe, you found a way / To win the field, although you lost the day."\footnote{Forde, T. \textit{Virtus rediviva}. 1660, C6v.}

The second method was to point out the logical fallacy within the puritan theory of success, namely that it only works when one's own side is triumphant. As Sir Charles Lisle says to Fairfax at Colchester

\begin{quote}
Fortune hath favoured thee I do confess\textsuperscript{a} but that proves not the justness of thy cause.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
For by the same rule Ottoman may boast, the partial deities favour him the most.\footnote{The famous tragedie. 1649, p. 10}
\end{quote}

In the sermons we will come across a third way around this problem. This was to identify Charles with the Old Testament King Josiah who was a godly and virtuous ruler, but whom God allowed to die at the hand of his enemies both as a punishment to a sinful nation who were thus deprived of a good king, and to spare Josiah from witnessing the suffering which was about to be poured out upon Israel. The sermon by Robert Brown to be discussed shortly draws this parallel between Charles and Josiah in some detail.\footnote{For the story of Josiah see 2 Chronicles 34-35}

\begin{quote}
What we see in these elegies, plays and sermons is yet another example of the Royalists attempting to wring victory out of defeat by placing Charles in the tradition of heroic death discussed in the \textit{Introduction}. Charles gains his life by losing it "they shall live to die, when I shall die to live." As such he stands in the gospel and Catholic tradition which sees this life as the preparation for the next, as a vale of tears through which it is necessary to pass before receiving ones reward; and as a testing ground for ones constancy and purpose, the place where one is fitted for heaven. This was a recurring theme of the cult; that Charles gained the martyr's crown only through his patient suffering in the cause of truth. Owen Felltham states that the martyr's crown is Charles' only
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
When by a noble Christian fortitude
He has serenely triumphed o're all rude
And barbarous indignities that men
\end{quote}
(Inspired from Hell) could act by hand or pen.\textsuperscript{86}

Indeed John Quarles mirrors the Josiah theme by suggesting that he was too good a king to remain on earth and that heaven was jealous for his company.\textsuperscript{87} An idea the author of \textit{The famous tragedie} turns to cynical account when Cromwell - portrayed as an ambitious, calculating and ruthless rebel - muses that in killing Charles he is doing heaven a favour, for

\begin{quote}
He is fitter far for to converse with saints and seraphim than with erroneous\textasteriskcentered and ambitious mortals, and twere a sin (a grand one) for to deter the hopes celestial have for to enjoy his presence.\textsuperscript{88}
\end{quote}

As such the defeat and Charles' subsequent reception in heaven is not an obstacle but rather a confirmation that his cause is just and will win through in the end, as Henry King puts it, "Thy sweetness conquered the sharp test."\textsuperscript{89}

However, for those Royalists left behind the future was not so rosy, as Felltham puts it, "So beloved he fell, that with pure grief / His subjects died, 'cause he was reft of life."\textsuperscript{90} What is the use of looking for a new light to guide one, such pale lights as are now left are only man made, not divine. The eulogists knew that in comparing the present sorry state of England with a supposed golden age of peace and prosperity before the onset of the wars they would strike a responsive chord in their audience. The comparison was even more effective in that it was over a decade since the beginning of the Bishops' War. The memory of Ship Money, the personal rule and Laudian controversies in the church had faded and seemed trifling when compared to the upheavals and suffering which had followed. Nostalgia and a yearning for 'normalcy' made many happy to forget the problems of the personal rule and to believe that England had been peaceful and happy under a wise Prince before the rebellion had turned the world upside down. John Quarles in \textit{Regale lectum miseriae} could say that

\begin{quote}
If this be England, Oh what alteration
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{86} Pebworth. 1973, p. 66
\textsuperscript{87} Quarles, J. \textit{Regale lectum miseriae}. 1649, p. 41
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{The famous tragedie} 1649, p. 33
\textsuperscript{89} King, H. \textit{A deepe groan} 1649, p. 36
\textsuperscript{90} Pebworth. 1973, p. 66
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Is lately breed within so blest a nation

England, sad object, that wert lately crowned

With a most glorious Prince, how art thou drowned

In royal blood? 91

As in *Fons Lachrymarum* he laments that, "gone are the days when this consuming earth / Was stuffed with pleasure, and perfumed with mirth." 92 Yet if England was so happy, if Charles was such a good, wise and 'glorious' Prince, why was there a Civil War? Why did this golden age end in blood, and why was so great a Prince defeated in battle and publicly tried and executed by his own people? In answering these questions the Royalists constructed a historiography which not only absolved Charles from any responsibility, but also helped them come to terms with their defeat.

For them, this golden age was disrupted by the ambition of evil men, who, manipulating and misleading the people sought power for themselves under the pretext of securing liberty and true religion, the whole design against Charles and the state being described as, "A crime *Leviathan* / Infidel wickedness, without the Pale." 93 The people were misled because of a surfeit of leisure and security granted them by the benevolent rule of Charles, which made them decadent, arrogant and sinful. This combination of the people's sins and the ambition of evil men brought Civil War to England and resulted in the murder of the King. This historiography also confirmed the Royalists sense of hope, because if the Republic were based on sin, then eventually God would act to destroy that sin and restore the true rulers. After the Restoration this was to become the official view of the Wars and the Republic, repeated in many a Fast Day sermon. Its weakness was that a significant proportion of the population remembered a different historiography. They had a different memory of Charles' rule and the reasons for the Civil War. This divergence of historical memory and the fact that Royalist historiography could not discuss the origins of the Wars dispassionately may be one of the reasons for the eventual failure of the cult.

For the eulogists and preachers of the 1650s however, there was no doubt as to the causes of the rebellion. Henry King was sure that even in 1640 the puritan faction in the Commons was

---

91 Quarles, J. *Regale lectum miseriae*. 1649, pp. 37, 35.
92 Quarles, J. *Fons lachrymarum*. 1649, p. 5
93 King, H. *A deepe groani* 1649, p. 33
intent on rebellion. Having denied the King the right to dissolve Parliament without their consent,
they went on to gain control of the militia

This done, the unkennelled crew of lawless men
Led by Watkins, Pennington and Venn,
Did with confused noise the court invade;
Then all dissenters in both Houses bayed.
At which the King amazed is forced to fly,
The whilst your mouths laid on maintain the cry.

The King, surprised and disconcerted by an unforeseen rebellion, is obliged to run before his
enemies, and Henry King maintains the hunting theme, which emphasises the King's vulnerability
and innocence before the implacable hatred of his pursuers

The royal game dislodged and under chase,
Your hot pursuit dogs him from place to place
The mountain partridge or the chased roe
Might now for emblems his fortune go.\textsuperscript{94}

The author of \textit{An elegie on, the meekest of men, the most glorious of Princes, the most constant of martyrs, Charles
the I.}, sees the link between the mob and those men who controlled it

His first affliction from rude tumult came,
From them the fuel, but elsewhere the flame,
Their trunk and boughs build the instructed pile
But worse men light and fan the flames the while.\textsuperscript{95}

The plot is made easier because of the ignorance of the mob which can be primed against church
and king without ever really knowing the reason why, or understand either the slogans they are
being taught or the real motives of their teachers. As John Quarles in \textit{Fons Lachrymarum} believed,
the plotters, "teach their prick-earred brethren to deny / The Common Prayer, but know no
reason why."\textsuperscript{96} Yet ultimately it could only be the sinful nature of the people that turned them

\textsuperscript{94}King, H \textit{An elegy} 1649, pp. 7-8
\textsuperscript{95}Monumentum regale. 1649, p. 14
\textsuperscript{96}Quarles, J. \textit{Fons Lachrymarum}. 1649, p. 8
against their Prince; after all the eulogists are convinced that the people could have no legitimate grievances. In *The famous tragedie*, Sir Charles Lucas is adamant that, "Britain's Charles, his peoples sins did kill." And in *A penitential ode for the death of King Charls*, the grieving Cavalier goes one better, and blames himself. In a manner reminiscent of counter-reformation piety he confesses to the dead Charles

> Say not the Commons, nor the army,
> City, nor judges; only I did harm thee.

Warming to his theme he makes the point that if the sins of the nation brought Charles to his death, then that means that each individual is guilty, whether Cavalier of Roundhead

> Though Pontius Bradshaw did in judgement sit,
> And Cook dress hell-bred sophistry with wit,
> To drain the blood,
> Of Charles the good
> And strike the royal heart,
> Not by evidence but art.
> These were but the fire and wood! But who did bring?
> Or where's the lamb for a burnt-offering?
> Let every penitent loyalist now cry,
> 'Twas sinful England! But most sinful I.

Most eulogists refrained from such radical introspection and were content to point the finger of blame at the mob and the perfidious faction who controlled it and who used it to further their ambitions. For, like the preachers, the eulogists were convinced that from the beginning of the troubles the rebels had conceived the rebellion in its entirety. They emphasised that compared to other outrages perpetrated against kings this deeply laid design was without parallel, thus, "Raviliack's was but undergraduate sin / And Goury here a pupil assassin." The Parliamentary campaign of 1640 - 42, the Civil Wars, the trial and execution of the king and the establishment of

---

97 *The famous tragedie*. 1649, p. 13
98 *Vaticinium votivum*. 1649, p. 102
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the Republic; all were carefully planned from the beginning. Henry King makes this point, accusing the Presbyterians of laying the seeds of rebellion which the Independents then took up and carried forward, thus

Though the Independents end the work
'Tis known they took their platform from the Kirk;
Though Pilate Bradshaw and his pack of Jews
God's high vice-gerent at the Bar accuse,
They but revived the evidence and charge
Your poisonous declarations laid at large
And if their axe invade the royal throat,
Remember you first murdered him by vote.100

A point also made in two pamphlets published at the same time as this elegy by John Pine and the anonymous author of *Clericus classicum*.

Thus identified as hypocritical and unreliable, the rebels' arguments are dismissed, because however plausible individual assertions may appear on the surface, that reasonableness only masks a desire to tear down the fabric of the state and set themselves up in power. A point Charles himself makes in his letter to his son at the end of *Eikon Basilike*, where he warns the Prince of Wales that the call for reformation in the church is only an excuse to pull down the hierarchy of the state. This view dispenses with the need to engage with and refute the rebels programme, just as the emphasis on national sins and ambitious factions exonerates Charles from any responsibility in the coming of Civil War or the defeat of the Royalists.

These attitudes and arguments accompanied a deeply laid social snobbery and fear of social upheaval. Thus Henry King identifies the fall of Charles with the fall of property, and Charles himself made good use of this theme throughout the Civil Wars, telling the gentry of Oxfordshire as early as November 1642 that, "In assisting me, you defend yourselves; for believe it, the sword which is now drawn against me will destroy you, if I defend you not."101 The fear of religious radicalism has been suggested as an important factor in the creation of a Royalist party in

100 King, H. *Elegy* 1649, p. 17
101 King, H. *A deepe ground* 1649, p. 31. "Charles' speech to the gentry of Oxfordshire, 2nd Nov. 1642", in Reliquiae sacrae Caroliniae. 1651, p. 46
1641-2 and in the change of attitude towards the King after 1646. Certainly any understanding of Royalist attitudes must include the profound dislike and anxiety many felt at the way the social hierarchy was breaking down in the face of rebellion and high taxation. After 1660 this anxiety helped annex the cult to an 'ideology of order' which sought to maintain the status quo and make a repetition of 1642 impossible. Yet in 1649 all the eulogists could do was stand amazed at the spectacle of their King being so profanely treated by his inferiors; so that Quarles, perhaps referring to the fact the Charles refused to remove his hat before the High Court of Justice, exclaims

Good God, what times are these, when subjects dare
Presume to make their sovereign stand bare;
And when they sent him from their new made place
Of justice, basely spit upon his face.

And in *Fons Lachrymarum* he refers to, "A brain-sick multitude, a rabble of all religions". Made up of individuals who are only happy if they can, "rail and reverently bawl / Against grave bishops and their pious king". And that the whole hierarchy of civilised values have been thrown into the melting pot, for

If a black-smith, or a tinker can
Hammer out treason, he's a zealous man.
Or if a learned cobbler will be sure
To stitch it close, oh he's a Christian pure!
Oh, these are holy, yea, and learned teachers,
These are divines and only these are preachers.
Advance mechanics, down with majesty.
These, these, are they, whose dunghill thought could never

Attain perfection, but they still endeavour
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To banish wisdom, that at last they may

Make all the world as ignorant as they.\textsuperscript{106}

Others refer to peasant leaders of the past, like Wat Tyler and Jack Cade, not only to damn the present rebels by association, but also to frighten the reader by conjuring up images of wild and all consuming peasant violence.\textsuperscript{107} Thus the rebels are, "dung-hill tyrants," engaged in, "rude tumults," and treason not only goes unpunished, but instead rules the roost. As the author of \textit{Caroli} observed, "Does not the judge and law too for a need / The stirrup hold, whilst treason mounts the saddle."\textsuperscript{108} A reference not only to the spurious show of legality attending the regicide, but also the by now familiar theme of the reversal of roles, the master now obliged to attend the servant.

This fear of social radicalism and the revolution of traditional values is linked to a belief that the unleashing of 'rude tumults' and the mob will result in the overthrow not only of the social hierarchy but of the whole course of nature, based as it is on the balanced operation of the hierarchy of powers. The author of \textit{On the execrable murther of Charles the first}, carried away by his grief, exclaims that, "Charles tragedy doth portend / Earth's dissolution and the world's just end."\textsuperscript{109} Others, whilst not looking for the end of the world, nevertheless clearly see in the regicide the imminent threat of anarchy. The author of \textit{On the martyrdom of his late Majesty}, sees the church and the state shaking under the impact of the executioners axe, which is laid to societies roots, thus, "that building must expect to fall whose prop is turned to dust."\textsuperscript{110} Whilst in \textit{An elegie on the best of men and meekest of martyrs, Charles the I} the author sees the innocent royal blood dripping into the earth causing such a reaction that, "the frame of nature shrinks again / Into a shuffling chaos."\textsuperscript{111}
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For the death of the King, "Voided all forms, left but privations / In church and state; inverting
every right."\textsuperscript{112}

For Henry King, the iconoclasm which accompanied the puritan victory was itself an
aspect of a wider attack upon the social structure; the breaking of a church window becomes one
with the execution of Charles in the deeply laid plot to turn the world upside down, thus

Neither tomb nor temple could escape,

Nor dead nor living your licentious rape.

Statues and grave-stones o'er men buried

Robbed of their brass, the coffins of their lead;

Not the seventh Henry's gilt and curious screen

Nor those which 'mongst our rarities were seen,

The chests wherein the Saxon kings lay

But must be sold or thrown away.\textsuperscript{113}

Nothing was spared in this sacrilege, King declares that the present storm against the church
surpasses that wrought by Julian the Apostate, John of Leyden or Mohammed the conqueror of
Constantinople. These, he says. "were poor essays on imperfect crimes / Fit for beginners in
unlearned times."\textsuperscript{114} The present sacrilege and persecution must provoke God's anger, indeed
King wonders why He has not intervened before. But he dismisses the excuse that the sacrilege is
to be explained by the undisciplined enthusiasm of the common soldiery; pointing at the
Parliament, he says, "we must believe that what by them was done / Came licensed forth by your
probation."\textsuperscript{115} If all else fails, the conspiracy theory is always available to explain that which
appears arbitrary and uncoordinated. King repeats the oft heard fear of the second session of the
Long Parliament, that any attack on the property or rights of the church, must inevitably lead to
an attack on other forms of property and the whole social order. The author of \textit{A sigh for an afflicted
sovereign. Or, England's sorrows for the sufferings of the King} asserts that the death of Charles will lead to
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the destruction of all nobility, for the aristocracy only derived their lustre from him. With the extinquishing of the great light the nobles lustre, "must / Shrink to a snuff; your honour to the dust."\textsuperscript{116}

All will be devoured by the monster of rebellion, and as the Fronde came to be represented by a python, so the rebellion against Charles and the forces of popular sovereignty unleashed against church and state are call by John Quarles, the "many-headed monster" of the people and by Thomas Forde, a hydra-headed monster which boasts of its power and justifies its presence by asserting democratic ideas of popular sovereignty and the subordination of kings to the people.\textsuperscript{117} Quarles has his democratic monster declare that in a state where, "our welfare is the supreme law / I'd suffer all to preach / And sow sedition, everyone shall be / At least a saint, and preach upon a tree."\textsuperscript{118} In this democratic confusion all order, divine and human, is sacrificed and, in an image reminiscent of Hobbes' state of nature, the only law is the greed and lust of each individual pitted against all other.\textsuperscript{119}

Having discussed what the eulogists have to say about the nature of the tragedy they have experienced, it is now appropriate to look at what they have to say about Charles himself. Here we will meet again many of the images and assertions prevalent in the period immediately before the regicide; as such it is another example of the way in which a Royalist political theology surrounding the person of Charles became fixed at the very beginning of the cult and, as the next chapter will demonstrate, remained largely unchanged throughout the heyday of the cult's existence.

If, as the eulogists had already asserted, the Civil Wars and regicide were the product of national sins and the ruthless ambition of evil men, then Charles emerges as a figure untainted by

\textsuperscript{116}A sigh for an afflicted sovereign. 1649, p. 1
\textsuperscript{117}Quarles, J.: Regale lectum miseriae. 1649, p. 3 and Forde, T. Virtus rediviva. 1660, C4r
\textsuperscript{118}ibid pp. 4, 8
\textsuperscript{119}Both the monsters in A famous tragedy and in Quarles are sexually immoral. In A famous tragedy, Cromwell is seen seducing Lambert's wife whilst the King is executed, whereas Quarles has the personification of rebellion making love, "in the open air" (Regale lectum miseriae, p. 7) As a symbol of anarchy, sexual license was often employed, it represents the breakdown of traditional morality and social restraint. It is also used as part of the campaign to blacken the reputation of the Republics leaders and to suggest that puritan morality was hypocritical.
any fault or responsibility. Charles' innocence is absolute, as the author of *Carolī* puts it, "Simeon the Stylite in his pillar / Might live more strict, but not more innocent." In none of the elegies studied is there any hint that Charles' policies as King or his leadership of the Royalist war effort was in any way flawed or mistaken. In fact some of the writers go to the lengths of claiming that Charles' great virtues proved his undoing. The author of *Two elegies. The one on his late Majesty. The other on Arthur, Lord Capel*, reflects that Charles' "Saint-like mercies were / So great, they did remit that needful fear / Subjects should show unto their King." Yet even this implied criticism is immediately countered by claiming that Charles rivalled in valour and wisdom both Caesar and Solomon, "and he / By the comparison can no loser be / If we but cast piety in the scale / And patient sufferance, King Charles must prevail."

We have already encountered the suggestion that Charles was too saintly a character to remain long on this earth; that in a platonic sense Charles' soul was too pure to stand being embroiled in the base earth for very long. This pure soul is usually identified as the Man of Sorrows, a King unjustly burdened with the sins of his people. He is described as having "saint-like mercies", and some eulogists, hoping to bring the reader closer to the scene of martyrdom, put suitably heart-rending speeches into the mouth of Charles himself, establishing his loss and sadness for the reader. John Quarles has Charles address God in *Regale lectum miseriae*, where he asks

> Was ever grief like mine?
> Was ever heart so sad? Was ever any
> So destitute of joy, that had so many
> As I have had?

Quarles goes on to say that despite these manifold affliction, Charles could remain constant to his virtuous self, through self-discipline and constancy. Echoing the ne stoics, Quarles asserts that, "He was a king not only over land / But over passion, for he could command / His royal self." This theme of self mastery is evident in the *Eikon Basilike* and bears witness to "a heaven-channeled
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mind,"¹²⁴ which allows Charles to be wise, just, chaste, merciful, courageous and devout, but principally it gave him that intangible aura of Majesty which enabled him to subdue discord by his mere presence. Owen Felltham asserts that Charles' title to rule is to be seen in, "his Princely grace" and virtues, and that they were so great that he should by rights have been Emperor of the world rather than just King of Great Britain.¹²⁵ Thomas Forde states that the glory of Charles as he enters heaven is such as to put all former heroes into the shade

Thou art all wonder, and thy brighter story
Casts an eclipse upon the blazing glory
Of former ages; all their worthies, now
(By thee out done) do blush, and wonder how
They lost the day beclouded with a night
Of silence, rising from thy greater light.¹²⁶

This theme, so familiar from the masques of the 1630s, is employed at the King's trial to contrast the turbulence of the rebels with the recollected equanimity of Charles. On being brought to the Bar

Like a sun he shined

Amongst those gloomy clouds which had combined
Themselves together, plotting to disgrace
His orient lustre and impaled his face
But he whose patience could admit no date
Conquered their envies and subdued their hate.¹²⁷

¹²⁴ ibid p. 49
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¹²⁷ Quarles, J. Regale lectum miseriae. 1646, p. 43. The oft-repeated assertion that Charles' dignity and courage confounded his judges at the trial was seen in a different light by Lucy Hutchinson. She observed that many at the trial noted the disdain which Charles exhibited when confronted with the suffering and loss caused by the wars; "and he stuck not to declare in words, that no man's blood spilt in this quarrel troubled him but only one, meaning the Earl of Strafford." Hutchinson, L. Memoirs of the life of Colonel Hutchinsona 1995, p. 234.
Beyond this stoic self mastery and majestic equanimity, most of the elegies at some point review the list of Charles' virtues, almost like a catechism. Charles is the best of men and the best of kings, a loving husband and father, a paragon of all the traditional virtues which, in another echo of the masque, illuminate the land. The author of Caroli dates Charles' wisdom back to his childhood when even as Prince of Wales, "His wisdom did so antedate his years." Not only that but his piety was beyond reproach, indeed his whole reign had something of a priestly quality about it, and, "His crown contained a mitre."128 His understanding of his realm was beyond compare, almost as if he had sat in the council chamber of God himself. In contrast the regicides have destroyed the health of the land and the author of Chronostichon sees the fall of the axe as rendering Britain blind:

Each well-set limb
By dislocation was lop't off in him.
And though she yet lives, she lives but to condole;
Three bleeding bodies left without a soul.129

But yet again there is a paradox in all this adulation. If Charles was such a paragon of virtues, why did he inspire such distrust and end his days on a scaffold? It is the same paradox we have noted in looking at Charles' rule, which, according to the eulogists, was an expression of his virtuous self. The eulogists, like the preachers, did not often confront these paradoxes head on; indeed they could not, without undermining the whole foundation of Charles' radical innocence. What they could do was to present Charles as a type of innocent suffering in the hope that all those who had shared something of the sufferings attendant on the Civil Wars would identify with him. He could also be presented as the good king sacrificed for the sins of his people; a people blinded to his greatness and virtue by their sins. Here again we encounter the identification of Charles with, on the one hand, the godly kings of the Old Testament, David, Josiah and Solomon, whilst on the other that most singular and controversial aspect of the cult, the Christ-like parallel (See fig.5).

Henry King, having stated that the death of Charles calls to mind the murder of King Josiah, nevertheless feels that some apology has to be given for these biblical parallels, and declares

128 Caroli, in Monumentum regale. 1649, p. 23
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O pardon me that but from Holy Writ
Our loss allows no parallel to it.
Nor call it bold presumption that I dare
Charles with the best of Judah's kings compare.
The virtues of whose life did I prefer
The text acquits me for no flatterer.
For he like David perfect in his trust,
Was never stained like him, with blood or lust.¹³⁰

Charles is more virtuous than David, more devote and constant than Solomon, more zealous than either Jehosaphat or Hezekiah and more patient than Job. His restoration of St. Paul's is compared to Joash's restoration of the Temple and, "Must (if no other) be his monument"¹³¹ (See fig.6).

In surpassing the Old Testament kings in piety and wisdom, Charles can have only one comparable biblical parallel, that of Christ himself; in Felltham's famous phrase, "Here Charles the first, and Christ the second lies."¹³² As we shall see in looking at the sermons of Warner and Brown, the parallel drawn between the passion of Christ and the death of Charles was being made in the very first days after the regicide, and it proceeded from the same parallel which was being drawn by Symmons and others whilst Charles was still alive. But whereas Warner and Brown had to veil their allusions for fear of the Republican response, Royalists abroad felt no such inhibitions. Within weeks of Charles' death, Dr. Lotius, in a speech before Charles II on behalf of the Consistory of The Hague, declared that Charles had walked in the footsteps of Christ and the protomartyr Stephen, particularly in forgiving his enemies and praying for his persecutors on the scaffold; a point taken up by John Quarles in Regale lectum miseriae. Henry Leslie and Richard Watson, preaching before the exiled court in early 1649, also drew the Christ-Charles parallels openly and without ambiguity. Watson refers to Charles as, "a second Christ."¹³³ Whilst Leslie
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as he [Charles] was a good king (full of grace) he was a most lively image of Christ; so lively an image of him, that amongst all the martyrs never was there any who expressed so great conformity with our Saviour in his sufferings as he did.\textsuperscript{134}

Throughout the elegies references to Christ's passion recur in connection with Charles. The Scots for their 'selling' of Charles to the English Parliament on 1647 are "compared with Iscariot"\textsuperscript{135} and later in the same elegy King refers to "Pilate Bradshaw with his pack of Jews."\textsuperscript{136}

The author of \textit{A penitential ode for the death of King Charles}, refers to, "Pontius Bradshaw," sitting in judgment on Charles,\textsuperscript{137} and Owen Felltham believed that the regicides went even further than the Sanhedrin, in that they could claim ignorance of Christ's real identity, whereas the regicides were in no doubt as to whom they were killing

When Herod, Judas, Pilate and the Jews
Scots, Cromwell, Bradshaw and the shag-haired mews
Had quite out-acted, and by their damn'd cry
Of injured justice, lessened Crucifie.\textsuperscript{138}

Like Christ, Charles is radically innocent, yet he does not flinch from giving himself up for his people, and the trial and execution are likened to a "passion-tragedy / His Saviours person none could act, but he / Behold what Scribes are here, what Pharisees! / Whitehall must be, lately his palace, now his Calvary."\textsuperscript{139}

Yet it was the author of \textit{Caroli}, collected in \textit{Monumentum regale}, who set out the full Christ-Charles parallel thus

Now Christ the King, and as good a King too,
Being Christ's adopted self, was both to do
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And suffer like him.

Charles was to walk in the same footsteps as Christ, and wear the same crown of thorns, the very crown he is seen holding in Marshall’s famous frontispiece to the *Eikon Basilike*. When abused he did not retaliate or abuse his enemies in return, but accepted his lot so that he might, "take up / His Saviours cross, and pledge him in his cup." Having

Liv'd o're our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount,
And did all Christian precepts so reduce
That's life the doctrine was, his death the use;
Posterity will say, he should have died
No other death than by being crucified.
And there renownest epochs will be

Great Charles his death, next Christ's nativity.\(^{140}\)

Here again we are confronted with a paradox; namely that Charles' reputation as a martyr can only be achieved by his death, and it is only through the total failure of his earthly career that his divine qualities are revealed. In this respect Charles conforms to the traditional Christian economy of martyrdom, of giving up one's life to save it, and of death as the gateway to greater life; themes touched upon previously. However, it was a paradox Charles himself appeared to be aware of, particularly in referring to Parliament's promise to make him a glorious king, and the eulogists were quick to underline the point that the fury of the rebels only succeeded in revealing more clearly Charles' Christ-like qualities. As the author of *Caroli* puts it, "The stones they hurled at him, with intent / To crush his fame, have proved his monument."\(^{141}\) And John Quarles has Charles anticipate this fact by saying, "What, though I suffer here, my sufferings shall / Advance my soul; may they not make you fall."\(^{142}\)

Whilst the acceptance of suffering may be a commonplace of Christian martyrology, there is almost a sense of predestination in some of the eulogists. Charles' virtues are so excellent, his enemies so vile, and the sins of the nation so great, that his martyrdom becomes almost a
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foregone conclusion. The author of Caroli has already observed that it was unfortunate that Charles was not crucified, thus making the parallel with Christ even more obvious; and John Quarles has Charles refer to death as, "my longed for hour! I long to throw this burden down, that presses me below." Monumentum regale contains a number of elegies which feature Charles welcoming death, and the authors use it as the medium through which Charles' virtues can shine. Indeed, weeping at his death is called "the treason of our eyes," for "Our sun did only set, that he might rise." Death "and thy Bourreaux," are forgiven for killing Charles; their "courteous knife" was the instrument which released Charles from the "great injury of life." By subsuming the fear and squalor of the actual killing into the image of the saint and martyr, and by insisting on reading the circumstances of Charles' death exclusively from the perspective of the 'glorious martyr', the eulogists are able to make even the executioner and his axe serve the cult. Charles receives his due not, as Milton would say, as punishment for his crimes and failings as a king, but as a reward for his sanctity and constancy, which leads him inevitably to a martyr's crown.

In conclusion, the eulogists present three alternatives for the future. Initially there is apotheosis; the dead Charles is now beyond all earthly sorrow, and, as a glorious saint in heaven, he can rest from his labours. The author of An elegie upon King Charles the First, murdered publically by his subjects, records Charles' apotheosis thus

And thus his soul, of this her triumph proved,
Broke, like a flash of lightening, through the cloud
Of flesh and blood; and from the highest line
Of humane virtue, passed to the divine.

One is reminded of baroque iconography, or of the Ruben's ceiling of the Banqueting House in Whitehall; of swirling clouds and fat cherubs, and the saint, his eyes gazing longingly into heaven, being borne, aloft into some great vault to receive his reward. Thomas Forde in The second anniversary on Charls the First, 1658, boasts that

Here is a saint more great, more true than ere
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Came from the triple crown, or holy chair.

We need no further for example look,

Than unto thee, thou art the only book;

Thou art the best of texts.146

Yet these elegies differ from a continental baroque view of martyrdom both in a platonic distaste for flesh and blood, which must be transcended; and in the absence of any hint of intercession; in none of the elegies studied is there any suggestion that the glorified Charles could be a channel for intercessory prayer. The author of Memoriae sacrum optimi maximi Caroli I emphasises the fact that Charles can now rest from "thy great work", and has laid down the burden of his temporal crown. Now he can, "rest in your sacred hearse / While we embalm your memory with our verse."147 As we have just seen, Thomas Forde sees Charles purely as an example, as a text to be read but not addressed directly. The exception is Owen Felltham's Epitaph, where he refers to the miracles wrought by Charles's blood, miracles which should serve, "to convince the heretic worlds base thought."148 This 'Protestant’ view of martyrdom, that death sets an unbridgeable gulf between the living and the dead, meant that whilst Charles' followers could draw comfort from the belief that Charles was indeed receiving his reward in heaven, they were left with only the memory of his virtues to sustain them. As that memory faded, so the virtues became ever more irrelevant.

The second conclusion presented by the eulogists was to contrast the glory of Charles in heaven with the sorrows of his subjects left on earth. As we have already seen this was an effective propaganda ploy to use in 1649 when many people were yearning for a return to normality and settled government. The author of Caroli compared the present state of England to that of Egypt assaulted by plagues in the Book of Exodus. But whereas Egypt had only to deal with plagues of locust, and hail storms, England had to contend with "frogs and lice, and Independents too."149

Another way of coping with the regicide, and the third conclusion of the eulogists, was to reflect upon the inevitable vengeance which would fall on the rebels, a vengeance to be poured out by
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God and Charles' supporters. At its heart was the Old Testament conviction that Charles' innocent blood called out for vengeance; in his second dream on Charles' death, John Quarles has him declare

Be well assured that every drop which parts
Out of my veins shall cleave into your hearts
Like tangling bird-lime which will hold you fast,
And vengeance too shall find you out at last.

God's "all-surveying eye" can see what the rebels have done; acts for which they will be punished. Wherever they flee and whatever they do, the guilt of their actions in spilling innocent blood will pursue them.\(^{150}\)

In this we see again the importance of the notion of bloodguilt and the juxtaposition of resignation and revenge which Milton found so objectionable in the Eikon Basilike. Milton saw the presentation of Charles' saint-like qualities as a weapon with which to attack the republic, and all the harping on about meekness, forgiveness and virtues as a smoke screen to hide the concrete political motives of hatred for the Republic and the desire for revenge. Certainly Henry King is quite explicit as to the true purpose of Royalist grief

Let all our sigh\(s\) have tongues, and every groan
Language enough to hurl confusion
On those damned traitors who have stolen our sun.\(^{151}\)

And the author of A coffin for King Charles has the dead King himself assert the juxtaposition of his own glory in heaven and the inevitability of vengeance

Singing with angels, near the throne
Of the Almighty Three,
I sit, and know perdition
(Base Cromwell) waits on thee.\(^{152}\)
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Many eulogists look from the dead father to the living son, as one who would "exhale the vapours from our eyes."\textsuperscript{153} He is the hope of the future and grief must be channelled into working for his restoration. King calls this hope, "an antidote for grief," and "all our just arrears / Of grief for Charles his death cannot be done / In better pay, than to enthrone his son."\textsuperscript{154} The author of \textit{Two elegies. The one on his late Majesty. The other on Arthur, Lord Capel}, takes this further by arguing that just as the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church, so out of the spilt blood of Charles will spring a restored monarchy

\begin{quote}
Nor ever King such a foundation laid
For a sons greatness since kings first were made.
Christ, who knows best what was for the churches good,
Steeped the first seeds from whence it sprung in blood.
Twas Caesar's blood, shed on the imperial seat,
Made young Augustus Caesar, and so great.
May our young King as wisely build upon
This bloody ground work and foundation,
As young Augustus did a Caesar's blood.\textsuperscript{155}
\end{quote}

Whilst one can forgive the Royalists in 1649 for trying to make the best of what must have seemed a very bad job, one cannot but be aware of yet another paradox; that Charles had to die to enable the monarchy to return stronger in 1660. Nevertheless, as we shall see when we look at the cult in its hey-day after the Restoration, this is arguably what took place.

One of the most striking features of the political theology underpinning the cult as expressed in these elegies and commemorative verse was that it would allow for no ambiguity. The many paradoxes and evasions within this genre exist as a result of that striving to create a closed, all-encompassing system. The causes and historiography of the wars, the character and motives of the regicides and the character of Charles himself, are all drawn with broad brush strokes which allow of no dissension or discussion. This determination to paint the regicide in black and white
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terms also characterised the commemorative sermons of the 1650s. Given the circumstances of defeat and exile it was perhaps inevitable that the Royalists during the Republic should have painted such an exaggerated picture of Charles; after all, they were trying to sustain a vision of monarchy and Anglicanism against a Republic which seemed to carry all before it. Yet in the longer term this rigidity and exaggeration may have worked against the cult. The further one moves in time from the events of January 1649 the more the image of Charles and the political theology sustaining that image, is challenged and diluted. Once the external imperatives sustaining the vision of these elegies is removed after 1660 so the exaggerated claims made on behalf of Charles, and the historiography surrounding the cult begin to look increasingly untenable, until with the Exclusion Crisis, powerful voices are heard for the first time in public questioning the accepted memory of Charles and demanding the abolition of the Fast. However, that development is still to come. Now we need to turn to the printed sermons of the 1650s to look at the ways in which they contributed to and helped establish the typology and theology of the Fast Day sermons which proliferated after the Restoration.

### iii. The sermons

John Downey, in his book on pulpit oratory in the eighteenth century, reminds us of the tendency of modern scholarship to neglect the sermon as a social, political, theological and literary source in the early modern period. Downey’s concerns are principally literary, but what he says about the place of the sermon applies equally to the seventeenth century and to the political and social context of the Civil Wars and regicide. We should resist the temptation to view the seventeenth century sermon as some sort of aberration, when the pulpit was invaded and abused by political invective and manipulation; this is to apply twentieth century assumptions to the seventeenth. The pulpit fulfilled more than an exclusively ‘religious’ function. It was at one and the same time the newspaper editorial, the press office, the soap box, the convention platform and the television studio of the age. From this platform both clergy and laity assumed and expected that the great issues of the day would be discussed, dissected, moralised and preached up. Indeed it is difficult to see how or where contemporaries would have drawn a distinction between the sacred and the profane. The puritan took up his sword as an instrument of the Lord and under the
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promptings of providence; whilst the Royalist fought to preserve the Lord's anointed and to maintain a hierarchy in church and state instituted by God and set forth in His word. As the Royalist Paul Knell observed in the preface to a sermon preached in April 1648, 'as the pulpit and press have both helped to heighten this rebellion, so it is fit they should both endeavour the de-throning of it,' and Charles himself well knew that armed might was of little use to him if the pulps preached rebellion.\footnote{Knell, P. \textit{Israel and England}. 1648. A2v}

Downey also reminds us that with the decline of the sermon the whole structure of epideictic oratory has also fallen into disrepute. The \textit{Oxford English Dictionary} defines epideictic as being for 'display or show-off' and this exemplifies the way in which both the rhetorical structure of the sermon and the epideictic technique have changed their meaning entirely. In contemporary terms 'rhetoric' often means word used without meaning, a display of word power signifying nothing; it is a term of abuse used by politicians to imply that their opponents' statements lack substance. Yet so much of the early cult literature is presented in this epideictic manner, that without some understanding of the technique we lose the original sense of the words and fail to understand how it was received by the audience.

A glance at contemporary diaries reveals a preoccupation with sermons, not just their theological content, but their length, structure and delivery; the attitude of the preacher, his mode of address, mannerisms etc. Pepys often notes his opinion of the sermons he has heard, and the good Anglican John Evelyn records in 1649 that he had to invite 'orthodox' ministers into his own home where they preached in his parlour and administered the sacraments, 'now wholly out of use in the parish church, on which the Presbyterians and fanatics had usurped'.\footnote{Evelyn \textit{Diary}: Vol.1, p. 249-50. March 18\textsuperscript{a} 1649} The first widely used system of shorthand was devised to enable people to make notes of sermons as they were being delivered. Caroline Richardson has demonstrated that despite the lack of specific training in
preaching given to the clergy, the whole structure of grammar school and university education depended upon feats of memory, the use of rhetorical structures and systems and the declamation and recitation of addresses, exercises and orations. By the time the young clergyman entered the pulpit to deliver a sermon he had already spent ten to fifteen years learning the art and structure of composition and declamation. Likewise literate sections of his congregation had been put through the same educational system and would recognise the methodology of sermon construction and delivery and be in a position to comment upon it — favourably or otherwise.

When we turn to the sermons concerned with the regicide delivered during the 1650s, we are immediately struck by their comparative scarcity. Compared to the elegies and the numbers of Fast Day sermons extant for the period after 1660, the surviving printed sermons from the 1650s can be counted on the fingers of one hand. This does not mean that sermons concerning Charles were not preached or that individuals did not observe the 30th January as a day of fasting and prayer. We have already mentioned the spontaneous observation of the 30th January by Evelyn, Fuller and Jeremy Taylor, and years later William Lloyd, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield observed in a Fast Day sermon of 1697 that there were 'many devout people of the Church of England who immediately humbled themselves under the afflicting hand of God; and kept a true fast on this day, for many years before there was any law to authorise it'. The author of The secret history of the Calves-Head Club tells how Juxon, Hammond, Sanderson and other Anglicans, 'met privately every 30th of January; and, though it was under the time of the usurpation, had compiled a private form of service for the day, not much different from what we now find in the liturgy'. What the lack of printed sermons for this period does indicate is that there were significant problems in getting these sermons printed and distributed after the government overhauled the censorship, and that possibly the beleaguered Royalists had other priorities.
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What the surviving sermons do reveal is a remarkable consistency of typology and theology amongst Royalist preachers. We have already observed how this typology was constructed before the regicide and presented in the *Eikon Basilike* and the elegies; a typology of method which textualises Charles and which circumvents the necessity for any objective engagement with him as an historical figure, with his policies as King, or his leadership during the Civil Wars.

The five sermons and the speech of Lotius to be examined here were all delivered within six months of the regicide. John Warner's *Devilish conspiracy* was preached on the 4th February, within a week of the execution and five days before Charles was buried at Windsor, Lotius delivered his address to Charles II and the exiled court at The Hague in the same month. The sermon, *Subjects sorrow*, attributed to either William Juxon or Robert Brown, Vicar of Sligo, probably also belongs to the weeks immediately after the regicide. Richard Watson's *Regicidium Judaicum* was preached to the exiled court on Palm Sunday 1649, and John Gauden claimed to have preached his sermon on the 10th February 1649, although it was not published until 1662; whilst Henry Leslie's dramatic presentation of Charles as the parallel of Christ was preached, again to the exiled court, in June 1649.

Francis Turner calculated in 1683 that after the Restoration above 3000 sermons were preached on the regicide each 30th January; certainly the printed versions available between the regicide and 1859, when the Office was removed from the Prayer Book, number many hundreds. But the first extant sermon is that of John Warner, Bishop of Rochester, who just five days after Charles' death delivered a sermon which was later printed under the title of *The devilish conspiracy, hellish treasons, heathenish condemnation, and damnable murder, committed, and executed by the Jews, against the anointed of the Lord, Christ the King*. Paul Korshin has observed that the regicide provoked, 'an
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164 *The Dictionary of National Biography* states that there is no evidence of Juxon's authorship of *Subjects sorrow* and that it has been attributed to Robert Brown. Wing has this sermon entered under both Juxon and Brown and a reprint dated 1710 attributes Brown as the author. For the purposes of this work, I assume Brown as the author.

165 In the preface to the 1662 printing of this sermon Gauden states that it was written 'in the just paroxisms of extreme grief and horror,' (Sig. A3) immediately after the King's execution, but that on sending it to London he could not find a printer. Finally it was printed anonymously by Dugard under the title, *Cromwell's bloody slaughter house discovered*. Certainly the violence of the language is in contrast to the other sermons here examined.
outpouring of typology,' but Warner's sermon is unique in being so completely typological that the figure of Charles is totally masked by an apparent discourse on the passion of Christ. In the printed version Christ/Charles is referred to simply as 'Christ the king' leaving the reader to insert whichever 'King' they wished. Whether Warner did this out of fear of the Republican authorities, and whether all his audience understood his typology is impossible to say. Certainly in reading the sermon with any knowledge of the events surrounding Charles' trial and execution it is impossible not to understand the real object of Warner's sermon. In the same manner, Subject's sorrow also uses a biblical device to mask the figure of Charles, although not so dramatically as Warner. Here the author devotes the first half of the sermon to an exposition of the virtues of the Old Testament King Josiah and the fact that God took away Josiah from a sinful people. Only in the second half of the sermon does the author make the parallel obvious between Josiah and Charles. But apart from Warner there does not appear to be any substantial difference between the sermons preached in England with those preached in exile in their presentation of the Christ-Charles parallel.

Returning to Warner, he had been an early and faithful advocate of royal power having been saved by Charles from Parliamentary impeachment as early as 1626 after preaching a spirited defence of the royal prerogative. During the first Civil War he spent four years following the King's army and although he eventually compounded for his estates to the tune of £5000, he refused to take any oath to the Republic and lived to return to the diocese of Rochester in 1660.

The importance of Warner's sermon, when taken together with those of Brown, Watson, Gauden, Leslie and Lotius, lies not so much in the fact that they are some of the first printed sermons commemorating Charles' death to survive; or as examples of literary subterfuge in the face of political opposition; what is important is that these sermons contain so many of the themes and parallels, symbols and illustrations which over the next century or so constituted the commonplace illustrations of 30th January sermons and which reflect themes we have already met in the elegies: They demonstrate that the typology and political theology of the cult was already in place at Charles' death and was to remain remarkably consistent over the next century.

These preachers sought to address two principal themes, the first concerned the nature of authority and the effect of the regicide both upon society and upon the judgement of God. The

second concerned the person of Charles as a type of Christian martyr and suffering King. These two themes also characterised Fast Day sermons after 1660 and reflect the way in which the cult was based on an epideictic presentation of Charles and as a vehicle for a particular political belief. As time went on the two themes increasingly diverged, with the person of Charles becoming submerged into a political discourse, until by the early eighteenth century many Fast Day sermons could be preached without any reference to Charles at all. However, in these early sermons there is a balance preserved between Charles the martyr and the political implications of that martyrdom.

Given the circumstances within which these sermons were preached there was an obvious need to redefine the position of monarchy as an institution in the face of triumphant republicanism, and to do that the preachers turned to the only sources of political debate open to them, scripture, history and analogy. Robert Brown used the familiar Renaissance analogy of the body politic to argue that man as a subject derives 'the life of his civil constitution from the King.' At the same time he also drew on a much older tradition which saw the health of the nation reflected in the health and vitality of the king, when he asks: 'How is the happiness of a kingdom twisted with the welfare of a religious king? How close doth the ruin of a people follow the loss of a pious prince?' In a lengthy digression, Brown provided almost a manifesto of monarchy based upon divine right, emphasising God's particular concern for the welfare of godly kings.

John Warner presented the classic patriarchal definition of monarchy as derived from God's original donation of absolute power to Adam. Kings rule by God's will; are accountable to him alone and are above all human law. Also, monarchy is the only guarantee of stability and prosperity for

the sceptre in the hand of one is more steady and upright than in the hands of many: so we must observe that the greatest empires that ever were, grew great by monarchy; which soon crumbled away when shared among the many.
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A theme repeated by Henry Leslie, who saw Charles as 'the figure of God in the nature of government'. Richard Watson stressed that rebellion and atheism were essentially unnatural and contrary to man's inclinations. In their hearts all men knew, by the light of reason implanted by God, that monarchy was the only natural form of government because it was favoured by God himself. The rebel rebelled as much against his own natural inclinations and conscience as against his king.

Likewise all the preachers emphasise the extent to which rebellion upsets the natural order and turns the world upside down. We have already mentioned Brown's identification of the health of the nation with that of a good king, and he ends his sermon by warning his audience that there can be no health or peace in England with 'our religion and liberty measured out unto us by the pike's length, the decisions of the sword become the principle of faith, and that mechanic persons, tradesmen, the sole moderators of public affairs and the chief princes and potentates of our kingdom'. John Gauden wondered how, 'such sons of the earth, of so base extraction' could become, 'the creators of a new heaven and a new earth'. But this point was taken even further; rebellion not only destroys the natural order in society, it also invades and corrupts the very soul of man. Watson comments that rebellion is not only contrary to man's conscience and inclinations but in rebelling against outward authority the rebels destroy the virtues within themselves, becoming cruel, full of hatred and insensitive to all calls of reason or charity. Thus, as he puts it, 'They who have forgotten to be men, to be merciful one to another in love, will scarce bethink themselves to be subjects, to be obedient all to anyone in duty'. Brown makes the point that the reason the rebels refused Charles a decent burial in Westminster, apart from the fact that it would have revealed the popular devotion to the King and the extent of public horror at the regicide, was because their consciences could not bear the proximity of the King's innocent body. Just as Julian the Apostate, on consulting the oracle of Apollo, discovered that it was struck dumb by the
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proximity of the body of the martyr Babylas, thus would it be with the rebels, 'if King Charles his sacred relics were lodged as nigh unto them as Westminster, and therefore Windsor was near enough.'

Given the circumstances in which these sermons were preached it is hardly surprising that they emphasise traditional arguments for monarchy, of the King as God's vicegerent etc. Their concern was as much to support the Royalist party as to convince their opponents and to reassure those who had recently seen their King beheaded that as monarchy was the system of government favoured by God, so God would ensure that its restoration would not be long delayed. As such these sermons differ slightly from those preached after 1660. After the Restoration the political arguments were designed to underpin an existing reality, to reinforce the reasons why the King should reign and why the people should obey. In the 1650s the aim is to look forward to that hoped for restoration and to keep alive the political theology which alone, it was believed, could ensure a return to the established order.

Yet the preachers were faced with the same fundamental dilemma as the eulogists; namely that if monarchy is instituted by divine right and is God's favoured system of government; if all men instinctively know in their hearts that rebellion is a sin, why was Charles beheaded and the natural order so comprehensively overthrown? Like the eulogists, the only answer they can offer which retains the radical innocence of Charles is to root the causes of the Civil Wars in the sins of the people and the ambition of a faction. Robert Brown insists that the wealth and peace generated by the wise rule of Charles made the people soft and arrogant. The people 'became self-willed, heady, high-minded, and incorrigible, they slandered the footsteps of God's anointed, smote him with the tongue, contended with God's priests', they launched themselves against true religion, against the Bishops - 'the fence of the church', and when Charles sought to defend the church, against him as well. They were led astray by 'the liquour of flatuous and superficial knowledge instilled into them by the giddy preachments and undigested, swelling and tedious prayers of their lecturers'. They believed they knew more than God Himself and could violate His precepts whilst claiming to be his servants, 'using the name of God and religion as conjurors in
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their incantations, to perpetrate those things that are most contrary unto God and destructive unto
religion.  

Unlike most Royalist commentators and eulogists, Brown is prepared to acknowledge
that in the beginning the rebels probably did not envisage killing the King, yet having allowed
that, he is quick to point out that small sins have a habit of becoming larger, and that rebellion in
thought or deed however small is still rebellion and thus a sin against God. Whatever their original
intentions, the rebellion they unleashed led inexorably to the murder of their King.

Warner agreed that the principal reason for the rebellion against 'Ch: the king' was
unbridled ambition on the part of a faction intent on usurping the kingly power, 'We will kill Ch:
the king, and so seize on his inheritance'.  They were so consumed with ambition that they could
not bear so good a man to live among them, a theme echoed by Brown in his identification of
Charles with Josiah; Charles' goodness only exposed the lusts and sins of the rebels. Yet in pursuit
of their ambition they displayed ruthless cunning and skilful manipulation, accusing 'Ch: the king'
of treason and murder when they themselves broke every law of God and man. Echoing an
argument Charles himself used at his trial, namely that he embodied the rule of law against
arbitrary power, Warner tell his audience that 'Ch: the king' died for them in defence of lawful
authority, 'He must die for the people, that is, for our law and liberties; and so is become by his
death your martyr, your sacrifice, and your saviour.'  

Gauden, in his outpouring of hatred against the regicides, denounced the 'wicked designs
of ambition and tyranny.'  The rebels, he claimed, surpassed the Jesuits in their cunning and
cruelty, seeking to 'subject the royal sovereignty to that of the people, as you call it, not that you
mean so in good earnest, further than to delude the people, and to raise the hands of your
desperate faction above all, both king, prince, peers and people.'  This fundamental distrust of
the intentions of the rebels reflects that same distrust already noted in the Eikon Basilike where
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Charles warns his son against calls for continued reformation of the church, as this only hides an
intention to attack the whole established order.

Although the sermons parallel so many of the themes found in contemporary elegies and the Eikon, as one might expect there is a greater emphasis on arguing a theological and scriptural case against the fledgling Republic. In looking to the Bible, the preachers found three principal analogies; the first was the Jews' rebellion against God and their killing of Christ, the second were the virtuous kings of the Old Testament, particularly Josiah; and the third was the parallel between Charles and Christ.

The Jews were to be a favourite device for those preaching on the regicide, and many sermons are ripe with this form of indirect anti-Semitism, for the Jews are the type of rebellion against God and against his anointed. For example, Gauden asks of the rebels

What have the falsest Jews, the fiercest Turks, the most brutish heathen, the renegade Christian, the subtest Jesuits, or the most fanatic Anabaptists and schismatics, or any other that are wholly without God in this world, ever done compared to your villainies?  

Gauden tosses in every seventeenth century bogey-man he can find to terrify his readers and then goes on to emphasize, in good pulpit style, that the objects of his wrath are worse even than these.

Richard Watson and John Warner both base their sermons on the theme of the Jews' rebellion. The fact that one was preached in England and the other at The Hague demonstrates that the device was not just a ploy to evade the censor, but a commonplace of pulpit oratory. Warner's sermon is replete with references to the Jews and through them the regicide. Thus the Sanhedrin is referred to as 'the court of justice,' and the Pharisees identified as a sect of innovators and hypocrites; men who believed themselves to be saved before all others and who used the words of scripture merely to abuse it. Under the disguise of strict religion they plotted the downfall of the king so that, 'they shall be Independent and free from all government but their own.' The whole tenor of Warner's use of the Pharisees is contemporary; in the printed version he uses the present rather than the past tense and the obvious use of the term Independent - the printed version has a
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capital 'I' - suggests a deliberate use of the Pharisees to condemn contemporary Independents and puritans who were held responsible for the miseries of the Civil War and the death of Charles. Warner goes on to parallel the mob, the priests, the lawyers, the Herodians and the Council of the gospels with those on the contemporary stage; comparing the co-operation between Romans and Jews in the killing of Christ with the oft-repeated belief among Anglicans of a conspiracy between Jesuits and puritans to undermine the royal supremacy and the Church of England.

Likewise Richard Watson draws the same parallel between the Jews and rebellion; his sermon being delivered at the beginning of Holy Week 1649 when the story of the Jews involvement in Christ's death was about to be retold. Watson takes the opportunity to dwell not only on the role of the Jews, but on Pilate's confession of Christ as king. Principally he concentrates on using the commonplace of the Jews as the type of the rebel, their history being one of continual rebellion against God and his earthly rulers. Their subsequent banishment and wanderings demonstrate, 'how long revenge follows rebellion at the heels.' Yet they are always ready to justify and excuse their rebellion in their own eyes. Thus the Chief Priests and the scribes make all sorts of excuses to Pilate who, having recognised Christ as a king, tries to point this out to the Jews. They reply that they have only one king in Caesar, a remark Watson rejects by pointing out that soon after the death of Christ the Jews rebelled against Rome. But, as he insists, the rebel is blind to reason and logic and that, 'when they have authority to countenance, and subtle sophistry to colour their actions they have a guard both for their wilfulness and ignorance and can bid defiance to the world.'

Of the five sermons and the speech by Lotius under consideration, only one, *Subject's sorrow*, uses the parallel of the Old Testament kings in any sustained way. On the title page the parallel is spelt out and Charles is called 'Britaines Josiah' and Brown, using a text from Lamentations (4:20) expounds Josiah as the breath of our nostrils, the Lord's anointed and the protector and refuge of the godly. Josiah was a king of Judah who purged the land of false gods, restoring the Temple and the observance of the Mosaic law. But God, in His anger at the idolatry of the people, resolved to punish Jerusalem, but told Josiah that he would not live to see this
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happen. Josiah duly dies and Jerusalem is eventually destroyed by the Babylonians and the people carried into captivity. As Margaret Aston has shown, Josiah had already been associated with Edward VI as a godly ruler intent on purging the land of idolatry and superstition. Given the controversy over Laud's altar policy and Charles' known love of the 'beauty of holiness' it was impossible and undesirable to identify him with the iconoclastic aspects of Josiah's reign, although his restoration of St. Paul's was compared with Josiah's restoration of the Temple. However, in viewing Charles as the virtuous prince of a sinful nation there were many useful parallels to be drawn. Thus both Charles and Josiah are presented as the fount of justice and law and the defenders of true religion. Their example 'giving life, reputation and lustre unto religion', and their consciences are 'a clear and unspotted glass wherein the glorious image of divine holiness did show itself transparent in the whole conduct of his actions.'

Next, Brown considers the significance of anointing, what he calls a 'divine signature of supreme power,' and the extent to which the nation is dependent upon the king, before moving on to consider the particular parallels between Charles and Josiah. In this he asks rhetorically whether Charles was not as pious and virtuous as Josiah, whether his title and prerogatives were not rooted in the same divine donation as Josiah's; whether it is not the same national sins of rebellion and sacrilege which destroyed Charles as well as Josiah, and whether in their loss the deluded people of England will not come to mourn Charles as heartily as Judah did Josiah? Brown rehearses the oft-repeated catechism of Charles' virtues, contemplation of which is 'a fragrant tract, having the sweet smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed.' Thus, as the eulogists never cease to remind us, he is pious, prudent, chaste, a gentle husband, father and master; he is merciful to his enemies, constant in suffering and steadfast in his principles. Brown also lists Charles' eloquence in his catalogue of virtues which, given the king's stammer, must be stretching the bounds of reality.
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Yet Brown asserts that Charles' speech was delivered in a 'flowing and king-becoming style, sweet, pure, accurate, perspicuous, grave, full of copious facility and elegant felicity, without strained affection or servile and forced imitation.'\(^{190}\) As we saw earlier in considering the *Eikon Basilike*, Brown joins Richard Watson and the eulogists in seeing the King's Book as the culmination and the most eloquent mirror of his virtues, his words are 'the repertory of all his actions, and the truest index of his virtues.'\(^{191}\) It is to this book that those grieving their loss should look for comfort, for it is 'a shop full of heavenly medicines for all the maladies of the soul.'\(^{192}\)

Having extolled Charles' virtues, Brown ends by returning to the parallels with Josiah, mourning the judgement which has come upon the nation through ungodliness and lamenting the fact that Charles, 'our physician, our nursing father, our comforter, our protector, is taken from us.'\(^{193}\) None of these sermons contain any reference to intercession. Charles may be a glorious martyr in heaven, but he has no power to assist or intercede on behalf of his suffering followers on earth; neither can they call upon his aid in prayer. The speech of Dr Lotius reiterates this; he is obliged to preach resignation and endurance in the slender hope of better times. One can only speculate what the effect of such an uninspiring response to defeat, regicide and exile must have been on the assembled court. All they have is the example of Charles' life and death and his Book to sustain them. Yet within the context of cult literature that example should be more than enough, particularly as the parallel between Charles and Christ is drawn as strongly in the sermons as the elegies.

The sermon as a medium differs from the elegy in the sense that it is essentially public, designed to be preached at a congregation rather than read in private. Granted the printed sermon was read by many who would not have heard it preached, but in form the sermon could reach a larger potential audience than the elegy. Yet despite the difference of form, the boldness with which the Christ-Charles parallel is drawn matches anything found in the elegies. The only difference seems to be that the sermons preached in England seem a little more circumspect, not in
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their content, but in their presentation. Warner hides his sermon under the use of the Passion narrative, whilst Brown's is published anonymously.

In their content, all these sermons are explicit in the parallels they draw between Charles and Christ. Watson, on his title page, juxtaposes the crucifixion of Christ, a king, with an appendix on the death of Charles. He goes on to talk about the contemporary representatives of the original actors in the passion; thus he talks of 'a second Judas', although it is not clear whether he refers here to Cromwell or Fairfax; to 'second Jews', 'a second judge' in Bradshaw, 'second priests' and most importantly 'a second Christ, and anointed of God, that came as near as ever King did to our saviour in his life, and, I dare say, never any so near in the similitude of his death.' Likewise Henry Leslie announces in his title that he intends to preach on the martyrdom of King Charles and his conformity with Christ in his sufferings. Leslie also makes a point of mentioning the reading of the 27th chapter of St. Matthew as Charles was taking Communion on the morning of his death

and that chapter was read not by chance but by the direction of the rubric, it being the lesson appointed for that day, so that we could not but conceive that the murder then to be acted was like unto that which in the chapter is described.

Lotius and Brown, whilst their works are not directly concerned with drawing the parallel, nevertheless reveal in the little they do say the fact that they are fully aware of and approve the parallel. Lotius in his speech refers to Charles as the type of Christian martyr, and in particular Charles' forgiving of his enemies on the scaffold is singled out as an action 'after the example of our Saviour and the proto-martyr S. Stephen.' Brown, although basing his sermon around the Charles-Josiah parallel, nevertheless refers to Charles as going to his death 'with our Saviour, as a lamb unto the slaughter.' Whilst John Gauden pauses for a moment in his diatribe against the regicides to offer the opinion that Charles' death actually surpassed in horror that of Christ's, as Christ never assumed the royal power implicit in his person, whereas Charles was struck down
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whilst invested with 'that eminency of civil dignity and sovereignty wherewith the King from God was invested.'\textsuperscript{198}

Warner's sermon is the most singular of this group in that the contents are a detailed exposition of the Christ-Charles parallel, yet the sermon itself masquerades as being concerned exclusively with the Passion of Christ. As I have already mentioned, Warner uses the device of referring to 'Ch\textsuperscript{i}' whenever he refers to Christ/Charles, leaving some initial doubt as to the particular King he means. Yet a reading of the text in the light of the regicide can leave little doubt that Warner is referring to Charles under the guise of Christ and roundly condemning the regicide and the Republican authorities. We have already seen how he refers to the Pharisees as Independents, and how often he speaks in the present rather than the past tense when referring to the conspiracy against 'Ch\textsuperscript{i} the king'. The whole tenor of Warner's evocation of the Passion strikes one as being closer to Westminster in January 1649 than Jerusalem in 33AD! Thus the repeated emphasis on the treason of the 'Jews' against their anointed king, the identification of the Sanhedrin as 'the court of justice', the use of contemporary political language to ostensibly describe the Passion; as well as the identification of Jewish elders and 'Romish priests' as Samson's foxes repeats the Anglican commonplace of Jesuit-puritan collusion; they are both 'counter-tenors to monarchy'; all these parallels reveal Warner's principle object and targets.

Warner's technique of hiding behind the Passion narrative is both revealed and simultaneously stretched to breaking point when he claims that 'Ch\textsuperscript{i} the king' died principally to safeguard 'our law and liberty; and so is become by his death your martyr, your sacrifice and your saviour.'\textsuperscript{199} The main reason he went to his death was because he would not surrender up the church's inheritance to a conspiracy 'betwixt the devil and the Jew,\textsuperscript{200} he would rather suffer this ignominious death; and for this he deserves to be everlastingly chronicled as the churches nursing father, patron, protector and martyr in that he was killed in defence of the church.\textsuperscript{200} The 'he' Warner here refers to is much more plausibly Charles than Christ! It is unusual, if not unique, to

\textsuperscript{198} Gauden. 1649/1660, p. 34-5. In fairness Gauden does qualify this point by reminding his readers that this applies, 'not as to the dignity of the person, wherein Christ infinitely surpassed the majesty, as well as merit, of all earthly kings.'(p. 34)
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contend that the Passion of Christ defended our liberty and laws. The language also closely resembles other cult writers; Brown refers to Charles as 'our nursing father, our protector', and the whole tenor of the argument is contemporary, particularly when Warner refers to the church as 'his rightful inheritance, committed to his trust by God himself'.

Whether Warner masked his sermon in this way out of fear of the authorities, and whether his audience and readership understood his techniques we will never know. It must be said that for anyone with a knowledge of the trial and execution and any familiarity with the language and imagery of the cult, this sermon is not difficult to decipher. Warner's intentions are fairly transparent! The use of the device 'Chris the king' identifies Charles' trial and death with that of Christ's, the audience and readership is encouraged to see the 'passions' of Charles and Christ in parallel and by implication Charles partakes of the radical innocence and redeeming sacrifice associated with the crucifixion. Likewise the parallel damned the regicides by identifying them with the deicide of the Jews and, like the Jews, makes them outcasts from the company of true believers, a cursed tribe labouring under the judgement of God. In using the Christ-Charles parallel so provocatively Warner and his fellow preachers possessed an image and typology which at one and the same time placed Charles beyond the reach of all criticism and controversy, condemned his opponents as beyond the pale, and encouraged the defeated Royalists by identifying their cause with that of God Himself.

Yet in creating this parallel and establishing an image of a martyr beyond reproach, the apologists of the cult presented themselves with a problem. As time went on, and the immediacy and shock of the execution faded, it became increasingly difficult to sustain this exaggerated image of Charles. Those who had been close to him knew that he had made serious mistakes and errors of judgement throughout his reign. Many remembered the policies of the personal rule and the unease, distrust and opposition such policies generated. As a new generation with no personal experience of the King or the Civil Wars began to examine and question these events so the black and white image of a saintly King and devilish rebels became difficult to sustain. Those who had fought for, or supported, the Parliament were obviously unwilling to accept the blackness of their
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'crimes' and the continued existence of nonconformity after the Restoration and the failure of comprehension meant that there was always a sizeable portion of the nation who rejected the cult of the martyr based exclusively on an Anglican Royalist historiography. In establishing such an exaggerated image as the only orthodox reading of Charles' tragedy the protagonists of the cult ensured that it would be inaccessible to all those who did not share their interpretation of events.

But in those early days of the Republic, Royalists were being offered texts and types to sustain them in their grief and confusion. Images of hope and final victory through the inexorable workings of providence; as well as assurances that, given sincere prayer and repentance, God would not forever turn his back on them. One day the rebels would get their just deserts; as Gauden put it

You cannot but hear the sound of much vengeance coming upon you, to which your own black souls summon you and which your own consciences will the first place silently, but yet severely execute upon you.203

This historiography and typology was so powerful and established itself so quickly after Charles' death partly because it appeared to answer contemporary needs so completely, but also because the component parts were already available before the axe fell. As was discussed in the previous chapter, the cult did not appear out of nowhere in the early months of 1649, but grew out of a set of ideas, beliefs, images and typology which had been articulated and applied to Charles throughout the late 1640s. All that was needed to make the cult complete was a body, Habeas corpus; and this the Army obligingly supplied on the 30th January 1649.

iv. Healing miracles and relics

In his book *Admocbivialedología* published in 1684, John Browne, Surgeon-in-ordinary to Charles II, recounts the experience of the daughter of Sir Richard Atkins during the Republic. She suffered from swellings on her face and neck which were diagnosed as scrofula, or the King's Evil. Her doctor advised her to visit Charles II's exiled court at Breda or Brussels where she could receive the royal Touch. However, as Sir Richard and his daughter were preparing to undertake this journey, he happened to discuss his daughter's condition with Lady Orlando Bridgeman who told him that it was unnecessary to endure the discomfort and expense of a journey to Flanders as

203 Gauden. 1649/1660. p. 32
she had in her possession a cloth or handkerchief stained with the blood of Charles I, and that this relic had already performed many miraculous cures. Lady Bridgeman was happy to lend this cloth to Sir Richard, 'upon which he received the same, and his daughter frequently tapping her lip therewith about a week or ten days, or thereabouts, by God's blessing, and the use thereof, she was presently cured to admiration'.

As we saw in the previous chapter, the royal gift of healing was employed during the Civil Wars in a distinctly propagandist manner, intended to demonstrate the legitimacy of Charles' cause and the divinity which invested his person as King. It was also noted how the ceremony which hedged the Touch in the 1630s collapsed under the pressure of war when the King would perform the Touch virtually on demand and with great informality. Turning to the 1650s we discover the same propagandist use of the healings associated with relics of the dead Charles, such as the one just recounted. They usually concerned blood dried onto cloths and handkerchiefs. These healings served not only to encourage the defeated Royalists, but underlined the claims we have just considered made in a plethora of elegies and sermons, that Charles had been translated to a glorious throne and that his sanctity had been such that even his dried blood possessed the power to heal. As such, every healing claimed for the dead King in the 1650s was an affront to the existence of the Republic, just as the healings performed by the living Charles during the Civil Wars were an affront to all those ranged in arms against him. These posthumous healings offer a unique example of the potential power of the cult and the continuing belief in wonder-working monarchy. Yet the career of Charles the healer was relatively short and I hope to explore some of the reasons why this should be so.

Charles is unique in that he is the only post-Reformation British monarch to be accredited with healing miracles after his death. In every case the vehicle for the healing was a relic which usually consisted of blood dried upon handkerchiefs and pieces of cloth, as it was recorded

204 Browne, J., *Adenochoiradelogia: or, an anatomick-chirurgical treatise of glandules and strumaes, or Kings-evil-swellings.* Bk. 3. 1684. p. 152. Travelling to the continent in search of a cure could also be dangerous; thus one Michael Mason accompanied George Bowres to the court in exile so that Bowres could be Touched for the Evil. On his return, Mason found himself being interrogated by Thurloe as to his motives for contacting Charles II. (Thurloe State Papers. 1742. Vol.2. p. 353).

205 The fact that Browne chose to publish his account of royal healings in 1683 is significant - it was part of the Tory backlash against Exclusion and the accounts must be read with that in mind.
that many witnesses of the execution pushed forward to dip pieces of cloth in the King's blood on and under the scaffold, whether out of devotion or simply to gain a souvenir is not always clear; as Nalson records

His blood was taken up by divers persons for different ends. By some as trophies of their villainy, by others as relics of the martyr; and in some cases hath had the same effect by the blessing of God, which was often found in his sacred touch.\footnote{Nalson, J. \textit{A true copy of the journal of the High Court of Justice, for the tryal of K. Charles I.} 1684, p. 118}

In a contemporary painting of the regicide, here reproduced, people are shown doing just this (See fig. 7). During the Republic, with no King in England to aid sufferers, and given the hazards of seeking out Charles II on the continent, it is hardly surprising that the relics of the martyr King should be seen as cures or charms. Yet these accounts of cures raise many questions; how far was recourse to relics of Charles a statement of Royalist allegiance, and what are the similarities between the use of relics in England and the Roman Catholic use of relics on the continent; and what do the relics tell us about the Anglican view of intercession?

The first question is difficult to answer categorically. On the one hand Browne recounts the case of Roger Turner, whose three year old son was cured of the Evil after being touched by a handkerchief dipped in the dead King's blood. The handkerchief had been lent to Turner by a Major Gouge, 'a commander then in the Parliament army.'\footnote{Browne. 1684. Bk. 3, p. 150} On the other hand the pamphlet recounting the cure of the Maid of Deptford is explicit in its propaganda use of the royal relics; the title page explains that the cure will be 'to the comfort of the King's friends, and astonishment of his enemies.'\footnote{Miracle of miracles: wrought by the blood of King Charles the first, of happy memory upon a mayd at Detford\# 1649, T.p.} The other obvious point is that most of these recorded cures are recounted by John Browne thirty years after the event during the Exclusion crisis, a fact which must always be taken into account.

But it seems that reports of healings associated with relics had five principle functions. Namely, to comfort the King's 'friends', to assert the God-given power of kings, to confirm the legitimacy of the Royalist cause, to condemn and 'astonish' the enemy, and as a vehicle for
7. Collecting relics? People dipping cloths and handkerchiefs in Charles’ blood after his execution. Detail from an anonymous contemporary painting of the regicide.
launching violent verbal attacks upon the Republican regime. To this extent the royal miracle under the Republic performed much the same function as during Charles' lifetime and the occasional references to the enemy either possessing a relic, like Major Gouge, or being cured despite themselves only serves to underline the propaganda value of the touch.

Thus the famous 'Maid of Deptford', or Mary Bayly, was cured of the Evil by being touched with a cloth soaked in Charles' blood, yet the account of the healing is only a pretext to launch a violent pamphlet attack on the Republic and to complain, in the manner reminiscent of the tract of 1642, that with the King gone there is no one to cure the sick or heal the nation

It fared better with such poor distressed souls while the King lived, for he was so gracious that when there were a numberless company of poor distressed people, he would appoint them a time to give them a visit, and be as good as his word; and when his patients come into his presence, he scorned not to touch the poorest creatures sores, and handled their wounds to do them good, while the corruption of their disease ran upon his Princely fingers, and by the virtue of the same they had their perfect cure.

The Maid of Deptford is the subject of two other anonymous tracts from 1649, composed as letters to the exiled Duke of Buckingham. Having recounted the story of Mary Bayly, the writer goes on to conclude that the healing 'proves' that God's hand was upon Charles in a special way, as even his blood has the power to heal, and that such a miracle effectively refutes all the arguments of the rebels. In both these accounts it is noticeable that the writer locates the healing power directly in the person of the King; the author of Miracle of miracles refers to the 'Princely fingers' which healed the sick by the 'virtue' within them; and likewise in the letters to Buckingham the author declares in an elegy

Let Rome no longer boast of Garnet's straw,
Nor Becket's blood, for what I lately saw
Done by a crimson relic of King Charles,
Outshines their feigned miracles and charms,
As much as Phoebus in his pride at noon,
Outshines the twinkling stars, and darkened moon.  

In the second letter, apart from the Maid of Deptford, the author refers to one Elizabeth Man who was also cured of the Evil by the same relic used by the Maid. The author goes on to detail eleven men and women by name who have been cured by relics, as well as nine unnamed persons cured of blindness. All these people 'were cured by Mrs Hunsdon, dwelling in St Martin's church-yard, in the field, with a piece of a handkerchief dipped in his Majesties blood.'  

The author uses these healings to prove that Charles is now a saint in heaven, as miraculous cures by saints whilst alive, and through their relics after death have always been considered the marks of sanctity. This small tract is interesting as being one of the few contemporary accounts to explicitly claim Charles as a saint on account of the miracles associated with him. As such it comes closest to the Roman Catholic doctrine of saintly intercession and healing. To this extent this tract reveals a fundamental paradox of the cult and one which it never successfully overcame; namely how could Charles be both a saint in heaven and effecting miracles on earth through his blood if the doctrine of saintly intercession and the use of relics was, as the Thirty Nine Articles asserted, doctrinally wrong? It is the same question we have encountered in looking at the elegies and the sermons; how could Charles be a wonder-working saint, martyr and intercessor for the Church of England if that church had rejected the theological criteria which underpinned the Catholic cult of saints?

This theology was vigorously repudiated at the Reformation, the whole panoply of medieval folk religion, iconography and the theology which supported it being cut away by the reformers.  

As Margaret Aston has argued, there was a broad official consensus in the Elizabethan church determined to resist any suggestion of idolatry in belief or practice. This rejection of the cult of the saints was enshrined in the Thirty Nine Articles, with their injunctions against imagery and intercession, the two being considered as aspects of the same error. If the
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saints retained any position within the Reformed faith, they were simply distant examples of Christian living and dying and served merely as inspiring models for contemporary Christians, not as personal helpers and intercessors. In practice, the traditional crowd of saints which surrounded the late medieval Christian faded, until he was simply alone with his God.

Yet Protestantism, as was discussed in the Introduction, soon developed a sophisticated and complex martyrology of its own, based upon the contemporary struggle against what they saw as the Popish antichrist. This Protestant martyrology tended to see the martyrs' role as being based exclusively upon this world. Thus the saints became the visible community of true believers, struggling to discover and embody God's will and to live out the faith in a pagan and godless world. Their martyrdom consisted both in the struggle to live according to the truth, and, as the Wars of Religion intensified, increasingly to suffer and die for that truth. But once death had occurred, the martyr lost all power to intercede for the brethren left on earth. Death involved a total and complete separation between the saints still suffering on earth and those reaping their reward in heaven. No one ever invoked the assistance of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley in prayer, and Foxe gives no hint that the martyrs presented in his famous book could intercede on behalf of their colleagues on earth. The saints may find the reward for their constancy in heaven; they may in a general way pray for the peace of this world and the advancement of the true faith; but in no way whatsoever could they help individuals in individual ways.

In looking through the corpus of sermons, elegies, accounts of healing, and commemorative literature concerning Charles produced during the Republic we find him portrayed as victim, defender, exemplar, actor, martyr, hero and loving father; but nowhere is he addressed as intercessor. The only examples which come anywhere near suggesting intercession are the *Second letter sent into France* of 1649, and in a poem of Owen Felltham's, in which he reflects on the significance of the healings associated with relics of Charles.\(^{215}\) It may have been that some preachers did invoke the name of Charles as an intercessor, if so it seems that they dared not risk official censorship by publishing their thoughts. What we are left with, by and large, are the official sermons, preached, after 1660, before the Lords and Commons, the Mayor and Aldermen of London, or in the great cathedrals; before 1660 to the exiled court or London congregations. In

\(^{215}\) Pebworth. 1973, p. 66
other words the official version; a version given sanction by its printing. As such the view of
Charles is consistent with the Protestant tradition of martyrrology. His martyrdom consisting
entirely in his willingness to suffer hardship on earth in obedience to the truth; to die rather than
renounce that truth and from there to act as an example of fortitude and courage and as a sign
that the principles for which he gave his life were true and consistent. The only way the relics of
Charles could be retained within this Protestant view of martyrrology was by virtue of their
association with a pious Prince; the blood of the martyr retained some vestige of his healing power
which was in some way implanted within it. But, unlike the Roman Catholic use of relics, those of
Charles could not provide any link or bridge between the living sufferer on earth and the dead,
though glorified, Charles in heaven. The gulf which separated the living from the dead was fixed
as firmly in relation to relics as it was to persons.

As such the relics were more susceptible to the process noted already, that as time passed
and the immediacy of the events and personalities fades, so does the potency of the relics. For with
the Protestant view of martyrrology there can be no emotional connection between saint and
supplicant. Intercession is a two-way process, it is a relationship of request and answer. The ban on
intercession breaks that process, that relationship, so that the communion of saints, instead of being
seen as a real and tangible asset to the believer, gradually fades into the background and looses its
potency until ultimately they are seen as increasingly irrelevant. To this extent saints are similar to
the pagan gods, who gradually fade away if their names are not invoked. The relics associated with
Charles were more susceptible to this process than other aspects of the cult, in that they entailed a
theology which had been officially rejected by the Church of England and which by the
mid-seventeenth century was alien to a large part of the English nation. In these circumstances the
relics survived either as part of an older folk belief based upon the inherently sacred power of kings
and objects associated with them, or as mere mementos, souvenirs or keepsakes for those who
wished to keep alive the memory of the martyr King.

When presented with the phenomena of the royal Touch we are confronted with an
aspect of history which does not readily submit itself to the demands of historical analysis.
Essentially it is an expression of the sacred power of kings; together with the anointing, the Touch
is a symbol and sign that the king is not as other men, but elevated, sanctified and endowed by
God with the miraculous power of healing. Yet perhaps the most interesting question is not, why did the royal miracle die out in England at the beginning of the eighteenth century, but rather, why did it persist for so long, and why were so many people prepared to believe that relics of Charles I retained the ability to effect miraculous cures? After all, thousands of people were touched by the Stuarts, as Browne remarks, speaking of Charles II:

Hath there been scarce a city, town or country which cannot speak well of his curative faculty? Has there or is there scarce a street in this populous city, that hath not found the benefit of his sacred hand?216

The same could just as easily be said of his father, and Francis Eeles makes the point that, 'if the results had always been negative, the thing could not have gone on.'217 The phrase 'the King's Evil' was employed to diagnose a whole range of illnesses, some of which might have been hysterical in origin. This type of affliction may have responded to the excitement and drama of the healing process; the experience of travelling to London, or wherever the King was staying, the ceremony in the Banqueting House, the sight and touch of the King himself; all this may have had some sort of placebo effect on some sufferers, for if people believe hard enough that a certain ritual or act will heal them, it sometime does, a possibility also noted by John Browne.218 Scrofula is also noted as a periodic illness, it comes and goes of itself; thus a cure may appear to take place which would as ascribed to the royal Touch, if the illness then subsequently reappears it can be explained by the loss of the Angel, or the sins and lack of faith of the patient etc. As with any miraculous healing there is the fact that one apparent cure will cancel out hundreds of failures. For those with nothing to lose, and in a society of primitive medicine this included a high proportion of scrofula sufferers, recourse to the King was employed simply because nothing else was available. As Keith Thomas has observed, the power of the Touch lay 'in the public's disposition to believe in the possibility of such a miracle, a disposition which sprang from a mystical view of kingship and the monarch's place in society.'219 As such views of monarchy persisted so did the royal miracle, and as
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David Smith and J. C. D. Clark remind us, the theory of divine right did not simply disappear overnight in 1649, 1688, or even 1714; it was too much a part of the fabric of patriarchal society to be swept away so quickly.\(^{220}\) On the continent the French kings retained the Touch into the nineteenth century and the Stuarts in exile were assiduous Touchers until the death of Henry IX in 1807. Thus it was a belief in the sacred power of monarchy which produced faith in the royal miracle, and this belief was used during the Civil Wars and Republic when the Touch was employed as proof of the justice and divine endorsement of the Royalist cause. Marc Bloch called this belief in the sacred power of kings a 'collective error',\(^{221}\) an error propagated and often sincerely believed by kings and their ministers seeking to legitimate their rule and enhance their prestige. Certainly Charles believed implicitly that his anointing and the royal miracle expressed 'the divinity which doth hedge a king' and underlined the sacredness and otherness of his person and, as we have seen, he was more than willing to utilise the Touch during the 1640s to uphold his cause. To this extent the Touch was a propagandist device confirming the legitimacy of the Royalist cause and the sin of resistance to the Lord's anointed. Robert Brown in his commemorative sermon preached in the aftermath of the regicide emphasised the importance and significance of anointing in a long digression in which he reminded his audience that Eusebius asserts that anointed kings resemble Christ and that they should reflect the regal power of the King of kings. Anointing was a 'divine signature of supreme power'\(^{222}\) and an outward sign of an inward truth. Here Brown seeks to refute 'the sublimated and metaphysical professors of our time' who attempt 'to throw off all ceremony which is unto religion as the scabbard unto the sword to preserve it from the rust of contempt.'\(^{223}\) In this he reflected the opinion of many Royalists who saw the breakdown of 'due form' in church and state as a symptom of social and political collapse.

John Cosin had remarked that the effects of the abandonment of the liturgy and the growth of ex


\(^{221}\) Bloch, M. The royal touch. P. 243

\(^{222}\) Brown, R. Subject's sorrow. 1649. p. 6

\(^{223}\) ibid p. 10
tempore prayer was to make private individuals 'popes in their congregations', whereas anointing was an outward and visible sign which, 'put God's dominion into the King's hands; that must not be resisted for it is the resisting of God himself.' Likewise healings associated with relics of Charles served as a sign not only to encourage the Royalists in defeat and to confirm the legitimacy of their cause, but also to keep alive his memory and the principles for which he died. Thus John Browne argued that those who refused to believe in the royal miracle did so for political reasons, they were either papists, sectaries or atheists, who, if they should admit the King's miraculous powers in this respect would be obliged to grant the legitimacy of the Royalist cause and the error of their own views.

Yet although the healings associated with relics might be one of the more obvious aspects of the cult, it was also one of the least successful. The Royalists did not claim innumerable miracles on behalf of the dead Charles, and Browne records no healing miracles in connection with the relics after the Restoration, presumably because people now had a living King available and all to willing to perform the Touch. The exponents of the cult felt safer with a textualised Charles who could be accommodated within a Protestant system of martyrology; the identification of Charles as 'Christ the second' was more acceptable in the context of the sermon or elegy than it was when invoked by the people employing pieces of blood stained cloth to effect miraculous cures. This failure of the healing relics to be adopted by the Church of England is in marked contrast to Anglican willingness both to promote the healing power of the monarchy and the Christ-Charles parallels and reveals the extent to which the Church was not prepared to promote the cult at the cost of doctrinal innovation.

v. Alternative views: the exiles, the Presbyterians and the 'loyalists'

So far we have concentrated on the views of those committed to the Royalist cause and the historiography and typology they presented in praise of Charles. To a large extent these reactions are fairly straight forward and present the issues of war, rebellion, resistance and obedience in black and white terms; of good and bad, right and wrong, heroes and villains. But
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there were other, more ambiguous reactions to the regicide; reactions which are no less important
to the development of the cult and its subsequent history after the Restoration. For example, those
of the Presbyterians, outmanoeuvred and purged from Parliament in December 1648 to make way
for the trial and execution; the exiled royal family whose attitude to a dead husband and father
were not as straightforward as one might expect; and those of the group known as the 'loyalists', of
which the most famous was Andrew Marvell, who, whilst writing in praise of Cromwell, produced
one of the most dignified and well known elegies on Charles. All these groups and individuals
demonstrate the questions and uncertainties raised by the regicide and the relationship not only
with the dead Charles but with the new authority raised in his place. Their reactions, omissions
and evasions reveal that the moral and political issues raised by the regicide were not as clear cut
as the eulogists and preachers would have us believe and that these ambiguities would continue to
exist after the Restoration and contribute to the eventual failure of the cult.

Turning briefly to a consideration of these groups in turn, we will begin by looking at the
experience of the political and religious Presbyterians. Throughout the 1640s the tensions and
conflicts between the Presbyterians and Independents both weakened their opposition to the
Royalists and gave encouragement to all those, Charles included, who hoped to exploit the all too
obvious divisions in the Parliamentary camp. That history is not necessarily a part of this thesis,
except in so far as increasing Presbyterian fears of social and religious radicalism encouraged a
rapprochement with Charles and renewed efforts to reach a settlement after 1646.227 The conflict
between the Presbyterians and Independents reached a climax in December 1648 with Pride's
Purge and the expulsion of most of the Presbyterian MPs from the Commons by the Army. From
then on those who could not support the Army were effectively excluded from power and were
unable to stop the Army pushing through the regicide and establishing the Republic. Whilst the
Presbyterian gentry may have taken little part in the agitation against the regicide, the clergy were
anything but passive and the Presbyterian pulpits of London resounded with denunciations of the
Purge and the proceedings against the King; indeed the author of*The bloody court* insists that they
alone tried to help, 'for none else stirred to save the king.'228

228 *The bloody court*. 1649. p. 8
In January 1649, whilst the trial was in progress, the Presbyterian ministers of London presented a petition to Fairfax and the Army Council in which they condemned the Purge and the proceedings against the King. They claimed that the Purge far exceeded the affront offered to Parliament by Charles in his attempt on the five members in 1641 and that in resisting the King on that occasion it was not their intention thereby to do violence to the person of the King, or divest him of his regal authority. Much less was it their purpose to subvert and overthrow the whole frame and fundamental constitution of the government of the kingdom, or to give power and authority to any persons whatsoever so to do.

They urged the Army Council to reflect on the biblical injunctions against resistance and, 'the sad example of Corah, Dathan and Abiram in their mutinous rebellion and levelling design against magistracy and ministry in the persons of Moses and Aaron.' The author of The bloody court goes on to record how on the night before the King's execution the Presbyterian congregations of London met to pray, 'if it were the will of God to pray him out of trouble, however to prepare him for his sufferings, and to carry him through them with the comforts of the Holy Ghost.' Yet the Presbyterian position was becoming increasingly untenable. Whilst on the one hand they denounced the Purge and the trial, on the other they were too conscious of Charles' deficiencies in religion and his reluctance to commit himself wholeheartedly to the establishment of a comprehensive and coercive Presbyterian system to offer him any enthusiastic endorsement. Ultimately their response was essentially negative: they could denounce and condemn the activities of their more radical former associates, yet as the Treaty of Newport demonstrated, they had few...
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positive alternatives to offer, beyond the increasingly futile hope that the king might eventually concede to their demands. Writing after the Restoration, Perrinchief sums up the failure of the Presbyterians in the biographical sketch annexed to the *Works of King Charles the martyr*. In it, he says that their efforts were

fruitless, for they had lost their ministerial authority by serving the faction so long, till they needed not their assistance, and despised their admonitions. Besides, the very same principles they preached to kindle the war were now beat back into their faces, and made use of against them to adjust the murder. The people also condemned them for their short-sightedness, in that they would be the heady and indiscreet instruments of such men, and in such practices as must of necessity at last ruin them and all ministers, as well and the King and Bishops. 33

That the Presbyterians saw the regicide as a disaster and a national sin is evidenced by individuals such as Luke Milbourne's father, also called Luke, who despite supporting the royal cause in the first Civil War, took the Covenant and served as a member of the Kenilworth classis in the 1650s. Despite that, and his ejection in 1662, the Dictionary of National Biography records that he kept the fast of January 30th strictly until his death in 1668. 34 The role of 'Presbyterians' such as Monck and Fairfax in bringing in the Restoration is well known. However, there was always the sense of ambiguity; the hope that the monarchy would throw its weight unreservedly behind godly reform based on the full Presbyterian system. Ultimately this ambiguity was to defeat them. Their more radical opponents on left and right rejected the paradoxes within the Presbyterian position and opting either for the consistency of full-blooded Anglican royalism or the Republics, and in so doing out manoeuvred and defeated them, until English Presbyterianism as a political option disappeared into the restoration Anglican settlement.

Turning to a consideration of the position of the exiled court we meet similar paradoxes, tensions and ambiguities, and evidence that there was already disagreement amongst Royalists and conservatives as to the appropriate interpretation of Charles' reign and the regicide. Montrose was said to have fallen into a dead faint on receiving the news of the regicide; on recovering he swore

234 DNB Vol.13, p. 370
vengeance on the King's executioners and vowed to work for Charles II restoration. Likewise Henrietta Maria received the news of her husband's death in Paris and, like Montrose, fell into a dead faint. The inventory of her goods made after her death includes a boxed portrait of her husband which was kept in her closet and in a letter to Montrose of March 1649 she declared that the death of Charles should arouse all his servants to seek immediate vengeance on his murderers.

It is not the purpose of this study to discuss the response of the exiled court to the Republic or to discuss Royalist policy before the Restoration, except in so far as it gives some indication of attitudes towards the martyr. Yet as soon as the exiles tried to formulate a coherent policy towards the dead King certain fundamental problems arose; the most obvious being the question of religion. Henrietta Maria may have grieved for the husband she had loved, but how could the devout Catholic Queen honour as a martyr a Protestant King? Quentin Bane argues that religion became ever more important to Henrietta Maria in exile and her hostility to Protestantism increased until she banished all Protestants from her court and caused a major family disagreement by trying to convert the Dukes of York and Gloucester. This failure on the part of Henrietta Maria to appreciate the importance of Anglicanism for her Royalist subjects was manifest before the regicide when she urged Charles to concede to the establishment of Presbyterianism and her encouragement of the alliance with Scotland before the battle of Worcester. She consistently failed to understand the doctrinal, liturgical, social and political distinctions between the various churches in England or the extent to which loyalty to Anglicanism was so important an aspect of the Royalist identity. To Henrietta Maria, one Protestant heresy was very much like another. Indeed, she saw the death of Charles and the Civil Wars as the inevitable result of the Reformation, both as a judgement and because loyalty to the 'true faith' and loyalty to the king went hand in hand.

Given this attitude to the Church of England it was impossible for Henrietta Maria to take any lead in establishing the cult. Yet no such obstacle existed for Charles II and yet there is very little evidence that he took an active part in perpetuating the memory of his father nor

---


236 Bane, Q. Henrietta Maria: Queen of the Cavaliers. 1972.
patronised those who sought to propagate the cult. However, there is a tract printed in The Hague in 1650 by Samuel Brown recording the form of prayer used in Charles II's private chapel each Tuesday - the day of his father's death. The prayers and responses request God's blessing and protection upon the King and his followers, their deliverance from affliction and the confusion of their enemies. Charles I is only mentioned to the extent that these prayers were offered each Tuesday, the day of his execution.\textsuperscript{237} The official response in 1650 was to commission Salmasius' defence of patriarchalism against Milton. As we have seen, Salmasius did not say anything that had not been said many times before in numerous other Royalist tracts and as is usual with Charles II, one is left wondering exactly what his own views were. Also, the alliance with Presbyterian Scotland put great strains on any presentation of Charles I as a martyr for the Church of England. Christopher Wordsworth in his exhaustive investigation of the authorship controversy surrounding the \textit{Eikon Basilike} written in the 1820s, suggested that after his restoration Charles wished to distance himself from his father's memory because he shared neither his religion, nor his morality. Indeed, some of the Fast Day sermons preached before Charles II do make much of the chastity and constancy of Charles I in an attempt to awaken these virtues in his son. In public Charles II did nothing to undermine the cult and supported his father's authorship of the \textit{Eikon} against those who questioned this ascription, and he observed the Fast. But he made no attempt to build the mausoleum designed by Wren, was apparently content to leave his father's coffin in an unmarked grave in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and in a letter to the Speaker of the House of Commons in April 1660 on the need for the Fast Day to be established, seemed to cast doubt on whether the nation was indeed guilty of the sin of regicide.\textsuperscript{238} In private, Wordsworth argues, Charles II found the pietism, moralism and injunctions to uphold the Church of England embarrassing and politically awkward; on one occasion Charles, speaking of the Cavaliers, referred to his father as 'their martyr'.\textsuperscript{239}

\textsuperscript{237} \textit{A form of prayer used in King Charles II's chapel at the Hague upon Tuesdays throughout the year: Being the day of the week on which King Charles I was barbarously murthered, Jan. 30. 1648. (1649)}

\textsuperscript{238} Charles I grave was so neglected that by the eighteenth century its whereabouts had been forgotten. It was rediscovered by accident in the 1880s

\textsuperscript{239} Wordsworth, C. p. 214
It may have been that in his concern to heal the animosities of the Civil Wars, Charles saw the cult as unhelpful; after all he was not adverse to using other means to bolster the sacredness of monarchy such as the royal Touch, and presumably did not object to the repeated injunctions in the Fast Day sermons to submission and obedience. Perhaps, like many contemporaries, Charles found the exaggerated eulogies to his father's virtues too inconsistent with his own memories of the hesitations and mistakes of the reign. Perhaps he blamed his father's intransigence for causing the Wars which had resulted in his eleven years of exile and almost deprived him permanently of his throne. It is certainly possible that he resented the way in which the clergy used the occasion of the cult to launch thinly veiled criticisms of his own morality and policies. But whatever the reasons may be, and they are to a large extent lost in the realms of conjecture, one is struck both during the exile and after 1660 by the deafening silence which emanates from the Court in connection with the cult.

The ambiguous attitude towards the memory of the dead Charles of the Court is reflected in the biographies of the martyr which started to appear in the 1650s. Whilst the success of such biographies illustrates the interest and topicality of the issues, the disagreements among the biographers also illustrates that the historiography of Charles was not fixed and even Royalists and conservatives could differ quite violently over the presentation of the martyr. In 1655 Hamon L'Estrange published a Life of King Charles which took the narrative up until the death of Strafford. Thomas Fuller called this book, 'an handsome history likely to prove as acceptable to posterity as it hath done to the present age'.\(^{240}\) L'Estrange, whilst sympathetic to Charles, nevertheless accepted that he was guilty of mistakes and errors of judgement. Such 'moderation' was unacceptable to Peter Heylyn, Laud's former chaplain and biographer, who replied to L'Estrange the following year in his Observation on the history of King Charles. Heylyn's aim was to defend the image of the innocent and saintly Charles constructed by the Royalist eulogists and preachers and to refute any suggestion that he bore any responsibility for the events of the 1640s and his own defeat.\(^{241}\)

\(^{240}\) DNB. Vol.II, p. 995

\(^{241}\) The literary tussle between L'Estrange and Heylyn continued through the 1650s. In 1656 L'Estrange issued a second edition of The life of King Charles and attacked Heylyn in the same year in The observator observed, or animadversions upon the observations on the history of King Charles (1656). Heylyn responded with Observer's rejoinder and Extraneus vapulans, both of 1656.
In 1658, Heylyn entered the lists again, this time against William Sanderson who had published *A complete history of the life and reign of King Charles from his cradle to his grave*, which the *Dictionary of National Biography* dismisses as 'of little original value.'\(^{242}\) Indeed, Sanderson's *Complete history* is rather cobbled together from newspapers, manifestos, speeches and the *Eikon Basilike* and does contain many inconsistencies. But although Heylyn took it upon himself to answer Sanderson, provoking another literary squabble, Sanderson's *Complete history* does reflect most of the themes found in the orthodox presentation of the cult. For example, he is fully aware that the image of the imprisoned and suffering King did a great deal to win over former enemies to the Royalist cause in the two years or so before the regicide; as he put it:

> The pulpit, places of all sects and opinions lamented, [the condition of the King] even the same men in vain bewailing the loss of him whom they strove heretofore, who should first undo, now they extol and compare to Job for patience, to David for piety, to Solomon for prudence. He adulced (as with charms) his enemies to be made his adorers. Reproaches he converted into praises.\(^{243}\)

The Christ/Charles parallel is introduced directly in Sanderson's account of the trial, in such scenes as the mocking of Charles by the soldiery, 'they laying aside all reverence to sovereignty.'\(^{244}\)

And at the news of the execution, 'women miscarried, men fell into melancholy, some with consternations expired; men, women, and children then, and yet unborn, suffering in him and for him.'\(^{245}\) Sanderson goes on to recount the story of the Maid of Deptford and the miraculous healings associated with relics of Charles, before ending his biography by reprinting Charles' letter to the Prince of Wales from the *Eikon Basilike*. Despite this, Heylyn felt that Sanderson's view of Charles was not only inaccurate but not sufficiently hagiographic to go unanswered, and said as much in *Respondet petrus, or the answer of Peter Heylyn, D.D.* The acrimonious debate between Heylyn, Sanderson mirrored that between Heylyn and L'Estrange.\(^{246}\)

---

\(^{242}\) *DNB*. Vol. XVII. p. 757

\(^{243}\) Sanderson, W. *A complete history of the life and reign of King Charles...* 1658. p. 1140

\(^{244}\) Ibid. p. 1132

\(^{245}\) Ibid. p. 1139

\(^{246}\) Sanderson replied to Heylyn in *Post haste, a reply to Dr Peter Heylyn's appendix* (1658), to
Not content with attacking L'Estrange and Sanderson, Heylyn also published in 1658 The stumbling block of disobedience and rebellion and A short view. The first he claimed to have written in the early 1640s but never published; it contains a defence of the royal prerogative against the Parliamentary opposition and belongs more to the debates of 1641 than 1658. The other is of more immediate concern as it is a complete pocket-sized biography of Charles, presenting the Royalist Anglican view of the martyr already constructed in the sermons and the elegies. Heylyn obviously saw himself as the defender of cult orthodoxy against what was felt to be the dangerously heterodox views of L'Estrange and Sanderson, and the physical size of the edition was no doubt intended to make it easily concealed about one's person, so that it could be read discreetly and without attracting the unwelcome attention of the Republican authorities. Yet it is revealing that three authors who all considered themselves Royalists should have disagreed so violently over their presentation of Charles and the circumstances which lead to his death. At the time it was Heylyn's full-blooded Royalist Anglican view of the innocent and saintly martyr which was to dominate as the only officially sanctioned view. Yet the existence of other opinions and interpretations ensured that debate over these points would continue and the disagreements between Heylyn, L'Estrange and Sanderson was only the beginning.

Another response to the regicide was that of the 'loyalists', those who took the logic of the injunction in Romans 13, so beloved of Royalists preacher, that there was no power but of God at face value by arguing that the Republic was a power established and that therefore it existed by the grace of God and was owed the duty and obedience formerly accorded to the Stuarts. As John Wallace has demonstrated, the discussions over the Engagement reveal the soul-searching and uncertainty amongst the 'moderates' as to the honourable way to proceed after the regicide.247

Even Sir Robert Filmer felt constrained to write on the problem of obedience to a usurper; coming to the somewhat tortuous conclusion that de facto power entailed obedience to the extent that such obedience did not damage the interests of the legitimate exiled rulers.248 which Heylyn replied with Exames historicum (1659), which in turn provoked Sanderson to publish Peter pursued (1659).


248 Filmer, R. "Observations upon Aristotles Politiques touching forms of government, together
For many 'loyalists', as much as Royalists and Republicans, the regicide involved a painstaking process to discern the providence of God in the late momentous events. Thus John Hall argued in 1654 for

obedience to be continually due to that person which God in his providence should set over us. A man may be an unlawful intruder into a office whereunto a lawful power doth belong, when yet being possessed he is lawfully to be obeyed.\(^{249}\)

Hall's concern is to maintain an authoritarian monarchy as a bulwark against the ever present threat of anarchy. To achieve that objective he advanced an argument similar to the two bodies theory, namely, that whilst the office of monarch is established by God, there is some flexibility regarding the occupant of the office. Kings and Protectors may come and go; God's providence may raise up and cast down Charles or Oliver, but the important thing is that the office of monarch is permanent, is established as a hedge against lawlessness and the subject is duty bound to offer obedience and submission to whosoever wields the supreme power. As Hall went on to explain in *The true cavalier examined by his principles* of 1656, 'our principle is to respect him that is our higher power as in conscience sake to the ordinance of God, and not out of any fancy sake to his person alone, as the ordinance of man'\(^{250}\)

Edmund Waller was another 'loyalist' who drifted between the Royalist and Republican camps. His dislike of innovation had made him sympathetic to the constitutionalism of the Hyde faction in 1641. *The Dictionary of National Biography* argues that the Waller plot was inspired more by vanity than principle, when in 1643 Waller was flattered by the attentions of the King at Oxford, whence he had gone as a Parliamentary Commissioner. His life was saved on that occasion and his exile revoked than and in 1651 by the influence of Cromwell, to whom he was related by marriage. Eventually in 1655 Cromwell appointed him a Commissioner for Trade. In gratitude Waller published *A panegyrick to my Lord Protector, by a gentleman that loves the peace, union, and prosperity of the English nation*, a poetic version of Hall's treatise on de facto power being instituted of God and

\[\text{with direction for obedience to governours in dangerous and doubtfull times}^{*}, \text{in Sir Robert Filmer: Patriarcha and other writings. Edited by J. P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.}\]

\(^{249}\) Hall, J. *Of government and obedience*. 1654. A3r

\(^{250}\) Hall, J. *The true cavalier examined by his principles*. 1656. A12r-v
therefore demanding submission and obedience from the subject. Waller presented Cromwell as a new Augustus and, 'England now does with like toil oppressed / Her weary head upon your bosom rest.'

Cromwell is presented as the guarantor of peace, order and the maintenance of the social hierarchy, he gives 'hope again that well-born men may shine'. The Protector's rule restrains those who refuse to acknowledge the providence of God, those who

Think themselves injured that they cannot reign,
And own no liberty, but where they may
Without control upon their fellows prey.

One advantage of the 'loyalist' position was the ease with which they could justify accommodating the change of government in 1660. If de facto power was of God and man is subject to His providence, then the fall of the Republic and the return of Charles II was just another example of that providence in action. The divine institution of the supreme power had not changed, only its manifestation. Thus in 1660 we find Waller, having five years earlier written a panegyrick to Cromwell, now publishing one for Charles II. However, not everyone was convinced by the glibness of the 'loyalist' position, and it is evident in the paean of praise for Charles' return that Waller realises that he must attempt some explanation for his earlier loyalty to the Republican regime.

Perhaps the most well known of the 'loyalists' is Andrew Marvell, who also wrote one of the most successful poetic comments on the regicide in his *Horatian ode on Cromwell's return out of Ireland* in 1650. Marvell's concern, like all the 'loyalists', was for continuity in government. For Royalists like Edmund Hyde, continuity meant the return of the Stuarts. For Marvell it was grounded in a belief that the regicide had effectively removed the Stuarts and their claims upon the individual's loyalty. In laying down his life, Charles had absolved his subjects from their allegiance and left them free to serve the newly emergent power symbolised in Cromwell's

---

251 Waller, E. *A panegyrick to my Lord Protector, by a gentleman that loves the peace, union, and prosperity of the English nation*. 1655. p. 7
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254 The 'loyalist' position was to come into its own after 1688 when it became something of an official ideology justifying the deposition of James II.
victorious return from Ireland. Such a view also conformed to the providential view that the regicide was a sign that God had turned against the Stuarts and had raised up new rulers in their place, who now deserved allegiance and service. Certainly exiles such as Hyde feared the effects of this 'loyalist' argument, it was possible that they might have established the de facto legitimacy of the Republic amongst conservatives, particularly when Richard Cromwell successfully succeeded his father in 1658.

Yet the irony remains that Marvell's Ode includes the most famous and, in many ways, most moving elegy on Charles. The irony is compounded when Marvell has Charles manipulated by Cromwell in the same way a director uses an actor. Thus the famous description of Charles as the 'Royal actor' stands in the long renaissance tradition which views the world and man's place in it in terms of actors on a stage. It was a convention used freely by Royalist writers such as Henry Leslie who, in his famous sermon on The martyrdom of King Charles, or his conformity with Christ in his sufferings, moves from a consideration of the Passion to the regicide with the words

I am now to present unto you another sad tragedy, so like unto the former that it may seem but vetus fabula per novosi historiones, the stage only changed, and new actors entered upon it.

Marvell uses the convention in a highly pointed way, Cromwell's 'managing' of Charles' flight from Hampton Court to Carisbrooke reveals Cromwell's mastery of the 'wiser art'. In this Marvell reflects the Royalist writers who asserted that the plot against the king was deeply laid from the beginnings of the Wars, yet Marvell's intent here is not to condemn Cromwell as a Machiavellian schemer, but to praise his insight and genius. However, the Ode is full of such apparent ambiguities, not least in the sympathetic portrait of Charles who

nothing common did or mean
Upon that memorable scene:
But with his keener eye
The axe's edge did try,

A similar fiction of abdication was used in 1688 to explain James II's withdrawing and William's acceptance of the crown.

Leslie, H. The martyrdom of King Charles, or his conformity with Christ in his sufferings. 1649. pp. 11-12
Nor called the gods with vulgar spite
To vindicate his helpless right.
But bowed his comely head
Down, as upon a bed.

The sympathy for Charles extends to a reflection of the Christ/Charles parallel so beloved of the Royalist eulogists. In a more sophisticated way than they, Marvell suggests the Passion by the references to Charles’ dignity and composure, his acceptance both of his fate and his responsibility for that fate, his refusal to call on the gods for help even in defence of his ‘helpless right’. What distinguishes Marvell from the Royalists and puts him firmly in the ‘loyalist’ camp, is the view that in accepting his fate, Charles has tacitly accepted the victory of Cromwell and left his former subjects free to accommodate themselves to the new power raised up by providence. Yet at the same time, whilst the Ode looks forward with expectation to Cromwell’s triumph and the dawn of a new era for England, Marvell also reflects the disquiet of many at the high price which has been exacted.

That disquiet meant that the cult would always be surrounded by controversy, yet in the 1650s that controversy was to some extent muted by the circumstances in which the Royalists found themselves. Defeated, exiled and facing an organised and successful enemy, their priority was to construct images which would reassure and sustain those who kept faith with the Stuarts. There were clear limits as to how far they were prepared to go in this, as the refusal to officially countenance the doctrine of saintly intercession demonstrates. This, I would suggest, robbed the cult of an effective technique for sustaining a popular, emotional connection with the dead Charles. But the exaggerated claims for Charles’ virtues and sanctity and the particular historiography of the Civil Wars must be understood in the context of defeat, and as an understandable response to the trauma of the regicide. In constructing such an image the eulogists, preachers and propagandists were, inadvertently, creating hostages to fortune. Even during the Republic, the attitude of some of the Presbyterians and the royal family suggests a measure of ambiguity towards the officially sanctioned memory of Charles, and a reluctance to endorse the image of the saintly and innocent martyr without reservation.
Ultimately the political theology constructed around the dead Charles existed to further a particular constitutional and social vision. In the 1650s that consisted of preserving the Stuart monarchy in exile, overthrowing the Republic and restoring both the monarchy and the Church of England. It was to be this identification of the theological virtues of Charles with the political ambitions of the Royalists which was to become one of the most vulnerable aspects of the cult. For despite some evidence that a number of Presbyterians honoured the memory of the martyr in the 1650s, they were comprehensively rejected by the eulogists and preachers who ensured that the official version of the cult and the political theology and historiography it represented became the particular property of those who espoused a full-blooded Anglican royalism. Again, given the circumstances of defeat and exile such intransigence may be understandable. It meant, however, that after 1660 the figure of the martyr soon took on a very particular 'party' identity which was potentially disastrous for the reputation of Charles: given that the reaction of the 'loyalists' and even of Royalists like Sanderson and Hamon L'Estrange demonstrates that even amongst conservatives there was no general agreement as to the significance of the regicide, nor the appropriate reaction towards the newly constituted Republic. However, in the short term, the fall of the Republic and the seemingly miraculous restoration of Charles II in May 1660 did indeed seem to the Royalists like a return to Zion after eleven years in the wilderness; a clear sign that providence had at last heard their prayers.
Chapter four. The return to Zion: the cult and the Restored Monarchy

I look upon the 30th day of January to be the most proper day in all the year to preach up loyalty, and to preach down rebellion. (Rolls, S. Loyalty and peace. 1678. p197)

30th January 1663: A solemn fast for the king's murder. And we were forced to keep it more than we would have done, having forgot to take any victuals into the house. (Pepys, S. Diary. Vol.4. 1971, p29)

In January 1662 Nathaniel Hardy, the Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Field, was invited for a second time to preach the Fast Day sermon before the House of Commons under the terms of the statute and royal proclamation of the previous January, establishing the 30th January as a day of fasting and prayer in memory of the regicide. That Hardy should have been chosen to preach the first two sermons to the Commons after the Restoration is revealing in that he had begun his clerical career as a Presbyterian, being appointed the minister of St. Dionis, Backchurch in Fenchurch Street. In 1645, whilst present at Uxbridge during the Parliamentary negotiations with Charles, Hardy had come under the influence of Henry Hammond who persuaded him of the orthodoxy of episcopalianism; Hardy soon afterward declared himself an Anglican. However, given the fluidity of allegiance of those days, he continued as minister at St. Dionis' as well as maintaining contact with his former Presbyterian colleagues; the Dictionary of National Biography records that he attended the meetings of a Presbyterian classis until 1651.¹

Anthony Wood records that Hardy instituted a monthly 'loyal lecture' during the 1650s at which a collection was taken to assist Anglican and Presbyterian clergy who had fallen on hard times. Wood also mentions that Hardy observed the 30th January as a fast day, a fact attested to by Hardy himself, who in his 1662 sermon recalls how, during the Republic at the yearly return, either upon or near the day, I adventured to become a remembrancer. To God of vengeance, to the people of penitence, for that bloody fact, a fact indeed, which though it is not to be mentioned without abhorrenency, yet cannot be forgotten without stupidity.

¹ DNB Vol.8. p1238
I have now lived to see an yearly Fast enjoined upon that doleful day, to be kept throughout all generations; and by your favour had the honour to be one of your servants in that solemn work this last anniversary.2

Although the 30th January Office was only annexed to the _Book of Common Prayer_ in the summer of 1662, as Hardy's testimony reveals, Anglicans and Presbyterians had already been honouring the memory of Charles on that day throughout the 1650s.3 In 1649 Ralph Josselin - by no means an enthusiastic Royalist - confessed to his diary that he was, "much troubled with the black providence of putting the King to death; my tears were not restrained at the passages about his death."4 Within a few weeks of the regicide Thomas Warmstry could write that the event could be turned to good effect by encouraging the devout Royalist to meditate upon the mystery of God's providence and the need for repentance; after all, "there is no poison but have something medicinable in it, which the art of piety may draw forth of it."5 In November 1649 Thomas Fuller called for, "an anniversary of mourning" to mark each 30th January.6 To facilitate such anniversaries, forms of prayer were available, from John Cosin's _A collection of private devotions_ of 1635, to the form used in the exiled Chapel Royal each Tuesday to pray for the safety and restoration of Charles II. Others, based on forms of prayer drawn up for use in the Royalist armies were also available; such as Duppa's _Private forms of prayer, fit for these sad time_, published in 1645; to say nothing of the prayers and meditations available in the _Eikon Basilike_ and _The Princely Pelican_ composed by Charles himself. In 1650, Henry Vaughan published _Silex scintillans : sacred poems and private ejaculations_, a book of poems modelled on those of George Herbert. Whereas Herbert had been able, in his poem 'The British Church', to celebrate the via media of the Church of England, Vaughan's poem of the same name reveals the effects of civil war and regicide.

---

2 Wood, A. _Athenae Oxonienses. An exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the most antient and famous University of Oxford_ 1721. Vol.2. p. 466. Hardy, N. _A loud call to great mourning._ 1662. a2v

3 I have already mentioned the fact that Luke Milbourne Sr, a Presbyterian minister, observed the Fast solemnly each year. As well as noting the remark of William Lloyd and the author of _The secret history of the Calves-Head Club_ regarding the spontaneous observance of the 30th January in the 1650s.

4 Josselin, R. _The diary of Ralph Josselin 1616-1683_. E. Hockliffe, ed. 1908. p. 63

5 Warmstry, T. _A hand kirchife for loyll mourners._ 1649. p. 4

6 Fuller, T. _The just man's funeral._ 1649. p. 528
Ah! He is fled!
And while these here there mists and shadows hatch,
My glorious head
Doth on those hills of myrrh and incense watch!
Haste, haste, my dear!
The soldiers here
Cast in their lots again.
That seamless coat
The Jews touch'd not,
These dare divide and stain.
Get thee wings!
Or if as yet, until these clouds depart,
And the day springs,
Thou think'st it good to tarry where thou art,
Write in thy books
My ravish'd looks,
Slain flocks and pillag'd fleeces,
And hast thee so
As a young Roe
Upon the mounts of spices.
O rosa campi! O lilium convallium! Quomodo nunc facta es pabulum Aprorum?7

In 1652 he published *The Mount of Olives*, a collection of prayers and meditations for use during the day, going and coming from church and on receiving Communion. Of particular relevance to the beleaguered Anglicans were the prayers designed for 'times of persecution and heresy' and 'In troubles occasioned by our enemies.' In the former Vaughan laments that

Thy service, and Thy Sabbaths, Thy own sacred institutions and the pledges of Thy love, are denied unto us: Thy ministers are trodden down, and the basest of the people are set up in Thy holy place.

Whilst in the later prayer he points to his own experience of war when he says

Thou seest, O God, how furious and implacable mine enemies are: they have not only
robbed me of that portion and provision which Thou hast graciously given me, but they
have also washed their hands in the blood of my friends, my dearest and nearest
relatives.\(^8\)

Three years later Vaughan published *The golden grove*, a manual of prayer containing a catechism, daily prayers, hymns and rules for a Christian life. He notes that it is particularly useful at a time when 'the people are fallen under the harrows and saws of impertinent and ignorant preachers, who think all religion is a sermon and all sermons ought to be libels against truth and old
governors,'\(^9\) During 1659 John Huit or Hewitt, published *Prayers of intercession for their use who mourn in secret, for the publick calamities of the nation. With an anniversary prayer for the 30th of January. Very necessary and useful in private families as well as in congregation*, whilst in the same year, John Gauden published *Ecclesiae Anglicanae suspina, or the tears, sighs, complaints and prayers of the Church of England*. This is a
lengthy treatise, defending the Church of England and restating the traditional justifications for Anglican orders and the liturgy. Whilst these devotional manuals and works of apologetic may be entirely representative of contemporary Anglican devotional and theological practise, they are distinguished by the cutting edge of defeat and exile occasioned by the Civil Wars and regicide. To the usual prayers of thanksgiving, reflection and penitence are added the imperatives of impending martyrdom; the need for courage and constancy in adversity, the need to remember the injuries their enemies had inflicted, and the conviction that such injuries called forth both earthly and divine vengeance. All these were to be features of the 30th January Office.\(^10\)

It is difficult to assess the extent to which Royalists had to hide their grief over Charles' death and observe their mourning rituals in secret. We have seen how Sancroft spoke of Anglicans forced to live an underground existence, whilst Hewitt refers to both those who 'mourn in secret' whilst at the same time recommending his prayer for the use of congregations! Preaching in 1665,

---


\(^9\) Vaughan, H. *The golden grove*. 1655, aSr.

\(^10\) Perhaps one of the most famous examples of the maintenance of Anglican publishing during the Republic was John Pearson's *An exposition of the Creed*. 1659. It went through twelve editions before 1741.
Henry King remembered a time during the Republic when it was dangerous to appear in public in mourning dress on the 30th January, indeed, he recalls some who were "assaulted merely for their habit and hardly escaping with their lives."\(^{11}\)

Yet this is remembering with the benefit of hindsight, and it may be that Royalists after the Restoration tended to exaggerate the dangers and disabilities they faced under the Republic. That the observance of the Fast need not have been quite such a hole-in-the-corner affair is evidenced by Hardy's public observance on the day and his monthly 'loyal lecture', also the fact the John Evelyn could usually find the Anglican liturgy being celebrated somewhere in London during the Republic. Although the explicit documentary evidence is meagre, it is to be presumed that some form of ad hoc Office and prayers were offered by Royalist and Presbyterian clergy throughout the 1650s, whether in parish churches or, more likely, in the private chapels of the Royalist gentry such as Robert Shirley at Staunton Harold, Leicestershire. Yet even as late as January 1660, with General Monck marching south from Scotland, many people were still hedging their bets, not wishing to declare any fixed allegiance which might soon prove a liability. Anthony Wood records that in Oxford it was difficult to get anyone to preach on the 30th that year, until one John Dod of Christ Church was propelled into the pulpit. (he was recalled the following year to preach again, presumably without so much difficulty). Whilst Pepys put himself in mind of 'the fatal day' by singing in bed a version of a poem by Montrose!\(^{12}\)

Notwithstanding Pepys, by the autumn of 1660 the Cavalier Parliament was ready to turn its attention to the punishment of the regicides and the establishment of the Fast Day on a secure foundation. Consequently in November and December 1660 the Commons debated a Bill for the Attainder of the Regicides which passed into law at the beginning of January 1661; attached to this Act were instructions to keep the 30th January as a Fast Day in perpetuity.\(^{13}\)

\(^{11}\) King, H. *A sermon preached the 30th of January at White Hall. 1664. Being the anniversary commemoration of K. Charls the I, martyr'd on that day*. 1665. p. 16


However, the Act only established the day, it did not prescribe any set form of service. That was published on the 7th January, together with a royal warrant authorising the use of the attached liturgy and issued by the King in council under the terms of the royal supremacy. This royal warrant was to be read in all churches and chapels on the Sunday preceding the 30th and Pepys duly records that the parson did his duty. On the 30th he also noted

the first time that this day hath been yet observed. And Mr Mills made a most excellent sermon upon 'Lord, forgive us our former iniquities.' Speaking excellently of the justice of God in punishing man for the sins of his ancestors.

John Evelyn similarly records the first official observance of the Fast, but adds a reference to further events of that day which were consistent with the juxtaposing of the honouring of the martyr with vengeance against the regicides contained in the Act of Attainder. For Evelyn goes on to record that on the same day the bodies of Cromwell, Bradshaw and Ireton were exhumed from their fine tombs in Westminster Abbey and exhibited on a gibbet at Tyburn between 9.00am and 6.00pm, before being cut down and buried beneath the gallows. Evelyn makes the point that this event contrasts sharply with the pomp and splendour of Cromwell's state funeral just over two years previously, and allows him to draw suitable conclusions about the workings of God's providence, "Look back at November 22, 1658, [Cromwell's funeral] and be astonished! And fear God and honour the King; but meddle not with them who are given to change."

The liturgy for the first official Fast Day in 1661 has been traditionally ascribed to Brian Duppa, and was significantly longer than that subsequently annexed to the Prayer Book, including as it did, aspects of the Daily Office; in the course of 1661 Sancroft was commissioned to revise the Office. G. J. Cuming argued that Duppa's service was revised because it was 'in too high a strain to be acceptable', yet one suspects that the main objection was its length. Theologically Duppa's

---


15 All except the head of Cromwell, which was stuck on a pole on Tower Hill before being removed by an admirer. It eventually made its way to Sidney Susses College, Cambridge, where it is interned in the chapel.

16 Evelyn: Diary. Vol.3, p. 269. The quote is Proverbs 24:21, and was destined to become a favourite text for preachers on the 30th January.

liturgy differed hardly at all from that finally annexed to the Prayer Book. The principal change was that aspects of Duppa's office which would have been suitable for private use, such as the general confession, the Te Deum, and the Benedictus were omitted and the number of readings and psalms reduced. This was not done out of theological objection, but to make the office less unwieldy and more suitable for public use on a weekday. Sancroft's revised Office was used in January 1662, having been issued under the royal warrant earlier in the month, and Pepys again records that Mr Mills preached to his satisfaction "upon David's words, 'who can lay his hand upon the Lord's anointed and be guiltless'. Although Ralph Josselin noted rather grumpily that when he delivered his sermon there were, "not above seventy persons or thereabouts hearing, surely not an hundred."

However, the liturgy was to be examined again before its final inclusion in the Prayer Book, for on May 18th 1661 the newly constituted Convocation established a Joint Commission to review the State Prayers as part of the systematic revisions of the Prayer Book. Using Sancroft's revisions of Duppa's original as a blueprint, the Convocation worked on the Office throughout the summer of 1661, and it was this version which was then annexed to the new *Book of Common Prayer* under the Act of Uniformity and a royal warrant of the 2nd May 1662, and which the clergy were obliged to accept by the following St Bartholomew's day. With the annexing of the Office of the 30th January to the Prayer Book the construction of the framework within which the cult exists comes to an end. That framework had already been developed over the past decade or so; beginning with the presentation of Charles as a suffering and innocent King in the two years.

---

19 Following the use of the daily office, the 1661 order also provided for 'The Latter service', as well as Evensong. Presumably to be used after Evensong like Compline, this 'Latter Service' was taken as a model by the Joint Commission of Convocation in its revision of the office in the summer of 1661.
22 Unlike the Offices annexed for use on the 29th May and the 5th November, that for the 30th January provided material for use at Evensong and if the Office were used in the context of Holy Communion. In 1685, on the accession of James II, further changes were required. Charles II's accession had been the 30th January and it was inappropriate to celebrate the accession on the Fast Day - in practice this was moved to the 29th May. But in 1685, James succeeded on the 6th February and the following 23rd December a form of prayer was issued for use on his subsequent accession days. At the same time the Fast Day liturgy was revised and reissued. See: F. Streatfield. *The State Prayers and other variations in the Book of Common Prayer*. 1950, p. 33.
before the regicide. The appearance of the *Eikon Basilike* consolidated this image in the months after the king's death and the elegies and sermons of the 1650s elaborated a political theology around that image. In that sense the Office for the 30th January added nothing new; but what it did do was provide an officially sanctioned public arena wherein the received political theology could be expanded and re-presented. In providing for the preaching of a sermon the Office established what was to become the principal expression of the cult for the next one hundred and fifty years.

Having looked at the events surrounding the establishment of the Office, it is now time to consider briefly not only the nature of the Fast day itself, but the theology which underpinned the Restoration cult.

In many ways a consideration of the Fast Day is an aspect of this study which is alien to the modern world; few modern, western political leaders would seriously suggest that a day of national fasting to discern the will of God should accompany the creation of policy. Yet in early modern England the fast was an indispensable part of the public political process, employed equally by Anglicans, Independents, Covenanters and Presbyterians. Individual fasting as an aid to prayer and meditation has always been a feature of Christian spirituality, indeed, it is by no means confined to Christianity, but found in most religious traditions. But the public fast differs from the individual fast in that it usually seeks to discern the will of God in relation to a specific event or policy and is usually linked very clearly with notions of God's specific providence. The point being to discover the nature of divine providence so that the community can co-operate with it. As Winthrop Hudson has pointed out, essentially the fast day was a call to action in acknowledging the direct intervention of divine providence and co-operating with it; the introspective self-criticism usually associated with public fasts was intended as a means to this end, not an end in itself. God's favour was conditional and, like the Old Testament Israelites, the nation was obliged to acknowledge its faults and actively strive to discover God's will and put itself in the way of that will.23

Hudson argues that the first overtly political use of the fast day in England as a national event occurred in 1580 as a means of mobilising the nation to counter the threat from Spain.

---

Before then the fast day had been local in origin, held in response to local threats and disasters such as harvest failure, plague etc. Although an Act of 1552, *For the keeping Holidays and Fast Days*, established a calendar of holy days to be observed as either feast or fasts 'wherein the Christians should cease from all other kind of labours, and should apply themselves only and wholly unto holy works, properly pertaining unto true religion.' And in the same year the first Protestant manual on the art of the public fast was published by one Thomas Becon, who stated that the fast was to last one day, during which normal work ceased in favour or regular attendance at church; the pleasures of society and table were to be avoided and ones dress was to be restrained. In other words, the public fast was arranged to reduce the normal level of distractions and encourage introspection and reflection, just like the individual fast, yet here it is a communal act and engaged in with one's neighbours.

Becon's manual was joined by another in 1580, the same year as Parliament authorised the first national fast day, entitled *A very godly and learned treatise, of the exercise of fastynge*. The first edition, bearing the name John Daye, was quickly withdrawn for overplaying the sins of Queen and Council! The second edition, suitably toned down, bore the names of John Harison and Thomas Man. It was not until 1624 that Parliament dared recommend another national fast, although in 1604 Nicholas Bownde had published *The holy exercise of fasting. Described largely and plainly out of the word of God*, in which he particularly emphasised the centrality of preaching to a 'successful' fast day; preaching designed not only to awaken the consciousness of sin in the people, but also to prepare then for repentance and assure them of God's mercy. These were all features present in the fast day sermons preached on the 30th January after 1660.

Despite the lack of public fast days before 1624, Parliament took to beginning its sittings with a fast day to implore the guidance of God in their deliberations. From early in 1641, as the country slid ever further into crisis, Parliament ordered a monthly fast day to atone for those sins which had brought the calamity upon them, and the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion the following

---

26 See: Hudson. 1971, p. 9. The confusion over who was responsible for this tract is evident in Pollard and Redgrave as they list it simply under 'Treatise'!
year resulted in another rash of public fasts. The predilection of Cromwell and the Army officers for holding fast days and prayer meetings as an indispensable part of their policy discussions is well known. What is not so well known is that the Royalists did likewise. Charles countered the Parliamentary fast days with ones of his own, partly, no doubt, because many believed that the fast was an essential means of discovering God's purpose; but also because the fast day sermons offered an excellent propaganda opportunity, particularly when they could afterwards be printed and sold.

What distinguished the fast for the 30th January was that it was the first time a fast day was designed as an annual event, despite the Edwardian injunction that fast days were not designed to honour 'any saint or creature, but only unto God and his true worship', it commemorated a particular individual. Before 1649, fast days were related to specific events, when the event was past the fast day was not repeated. For example, one might announce a fast day before an important battle to prepare one's forces psychologically for the coming engagement; once the battle was joined the fast day had fulfilled its purpose. One might institute a Thanksgiving if one was victorious and presumably if one lost one had other things on one's mind; but the fast day itself was quite pragmatic in its purpose. However, the 30th January was designed as a yearly commemoration of an event so shocking that it blighted the people of England in the sight of God. In this respect the 30th January conformed to the early pragmatic fast days with the need to atone for those sins which disabled the community from perceiving the will of God, although the Church of England also taught that the fast day was necessary to avoid a future which was all too certain if the people did not repent of the sin of regicide.

Another feature of the fast day was its Old Testament character; the emphasis was very definitely upon sin, atonement, providence, bloodguilt and the wrath of God. The office for the 30th January emphasised the sin of God's rebellious people and the need for a genuine repentance which alone could turn away that wrath. God may be merciful, but the image presented is of a wrathful judge, a "mighty God, terrible in thy judgements, and wonderful in thy doings towards the children of men." The dominant theme of the Office was that of providence, the conviction that God not only took a personal interest in the form of government established in England, but

28 From the first Collect of the post-1685 Office
also directly intervened to direct the course of national politics as well as the lives of individuals; convictions which were repeated many times in fast day sermons. Not that views of providence were confined exclusively to the 30th January Office; as John Spurr has demonstrated, belief in providence underpinned the moral theology of the Restoration Church of England. This was, to a large extent, inherited from the 1650s, when the mysteries of God's providence seemed the only adequate explanation Anglicans and Royalists could offer to account for the catastrophe which had overtaken them, whilst at the same time preserving the innocence of Charles' reputation.

The reliance on providence appeared to be vindicated in 1660 when Charles II was restored without a shot being fired, and many of the thanksgiving sermons of 1660 and 1661 contain long meditations upon the inscrutable nature of the divine providence and the seemingly miraculous restoration which had come about because God had been satisfied with the repentance of his people. However, being God's people, whilst conferring definite benefits, also entailed responsibility. As part of the covenant, the people were obliged to observe God's laws in their government and conduct, if this were done then the nation would prosper. But, like the Israelites, the English rebelled against God and his anointed and brought down the inevitable catastrophe upon themselves as a result of that rebellion which, when the people awakened to their predicament, led them to repentance and to supplicate God for forgiveness. A forgiveness which would be forthcoming once the effects and repercussions of the rebellion had played themselves out. This, then, was the background to the Office, rooted in an Old Testament theology of law, covenant, rebellion and repentance.

Yet the Office fulfilled a further function; that of forestalling such a rebellion in the future. As the preamble to the Office made clear, repentance was necessary to expiate the guilt of regicide, of rebellion which had occurred in the past, but also to ensure that the sins of pride and disobedience which had caused the regicide may not recur and that God may not be provoked

---


30 For example, see, Sheldon, G. David's deliverance and thanksgiving. A sermon preached before the king at Whitehall upon June 28th, 1660. (1660). Morley, G. A sermon preached at the magnificent coronation of Charles the second. (1661) Gregory, F. David's return from his banishment. Set forth in a thanksgiving sermon of the returne of his sacred Majesty, Charles the second. (1660)
again "to deliver up both us and our King into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men." Thus there is penitence for past mistakes, but also a warning for the future. A warning the clergy were not slow to turn to political account by glossing the sins of pride and disobedience to mean both criticism of the royal government, the Church of England and the continued existence of a fifth column of dissenter and papists within the realm.

Turning more specifically to the Office itself, we see four principal themes in all versions of the Office used between 1660 and 1685. Firstly there was the juxtaposition of God's law and human rebellion; secondly the affirmation of the divine right of kings and all lawful authority; thirdly the reality of judgement and vengeance inevitably provoked by disobedience and regicide, both of God against England and of those who kept faith against the 'cruel and unreasonable men' who fomented the rebellion and profited by it. Finally, and perhaps most significantly given its importance in radical Protestant circles during the late 1640s, the extirpation of blood guilt and the dire consequences which befalls a people which sheds innocent blood.

Taking these themes in order; we have already discussed the significance of the Old Testament theology of law, transgression and judgement. Yet the Office is redolent with biblical assertions of God's justice and the people's rebellion, both in the Sentences, the Collects and the Litany. This emphasis on Old Testament justice may have been partly inspired by the image of rebellious Jews so favoured by Royalist eulogists and preachers in the 1650s. As such it points towards the identification of the Jews with the faction blamed for the regicide and onto the identification of the regicide with the Passion of Christ - but more of that later!

On a more pragmatic level the Office reasserted the theory of divine right, although given the circumstances this was done in a less strident manner than one might have expected. But the message of legitimacy is made very clear by appointing as the lesson David's execution of the Amalekite for the murder of Saul (2 Samuel 1) and, when the Office was used in conjunction with Holy Communion, the oft-quoted injunction from 1 Peter 2, to be submissive to the powers that be. Also, the prayer for the royal family emphasised the natural right of Charles II who was restored by providence together with "our ancient government in Church and State." When taken in conjunction with the State Prayers for the 29th May, the Office implied quite definitely that this
'ancient government' was not only the sole legitimate authority in England but that most favoured by God and thus restored after the hiatus of rebellion and regicide.

The theme of vengeance pervades the Office, both in terms of those who encompassed the death of Charles and the language used to describe them. They are blood thirsty sinners, murders, cruel and bloody men, and they are seen as blindly seeking the death of an innocent Charles. Although no specific reference is made to the fate of the regicides, by employing such language in reference to them the compilers of the Office were in no doubt as to their intended fate, whether judged under the Common Law or the law of God. Indeed, the inevitable fate of a regicide was portrayed obliquely in the first reading appointed where David has the Amalekite executed for killing Saul

And David said unto him, 'Thy blood be upon thy head; for thy mouth hath testified against thee, saying, I have slain the Lord's anointed.'

What the Amalekite had done in killing Saul was bad enough, what the English regicides did was infinitely worse for they not only spilt royal blood, but innocent royal blood; and the extirpation of that bloodguilt stands at the centre of the theology of the Office.

Patricia Crawford has rightly drawn attention to the importance of blood guilt in hardening attitudes towards Charles in the Army in 1648; what she does not mention is that it was to assume similar importance for the Royalists after the regicide. The preamble to the Office immediately sets the scene by hoping that the guilt "of that sacred and innocent blood" may not bring fresh disasters upon England. The Sentences reinforce the notion, most notably in the quote from Deuteronomy 21:8

Be merciful, O Lord, unto thy people, whom thou hast redeemed: and lay not innocent blood to our charge.

And Psalm 51:4

Deliver us from bloodguiltiness.

Both verses in the Sentences given to the people rather than the priest to say, emphasising that it is the community which must atone and not just a few named regicides.

31 2 Samuel 1:16
In the months after his father's death, Charles II had, understandably, been loud in his condemnation of the regicides. In a declaration issued from Jersey in 1649 he pledged himself to avenge his father's 'innocent blood, which was so barbarously spilt and which calls so loud to heaven for vengeance.'\(^{33}\) Ten years later the line has softened somewhat; in the Declaration of Breda Charles merely asks

If there be a crying sin for which the nation may be involved in the infamy that attends it;

we cannot doubt but that you [the Parliament] will be as solicitous to redeem it and vindicate the nation from the guilt and infamy, as we can be.\(^{34}\)

The 'if' is significant, as it was the means of accommodating to the restored regime all those former servants of the Republic who were not directly implicated in the regicide and who were willing to make such an accommodation. The compilers of the Office, however, were made of sterner stuff, and, like their Royalist colleagues in the Cavalier Parliament, were not so concerned to provide an escape clause for former Republicans. Consequently the Office is uncompromising in its assertions of bloodguilt and the need for repentance. Here we see why it was so important for the Royalist preachers and eulogists of the 1650s to establish beyond all doubt Charles' radical innocence; only blood which was truly innocent in its shedding could warrant the vengeance of God. It is also one of the principal points of divergence between Royalist Anglicans and the Presbyterians, for the latter could never quite bring themselves to forgive Charles his attachment to episcopacy, nor could they declare him to be radically innocent. For the Royalists the prominence given to blood guilt may be in part a reaction to the identification of Charles as 'that man of blood' by the Army in 1648; a charge which not only galvanised the Army into trying and killing the King, but which must have profoundly shocked all who called themselves Royalist. The King's murder they might have been able to understand politically, if not excuse; after all, kings had been murdered before. But to first affix the mark of Cain to Charles as the cursed of God and driven out from the bounds of godly society must have seemed almost insupportable. Hence the insistence throughout the Office on Charles' innocence and the subsequent infamy which must attend the shedding of his blood. We have already mentioned the Sentences, and the theme is taken up again in the Collects

\(^{33}\) His Majesties declaration to all his loving subjects\(^{1}\) 1649, p. 2.

\(^{34}\) Charles II. "The Declaration of Breda". In Gardiner, S. R. Constitutional documents of the Puritan revolution. 1966. p. 465
where repeatedly God is implored that "this our land may be freed from the vengeance of his righteous blood" and that when God should "makest inquisition for blood, lay not the guilt of this innocent blood, (the shedding whereof nothing but the blood of thy Son can expiate) lay it not to the charge of the people of this land."

Vengeance, bloodguilt and the curse of God also lead to the identification of Charles' death with the Passion of Christ. As blood guilt and vengeance are rooted in Old Testament theology, so is the identification not with the atoning action of Christ's death, but with the curse which the Jews brought upon themselves by their rebellion. Using carefully selected verses, which are traditionally glossed as prophesying the Passion, the compilers of the Office identified Charles as an innocent victim, the elect of God, who was murdered by sinners and bloodthirsty men

For the sins of the people, and the iniquities of the priests: they shed the blood of the just in the midst of Jerusalem,

and

How is he numbered with the children of God: and his lot is among the saints.\(^{35}\)

Themes taken up in the Collects which speak of Charles as being endued "with an eminent measure of exemplary patience, meekness, and charity, before the face of his cruel enemies."

Perhaps the parallel is drawn most explicitly by appointing the 27th chapter of St Matthew as the gospel reading. This has a double significance, first because it was the reading which Juxon used with Charles on the morning of his execution as they took Communion, the fact that if happened to be the gospel appointed for that day greatly impressing the King. Secondly, Charles' father had written a small manual on the cares and pains of kingship based on this passage which Charles had taken to heart.\(^{36}\)

But as well as the readings there is the famous and oft-quoted Collect, which draws the parallel between Charles and Christ

Blessed Lord, in whose sight the death of thy saints is precious; we magnify thy Name for thine abundant grace bestowed upon our martyred sovereign; by which he was enabled so cheerfully to follow the steps of his blessed Master and Saviour, in a constant,

\(^{35}\) Lamentations 4:13 and Wisdom 5:5, used in the Sentences.

meek suffering of all barbarous indignities, and at last resisting unto blood; and even then, according to the same pattern, praying for his murderers. Let his memory, O Lord, be ever blessed among us; that we may follow the example of his courage and constancy, his meekness and patience, and great charity. And grant, that this our land may be freed from the vengeance of his righteous blood, and thy mercy glorified in the forgiveness of our sins: and all for Jesus Christ his sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.

This Collect appeared in all the forms of the Office, from Duppa's to James II's revision of 1685. Whilst in many ways it was not as explicit as the Christ-Charles parallels drawn by eulogists and preachers in the 1650s, nevertheless it endorsed such a parallel by presenting Charles as walking in 'the steps of his blessed Master and Saviour' and living his life and going to his death 'according to the same pattern.' The Collect, and the studious ambiguity of many of the scripture verses used in the Sentences, opened the way to the parallel being drawn in all its full-blooded splendour by the Restoration clergy.

But however much Charles may parallel Christ, no one suggested that his death involved any of the universal atoning attributes of the Passion. Also absent from the Office is any hint of Charles interceding for England, the Church or the individual. Although at his trial Charles claimed to speak for the people of England and thus, in some way, acted as their intercessor, the Office resolutely talks of maintaining the memory of Charles and of seeing him as an example to be followed rather than as an intercessor. As we have seen in discussing the sermons and elegies in the last chapter, generally speaking Royalist Anglicans were uncomfortable with the doctrine of saintly intercession which had been so roundly condemned at the Reformation. What we are here presented with instead is the Protestant doctrine of sanctification.

However, there was a Collect put forward for consideration by Convocation which does envisage the Church of England receiving benefits from the prayers of the glorified Charles, and is worth quoting in full.

We beseech thee to give us all grace to remember and provide for our latter end, by a careful studious imitation of this they blessed saint and martyr, and all other thy saints and martyrs that have gone before us, that we may be made worthy to receive benefits by
their prayers, which they in communion with thy Church catholic offer up unto thee for that part of it here militant and yet in fight with and danger from the flesh.37

What is significant in this Collect, apart from the fact that Charles is given the title 'saint' as well as 'martyr', is its explicit invocation of the Communion of Saints and the assertion that we may 'receive benefits by their prayers.' Whilst this is not the full Roman Catholic doctrine of saintly intercession - there is no hint of the suppliant saying 'Carolus, ora pro nobis' - nevertheless it comes as close as a Protestant theology would allow to that position. What is also significant is that Convocation decided not to include this Collect in the published Office, perhaps it was too explicit!

But whilst conforming to the theological and political tradition of the Church of England, the long term significance of the Office - together with those for the 29th May and the 5th November - lay in the fact that they provided a platform from which the clergy might draw forth the themes and typologies contained within the liturgy and present each year a studied exposition of the political theology underpinning the cult. This was an opportunity many clergymen eagerly embraced.38

The sermons preached in honour of Charles during the 1650s have been considered in some detail in the previous chapter and it is not my intention to cover that ground again. However, the single most obvious expression of the cult for at least 150 years after the Restoration was the Fast Day sermon, and this work would be incomplete if they were not considered. Yet for all their ubiquity, at first glance the Fast Day sermons of the Restoration church appear to be remarkably similar, both to each other and to the sermons of the 1650s. The same texts, the same political theology, the same parallels and typologies; so that one initially wonders whether they have much to tell us. But on closer examination the Fast Day sermons after 1660 are different from their Republican predecessors. One important development is the change in sermon style between the 1660s and the 1680s, away from the rhetorical and epideictic towards a much 'plainer' style. Of course such changes affected the whole genre, but it had serious repercussions for the cult given that so much of the typology and political theology was dependent upon epideictic techniques.

37 Cardwell, E. A history of conferences and other proceedings connected with the revision of Book of Common Prayer; from the year 1558 to the year 1690. 1840. p. 388
38 The only modern consideration of the other State Prayers I have found is on the Office for the 29th May, Sharp, R. "The King's Restauration", in Faith and Worship. 1996. No. 40.
designed to evoke an emotional response to the martyr rather than an objective discussion of the issues raised.\(^{39}\)

On a more fundamental level, post-Restoration sermons were preached in very different circumstances from those of the 1650s. For example, the sermons of Leslie, Warner and Watson were preached to a defeated and exiled party, and their concern was to sustain the Royalists in their loss and to construct a distinctive vision of the Anglican martyr. After 1660 that was no longer necessary, instead the sermon becomes an opportunity to defend the restored order in church and state. Of necessity this makes the sermons and the cult deeply conservative, for very few preachers could envisage a situation where the cult did not support wholeheartedly the Restoration status quo; circumstances which not only limited the appeal of the cult to those satisfied by that status quo, but also made the cult vulnerable to change.

But in the early 1660s no one could foresee the changes which were to happen in 1688 and 1714; the Stuarts had been restored to the obvious relief of the majority of the population. By 1662, the Church of England had also been restored to much of its pre-war prominence; the dissenters excluded from political life and apparently marginalised. Under these circumstances the clergy saw little need to modify or moderate the image of the martyr created in the previous decade. On the contrary the fact of the Restoration seemed to confirm God's favour and justify their political theology. Taking a leaf out of their puritan adversaries' book they argued that the success of the Restoration was a sure sign of God's favour. Their duty now was to defend the establishment by example and instruction. Thus Thomas Arnway's *The tablet*, written, according to the preface, in exile in 1650 but not published until 1661, presents the familiar juxtaposition of good and evil, light and darkness. In Arnway's view, Charles went to war in 1642 to protect religion against heresy, monarchy against anarchy, plenty against scarcity, the church against sacrilege, convenient habitation against desolation\(^ {40}\)


\(^{40}\) Arnway, T. *The tablet, or moderation of Charles the first martyr*. With an alarum to the subjects of England. 1661 p. 19
Likewise the Christ-Charles parallel reappears without any apology. In an anonymous tract of 1660, Charles is described as 'that fleshly angel' who was 'wreathed with thorns, to the imitation of his Saviour;' he was 'holy as Christ was holy;' and the Eikon Basilike is 'inferior to none but scriptures themselves.'

This tract repeated many of the themes found in another anonymous publication which appeared immediately prior to the Restoration called Scutum regale, a 396 page denunciation of rebellion and regicide, complete with elegies for Charles and a legal commentary, in which the familiar parallel between the Jews' treatment of Christ and the rebels' treatment of Charles reappeared. In 1662, John Winter, preaching at East Dereham in Norfolk, could recommend the Eikon Basilike as a mirror in which to see Charles' virtues and constancy; the whole presented "in all so even a temper that never any came nearer him, who at his cross did say, 'Father forgive them, they know not what they do.'" Yet the rebel, consumed by passion, aims at Christ through the king, for "he [the rebel] cannot smite the anointed Lord of life, and therefore strikes at the life of the Lord's anointed."4 3

This was fairly muted in comparison to the sermon preached in Salisbury Cathedral in January 1670 by Thomas Lambert. Lambert is quite open in stating that he intends to draw "a parallel betwixt the Jews murder of Christ, and the English murder of King Charles the First." Lambert parallels Charles with Christ in their birthright, their anointing, their innocence, their patient acceptance of death and the similarity of their 'cause' - namely religion and righteousness. He declares that he will only consider his job complete "when I shall have left this glorious martyr's memory in your minds as a miracle of men, as a mirror of Princes, and convinced you that Charles his blood was enough to sink a kingdom."4 5

---

41 The faithful, yet imperfect, character of a glorious king, King Charles I. His country's & religions martyr. Written by a person of quality. 1660. pp. 4, 20, 21.
42 Scutum regale, the royal buckler; or, Vox legis, a lecture to traytors: who most wickedly murthered Charles I, and contrary to all law and religion banished Charles II, 3rd monarch of Great Britain, etc. 1660.
43 Winter, J. A sermon preached at East Dereham in Norf. Jan. 30. 1661. Being the day of the of the most horrid murther of that most pious and incomparable Prince, King Charles the First of England, etc. 1662. pp. 16, 1.
44 From the title page of Lambert's printed sermon.
45 Lambert T. Sad memorials of the royal martyr: or, a parallel betwixt the Jewes murder of Christ, and the English murder of King Charles the first: Being a sermon preached on the solemnity of His Majestie's martyrdom. In the Cathedral Church of Sarum, An. Dom. 1669. 1670. p. 4
Complementing the Christ-Charles parallels are the other parallels already noted; that between Charles and Josiah, or Charles and David; yet they were all put in the contexts of a martyrology which was at once Catholic and reformed. Catholic in the insistence that the martyr only gains his life by losing it, and reformed in the sense that Charles had achieved sanctification through reliance on God's grace, he was not an object of worship or intercession.46 As the anonymous author of *The faithful, yet imperfect, character of a glorious king* put it, Charles' executioners 'glorified him in Christ, when they crucified Christ in him'. The Christian hero wins the greater victory when apparently defeated on earth, he appears 'most lovely in his greatest ignominy when he took the most heroic revenge upon his executioners by turning their inhumanity to him into prayers for them'.47 The author is skilled enough to leave a telling ambiguity as to whether he refers to Christ or Charles.

The sermons of the early Restoration period also conformed to their earlier predecessors in the way they balanced an epideictic view of the royal martyr with a political theology derived from that image. Many of these sermons fall into two principal parts, after describing the virtues of the martyr, evoking the hearer's sympathies for his sufferings etc, the second part of the sermon moves on to draw out the political conclusions inherent in the view of the martyr. Here is presented what H. T. Dickinson called the 'ideology of order'; namely divine right, non-resistance, passive obedience, indefeasible hereditary right and prerogative power. These might be called the five pillars of Restoration royalism, or, after 1680, Toryism.48 But in the sermons it is the first three aspects which are usually emphasised. In view of the events of the 1640s and 50s, the preachers were concerned to reiterate that the king's power and position existed independently of Parliament, church or people and that any resistance to lawful authority was forbidden by the word of God. Thus in 1662, Arthur Bury used the story of David and Saul as a text from which to preach on the subject's duty of submission to the government of kings. Similarly, Matthew Griffiths 46 For examples of these parallels from the 1660s see the sermon by John Winters (1662) mentioned above, also: King, H. *A sermon preached the 30th of January at White-Hall, 1664*. Being the anniversary commemoration of K. Charls the I, martyr'd on that day. 1665. Bury, A. *The bow: or, the lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan, applied to the royal and blessed martyr K. Charles I. In a sermon preached the 30th of January, at the cathedral Church of St. Peter in Exon. 1662.*

47 *The faithful, yet imperfect, character of a glorious king*. 1660. p. 4

used the anointing of Saul as a text from which to preach on divine right and non-resistance in 1665. Griffiths demonstrating that the authority of a king originated in God’s donation to Adam and not in any election or anointing by priests or people, and that any active resistance to the Lord’s anointed is expressly forbidden.

For, if the people shall at any time, in a tumultary way, attempt any innovation in, or change of government, however they may be plausibly decayed into it by their factious ringleaders, and fleshed with seeming impunity, yea, with probable success for a time; yet the Lord will be sure to meet with them and say unto them hereafter, as he did to Samuel in the like case heretofore, ‘They have not rejected thee, that thou shouldest not reign over them; but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them’; and they that now reject God, and the king, and God in the king (whose lawful and immediate Vicegerent he is) are found guilty in the text, and shall be found but so many cast away in the world to come.49

In 1667, John Glanvill devoted the body of his Fast Day sermon to the duty of non-resistance, based upon Romans 13:2

Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

A text which was to be used frequently by preachers on the 30th January. Rebellion, according to Glanvill, is destructive to the order of society; in government it leads to anarchy, an end to all morality and the victory of might over right. In religion it leads to the victory of private opinion and error over revealed truth. He obviously has the more extreme sectaries in mind when he argues that true religion is doomed when it is cut off from its foundation of virtue and holy living and placed in emotions, raptures and swelling words of vanity which are nothing but the unquiet agitation of their own disordered brains.50 Such resistance not only results in the breakdown of society; more importantly, it affronts God who established order, hierarchy and authority for the preservation of man in society. Here Glanvill repeats another favourite illustration of Royalist and later Tory preachers, that Christ himself did not countenance active resistance to Roman rule, but rather taught that the subject had a duty to pay Caesar his due. Also, the Apostles, early church

50 Glanvill, J. A loyal tear dropt on the vault of our late martyred sovereign. 1667. pp. 27-8
Fathers and martyrs did not resist Roman authority, even when that authority was persecuting them. As Glanvill points out, Paul wrote his letter to the Romans during the reign of Nero; if such a tyrant was to be obeyed, how much more should a good and virtuous king like Charles be honoured?

Yet Glanvill is enough of a realist to be aware that the Civil Wars and Republic had undermined the position not only of the Church of England, but Christianity itself and that the 'spirit of the age', repelled by the evidence of intolerance and sectarianism, was inclining towards a scepticism towards the traditional teaching and morality of the church. As he put it:

Though government may be fixed again upon its foundations and laws turned into their ancient channel after the violence they have suffered, yet they lose much of their reverence and strength by such disestablishment. And the people that have rebelled once and successfully will be ready to do so often. As water that hath been boiled will boil again the sooner.51

This fear haunted many of the Restoration clergy and perhaps accounts for the urgency with which they preached divine right and non-resistance. Having, seemingly by the providence of God, recovered the foundations of government in church and state, they felt the need to teach the people not just their duty of submission, but to warn against the inevitable disasters and sufferings that would spring from a repeat of such rebellions.

For Glanvill and his audience the events of the Civil Wars and Republic were part of their own experience. They were speaking from that experience, but as time went on, and the events of the 1640s and 50s receded ever further into memory the immediacy with which these preachers had been able to invest their sermons became ever more difficult to sustain. Coupled with this was a change in rhetorical style in the last decade of the Restoration period which was to have profound implications for the way in which the image of the martyr was articulated. As early as 1665 Robert South felt constrained to offer an apology for using an Old Testament text in a Fast Day sermon; as if some of his audience would find it unsuitable and a misapplication. He excuses himself for his 'enthusiasm' in condemning the regicide on the grounds that the enormity of the crime justified his strong language.52

51 ibid p. 23
52 South, R. "A sermon preached before King Charles the second 1663". In: Sermons preached
Lessenich, in his work on the eighteenth century sermon, distinguishes between what he termed the 'baroque' and the 'neo-classical' sermon. Here, baroque is applied to language used primarily to arouse the emotions, in the context of the Fast Day sermon, through the epideictic technique of identifying the listener with the sufferings of the martyr who is presented as both radically innocent and the epitome of virtue. In contrast, the neo-classical sermon is based upon the application of reason, to persuade and teach the listeners through a measured discourse. Naturally no sermon is exclusively one or the other; the most baroque rhetorical flourishes must be rooted in a dialogue recognisable to the audience; but it is a useful short-hand to demonstrate that a change of style did affect the sermons of the late seventeenth century and that this change did have implications for the cult.

The move to a sermon style which was, according to Burnet, 'clear, plain and short,' can be attributed to many factors. Burnet cites the taste of Charles II for sermons which were clear, logical and devoid of rhetorical flourish. There was an understandable reaction against the enthusiasm of the radical sects and their emotional preaching, a fear that unleashing the emotions led to violence, rebellion and regicide. To some extent Anglicans took pride in their restrained and reasonable preaching as a way of distinguishing themselves from their dissenting neighbours. Then again, the period witnessed the founding of the Royal Society and the fashion for scientific enquiry; a climate within which religion was presented as something reasonable and compatible with such gentlemanly pursuits. In these circumstances an emphasis on bloodguilt, vengeance, supernatural anointings and the royal Touch looked increasingly out of place in fashionable society. As Horton Davies remarked, rational, latitudinarian churchman of the later seventeenth century sought a 'Christianity without tears,' stripped of its more difficult, supernatural trappings, and a God who would not have seemed out of place in a fashionable drawing room.

Yet beneath the demands of mere fashion was a change of a more serious and fundamental nature, inspired initially by the neoplatonism of the likes of Cudworth, Whichcote

54 Burnet, G. History of his own time. 1724. Vol.1, p. 191
55 Davies, H. Worship and theology in England from Watts and Wesley to Maurice, 1690-1830. 1961. p. 56
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and the Cambridge platonists. Again, in reaction to what they regarded as the extremism of the sects, the neoplatonists tended to stress those aspects of the tradition upon which people might agree; their watchwords were reason and restraint in religious discourse.\textsuperscript{56} Coupled with this was the process John Spurr has identified, of a move away from doctrinal controversy towards a concentration on Christian living in the Restoration church.\textsuperscript{57} These attitudes contributed to a 'latitude' in religious thought which sought to minimise conflict and presented Christianity as a necessary means of inculcating civilised ethics and a sense of responsibility to God and ones neighbours. The bad press generally accorded the Church of England in the eighteenth century has often overlooked not only the persistence of a sense of horror felt towards the abuses of religious enthusiasm in the 1640s and 50s, but also the very real sense in which it was believed that a reasonable religion could improve society. This sense of the uses of religion were summed up by no less a person than Dean Swift when he remarked that he

\begin{quote}
\textit{did not see how this talent of moving the passions can be of any great use towards directing Christian men in the conduct of their lives.}\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

Sissons argues that the individual who illustrated this move from the baroque to the neo-classical was John Tillotson, appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1689 on the resignation of Sancroft. Tillotson is held up as the type of the new, rational, latitudinarian churchman whose discourses were measured and reasonable and who viewed the church as a department of state, whose primary duty was the reformation of manners and the inculcation of rational principles. Charles Smyth also singled out Tillotson as the exemplar of this new neo-classical style of preaching; indeed he has a chapter in his book entitled 'The triumph of Tillotson.'\textsuperscript{59} If we compare Tillotson with that other famous preacher of the 1690s, Francis Atterbury, we not only see the extent to which Tillotson differed from Atterbury, but the extent to which Atterbury was obliged to bridle his own style to conform with the more restrained fashion of the age. One is often aware with the


\textsuperscript{57} Spurr, J. \textit{The restoration Church of England, 1646-88.} 1991.

\textsuperscript{58} Downey, J. \textit{The eighteenth century pulpit : a study of the sermons of Butler, Berkeley, Secker, Sterne, Whitefield and Wesley.} 1969. p. 13

high church and later Jacobite Atterbury that the baroque is bubbling away beneath the surface of his prose, threatening to burst asunder the cool neo-classical facade. Ultimately Atterbury was to sacrifice everything for the exiled Stuarts, a course of action Tillotson would doubtless have considered unreasonable and foolish.

This consideration of Tillotson and Atterbury has taken us ahead of ourselves, but it makes the point that the style of pulpit oratory underwent a profound change in the later half of Charles II's reign and that the implications for the cult were, at best, ambiguous. On the one hand the royal martyr could be presented as the victim of religious fanaticism and enthusiasm, a symbol of the terrible things that could happen when religious passions slipped the bridle of reason and lawful authority. On the other, the epideictic identification of Charles as victim and martyr was seriously undermined. Using baroque techniques, the justice of Charles' case was established by leading the listener to an emotional identification with the King in his sufferings. The neo-classical preacher in contrast had to 'prove' the justice of Charles' cause by rational discourse. This entailed a re-examination of the historiography of the Civil Wars which had been largely absent from earlier cult literature and is illustrated in the development of the Whig and Tory histories of the early eighteenth century. This development signalled the end of any consensus which may have existed at the Restoration concerning the position of the martyr.

To some extent the changes in style were always more apparent in fashionable London churches and cathedrals; one suspects that the average parish clergyman went on preaching in the same old way! Certainly in the 1660s and 70s the full panoply of cult typology was presented and represented each year at the Fast. Thus in 1678, Edward Sparke published the sixth edition of *Scintilla altaris, primitive devotion in the feast and fasts of the Church of England*. First published in 1652 it is another example of the way in which Anglican theology and spirituality survived in print during the Republic. Sparke added the State Prayers as an appendix to the third edition of 1663. For the Office of the 30th January he included a disquisition, an elegy, a prayer and a Collect from the Office.60 For nearly fifty years Sparke's *Scintilla altaris* remained a popular companion to the liturgical year of the Church of England, and irrespective of changing fashions in the pulpit,

---

60 The seventh and final edition of *scintilla altaris* appeared in 1700, to be succeeded by Robert Nelson's *Feasts and fasts* of 1704, this went through fifty six editions between 1704 And 1848, one of them, that of 1712, being in Welsh.
retained all the typology of the royal martyr with which we are familiar. Sparke taught that sin and pride had precipitated the rebellion in a faction inspired by the teachings of Loyola and Calvin. The fruits of the unholy alliance of Jesuit and puritan was to persecute and condemn 'a prince of the whitest innocence, next our blessed saviour'. The oft-quoted comparisons between the Passion of Christ and the death of Charles are repeated, for he was indeed 'the exactest picture of our blessed Saviour's life and death that e'r was drawn by any chronicle'; a fact which can be seen from his 'incomparable book' which is become 'a monument of richer metal than all the tombs of brass or marble.' In the elegy Sparke repeats all this again, Charles is Josiah, he is Christ-like, he is radically innocent and his enemies are equated with Jews rebelling against the Lord's anointed. The prayer, which concludes this section on the Fast Day, enjoins repentance for the sins which brought down such a noble King, whose example of constancy, patience and sanctification all are called upon to emulate. Sparke also gives thanks that God

\[
\text{Didst not cut off both root and branches in one day; for raising up many good Obadiahs to feed and hide thy faithful prophets and for the many thousands in Israel (that never had bowed their knees to the Baal of those times) which thou shelterest under the wings of providence.}^{61}
\]

He ends with the Collect from the Fast Day Office which begins 'Blessed Lord, in whose sight the death of thy saints is precious' in other words the one which sets out the Christ-Charles parallel most obviously. The popularity of Sparke throughout the Restoration period reflects the continuing potency of the typologies and the political theology which underpinned the cult. As John Kenyon has remarked, the figure of the royal martyr remained a potent symbol of sacred monarchy and the dangers of resistance for at least a generation after the Restoration. It also demonstrates the continuation of language and imagery associated with the Civil Wars and the determination of Royalist and later Tory writers and preachers not to let people forget the events of the 1640s and 50s.\(^2\)

Preaching on this theme in the 1670s and 80s, Gilbert Burnet published three Fast Day sermons which, in the light of his subsequent allegiance and beliefs after 1688, may have embarrassed him somewhat. In 1674 Burnet preached on the need for submission to lawful

authority, whilst the following year his theme was the continuing need to mourn the royal martyr. In 1681, at the height of the Exclusion Crisis, Burnet preached in defence of the Fast against Whig attacks on the commemoration.

Although in 1710 the Tories gleefully reprinted all three sermons to embarrass Burnet, nevertheless on closer examination his political theology, whilst far 'higher' than he would have owned after 1688, nevertheless includes important qualifications. In preaching on submission in 1674, Burnet reaffirms that the authority of kings derives from God and not from man, but goes on to reject any Hobbesian notions of unlimited power. Burnet expounds the classic Anglican doctrine of non-resistance and passive obedience in stating that whilst we owe the king our obedience we are not his slaves. In our submission we are obeying God's injunction to offer obedience to lawful authority, but that this is contrary to 'the pestiferous spawn of that infernal Leviathan' which puts the Prince above all law.63 As Mark Goldie has pointed out, and James II discovered to his cost, the Anglican doctrine of non-resistance and passive obedience did not relieve the Prince from all duties towards the law of God, and Burnet is entirely consistent with such views when he reminds his congregation that

For the first ten centuries no Father or Doctor of the church, nor any assembly of churchmen, did ever teach, maintain or justify any rebellions or seditious doctrine or practices.64

Like Sparke and many other Anglican apologists, Burnet repeats the commonplace of Samson's foxes, that the Jesuit and the puritan were united in preaching resistance as a way of undermining the Church of England and the royal supremacy. Burnet traces such views back to Gregory VII and the 'fiction' of the dispensing power of the Popes. Those Protestants who had inherited such pernicious doctrines under the cover of godly reformation offered what Burnet called a 'Judas-Kiss, to kiss our master when we betray him, and to own a zeal of religion when we engage in courses that disgrace and destroy it.' The Church of England, in her wisdom, had always

63 Burnet, G. Submission for conscience sake. 1674. p. 16
established the rights and authority of Princes on sure and unalterable foundation, enjoining an entire obedience to all the lawful commands of authority and an absolute submission to that supreme power God hath put in our sovereign’s hands.65

No wonder the Tories reprinted his sermons; the wonder is that it took over twenty years after 1689 for them to do so!

The following year Burnet offered a meditation on Charles’ virtues, taking as his text David’s grief over the death of Saul (2 Samuel 2:12). Here all the familiar attributes are represented, including an assertion that Charles had been given the power of prophecy when he asserted in 1642 that he would either emerge from the conflict a glorious King or a patient martyr. The second part of the sermon is a discussion of the reasons why the Fast Day is important and why the memory of the royal martyr should be kept alive. In the light of Burnet’s later career, some of the reasons he gave are quite interesting. He included the conventional excuse that the Fast was necessary to expiate national sins and the guilt of Charles’ innocent blood, but goes on to add that the Fast was particularly necessary because during the ‘ten years thraldom’ the people had grown accustomed to religious liberty and, what is worse, many had given up all profession of religion in any form. The Fast was an opportunity to remind the people of the truths of religion and inevitable results of rebellion.

This theme, of the utility of the Fast Day, was taken up again in 1681, when, at the height of the Exclusion Crisis, Burnet posed the question

Should we still continue to fast and mourn? Shall the yearly return of this black and dismal day, with the melancholy thoughts and reflections which accompany it, be for ever observed? Shall we convey this entail of sorrow to our posterity? Does this blood continue still to cry for vengeance?

Perhaps for the first time since the regicide a preacher had dared to pose the question in public. This reflected not only the attacks made upon the Fast Day by certain Whigs during the crisis, but a growing sense that the observance of the Fast had to be defended and justified. Despite this sermon being quoted approvingly in the rather extremist Whig pamphlet King Charles no saint, Burnet’s purpose was to defend the observance and these questions were asked rhetorically.65 ibid p. 36

66 Burnet, G. A sermon preached before the City of London...1681. p. 5
Beyond the reasons put forward in his 1675 sermon, Burnet argued that the Fast could only cease when the effects of the original crime had been removed; when God's judgement should be removed from the nation and when the causes of the first crime, i.e. rebellious attitudes and false justification of the regicide, should finally cease. He specified the rise of atheism and religious indifference, resistance theories and spurious notions of the popular will as examples of the continuing baleful effects of the regicide and of notions prejudicial to good government, peace and security.

This is unashamedly a political sermon and one in which the figure of Charles does not appear, except as the pretext for the sermon's delivery. The extent to which Charles disappeared is a feature of many post-Exclusion sermons as the political message overtakes the meditations on the virtues and sufferings of the royal martyr himself. In part it reflects the move away from the epideictic technique; where heart rending rhetoric based upon Charles' innocence, constancy and suffering were inappropriate. But undoubtedly after twenty years of Fast Day sermons, preachers were beginning to despair of finding anything new to say. Burnet himself admits this when, before launching into his political discourse, he admits

It may be expected that I should in the next place enlarge on the virtue, the piety, chastity, temperance, the magnanimity and constancy of mind of this murdered Prince. But the performing this as it ought to be, I confess, is a task above my strength: especially coming after so many who have done it with such life, that anything I could add would be but a flat repetition of what has been often much better said.67

The sermon from which this extract is taken was included in the reprint of 1710, designed to embarrass and tarnish Burnet's reputation as a Whig and defender of the Revolution; and it is true that after 1688 Burnet never again published a fast Day sermon. Nevertheless, this sermon was not quite such an uncompromising piece of Tory polemic as his editors might have hoped, and reveals that by the early 1680s the whole tradition of the Fast Day and the political theology which sustained it was under pressure. This sermon demonstrates that there were voices questioning the need to keep on remembering the events of 1649, and voices raised in defence of principles of popular sovereignty and the subordination of rulers to the ruled which looked back to the 1640s and 50s not with horror and loathing, but with renewed interest and respect. Although

67 ibid p. 7
this sermon was preached at the height of the Exclusion crisis, Burnet does not use the occasion of
the Fast to simply denounce the enemy; instead he ends with a plea for comprehension, toleration
and peace, a happy state of affairs achievable

if the King and people, if city and country, if conformists and dissenters all would happily
conspire in the duties proposed in my text, of loving truth and peace.68

As such Burnet, whilst defending the observance of the Fast, anticipates to some extent his
adoption of 'Revolution principles' after 1688.

Other preachers were not as restrained as Burnet, and the outbreak of the Popish Plot
and the subsequent crisis over Exclusion stimulated the clergy to renewed efforts. The 30th January
became the occasion for violent denunciations of Exclusionist, and later, Whig principles and
signalled the almost complete identification of the cult with Tory ideology.69 Thus in 1678 Richard
Thompson was appointed to the important living of St. Mary Redcliffe in Bristol and the following
January took the opportunity afforded by the Fast Day to launch a spirited attack upon the
Presbyterians who, he claimed, had fomented the Civil Wars, brought Charles to the scaffold and
who were even now up to their old tricks in concocting the Popish Plot, through which they hoped
to undermine the monarchy and the Church of England. Thompson was impeached for such
remarks, but he not only survived the impeachment but went on to be appointed Dean of Bristol
in 1684. In 1679 Dr Cudworth was preaching before the Court at Whitehall and reminding them
how during the Civil Wars, treason masqueraded as 'a form of reformation and godliness' and how
such treasons were returning under the guise of the Plot and the call for Exclusion.70 This
identification of the cult with Toryism was perhaps inevitable given that the cult was based on a
conservative ideology of divine right, non-resistance and a rejection of the popular sovereignty
which it was believed had either inspired the regicides or been used by them to justify their
ambitions. The continuity between the principles of a Royalist Anglican before 1680 and a Tory

68 ibid p. 29

69 For background reading on the Exclusion Crisis see: Jones, J. R. The first Whigs : the politics of
the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683. 1961. Harris, T. London crowds in the reign of Charles II :
propaganda and politics from the Restoration to the exclusion Crisis. 1987. Harris, T. Politics
under the later Stuarts : party conflict in a divided society 1660-1715. 1993. Mullett, M. James II
in the 1680s. 1972.

70 Barry, J. "The politics of religion in Restoration Bristol". The politics of religion in Restoration
afterwards meant that many people could change labels without changing any of their beliefs or ideals.

Throughout the 1660s and 70s the clergy had preached on the principles of non-resistance, indefeasible hereditary succession and the divine right of lawful authority. After the Restoration the nature of cult literature changes in that they were now defending a present reality instead of looking for change as they had been in the 1650s. Consequently many sermons reflect the warning of Thomas Sprat, preaching before the House of Commons in 1678, who warned his audience against a revival of the spirit of rebellion which led to Charles' death. Sprat devoted most of his address to a representation of Charles as an example of constancy and non-resistance, yet he also added that the primary purpose of the Fast was not simply to condemn the regicides and followers, but to convert them by

- declaring the pious works and admirable patience of those that had suffered; and in giving God the glory of exemplary suffering.

Samuel Rolle explored similar themes in the same year in *Loyalty and peace*, two lengthy discourses on the nature of conscience and the regicide. Again, Rolle is inspired to restate the whole political theology surrounding the cult in response to attacks upon the continuing observance of the Fast by those who on the one hand argued that it merely reopened old wounds and, on the other, those who

- would rather applaud that bloody fact than profess to abhor it, and would not doubt to say that Ministers in observing the thirtieth day of January as a solemn fast do but mock God and flatter the state.

For Rolle, the Fast was even more important now that the principles which had brought Charles to his death seemed to be undergoing a revival. He urged parents and masters to instruct their children and servants in the fifth commandment, 'particularly as it contains the duty of subjects towards kings and rulers', reflecting that in instructing their social inferiors they might in turn themselves learn the duty of obedience to their superiors for
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some good and pious women, whilst they are teaching their children and servants
obedience to the King, may reflect and learn more obedience to their own husbands.74

Rolle concluded by asserting that if the people of England did truly repent of the unpardonable sin
of regicide there would be no further cause to fear rebellion.75

The following year Edward Pelling, again conscious of the revival of those very notions
which contributed to the regicide, reiterated the patriarchal view of divine right monarchy,
comparing this God given system with the inversion of values and the perversion of conscience
which accompanied the regicide.76 Both Rolle and Pelling illustrate the growing fear amongst
those whom I may now call Tories, that the monster of rebellion, which seemed to have been
defeated in 1660, was returning under the guise of Exclusion; as an anonymous broadside of 1681
warned, 'several of late have loudly cried out, 'how like is this to '41.' 77 There was a sense of
incomprehension amongst the Tory clergy that the people should again be mislead into paths
which could only lead to destruction, and the historiography of pride and ambition, which had
been applied in cult literature to the rebels in the Civil Wars, is transposed to the Exclusion Crisis.
Using the Fast Day to recall the horrors of the Wars and the sin of regicide may 'put some stop to
the violences which seem to be preparing by several factions.'78

Other broadsides took up these themes in the propaganda war over Exclusion, and it is
striking to note the extent to which the Civil Wars were invoked by the Tories as a warning of the
consequence of Exclusion. They re-presented themes from the cult with which we are now
familiar, such as the Jesuit-puritan plots, the Christ-Charles parallels, the doleful effects of regicide,
and the blessings brought by the Restoration. These themes were particularly effective when
reissued as engravings, Charles was either referred to directly as in Nalson's Britannia mourning the
execution of Charles I of 1682, where mourning Britannia sits amid the ruins of St Paul's, with the
crown, the mitre and the executioners axe at her feet, whilst being harangued by a two-faced
purito-papist. In the background battle is joined between troops of cavalry (See fig.8). Or indirectly
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as in Pettit’s *Visions of thorough reformation* where a Presbyterian in league with the Pope is depicted deposing the royal crown and painting over the royal arms with those of the Republic. Roger L’Estrange’s famous broadside *The Committee, or popery in masquerade* of 1681, sums up most Tory fears. A committee, made up of sectaries, sits under a banner announcing ‘Behold we are a covenning people’, whilst in front the common people denounce popish lords and the service book. In one corner, Strafford, Laud and Gurney are led away in chains past a discarded crown, sceptre and bust of Charles I, whilst in another corner the Pope whispers encouragement to the Committee (See fig.9). The poem accompanying this engraving includes the stanza

You’ll say this prints a satire. Against whom?
Those that crown’d holy Charles with martyrdom.
By the same rule the scripture you’ll traduce
For saying Christ was crucifi’d by the Jews:
Nay, and their treasons do agree in this;
By Pharisees betray’d; and with a kiss:
Conscience, the cry; Emmanuel was the word;
The cause, the Gospel, but the plea, the sword.79

Even the humble playing card was pressed into the propaganda war over Exclusion. The Whigs were the first to use them for political purposes in 1679 with packs illustrating the story of various ‘Popish Plots’ from the Armada through Gunpowder to the contemporary revelations of Titus Oates; these were joined the following year by a pack detailing the Meal Tub Plot. The Tories took some time to respond to this Whig initiative, but in 1681 appeared a pack called *The knavery of the rump*, which reminded its users of the dangers of distractions in the state! Thus the ace of spades showed Bradshaw and the hangman under the legend ‘Keepers of the liberty of England’, whilst the ace of diamonds depicted the High Court of Justice which is called ‘Oliver’s slaughter house’. The queen of spades refers to Cromwell’s alleged seduction of Lady Lambert, whilst the ace of clubs shows a house being plundered and a woman molested under the legend ‘a free state, or a toleration for all sorts of villainy’. Cards referring specifically to the King include the king of spades, where Bradshaw harangues Charles at his trial, whilst Charles asks plaintively by

what authority he is brought there. The ten of clubs shows Cromwell at prayer whilst the King is
being beheaded outside the window.\(^8\)

Having successfully turned a Whig propaganda device against them, the Tories followed
up *The knavery of the rump* with packs detailing the defeat of the Rye House Plot in 1683 and in 1685
appeared a pack detailing Monmouth's rebellion. But the Whigs were to have the last word in the
late 1680s with two packs detailing a highly partisan version of the reign of James II and the
success of the Revolution.\(^81\)

For those desiring a more sustained discussion of principle, there was the first edition of
Filmer's *Patriarcha*, composed in the 1640s but now published for the first time. Other dissertations
on patriarchalism included John Monson's *A discourse concerning supreme power and common right* also
published in 1680 which was so Filmerian in its conclusions that it was for a time attributed to Sir
Robert himself.\(^82\)

In 1682 George Hickes, preaching on the 30\(^{th}\) January in Bow Church before the Lord
Mayor and Council, reminded them that the principles of resistance and regicide, which some
people calling themselves Protestants had tried to teach the people, were in fact Popish and
Jesuitical and that orthodox Christianity had always taught non-resistance and submission.\(^83\)
This is another example of a Fast Day sermon in which the figure of Charles is submerged under a
political discourse, for Hickes details forty erroneous and heretic beliefs - complete with marginal
notes on their propounders - covering deposition, radical reformation, popular sovereignty and
resistance. Hickes repeats the warning that Exclusion had witnessed a disturbing resurgence of
these dangerous ideas; ideas which no true Anglican could countenance, for the Church of
England looked back to a primitive and uncorrupted Christianity which was marked by

\(^{80}\) Whiting, J. R. S. *A handful of history*. 1978.
\(^{81}\) ibid, chapters 8 and 9
\(^{82}\) *Patriarcha* was reissued in 1685. Other works of Filmer were also published as part of the
propaganda war over Exclusions, including: *The free holders grand inquest*, published in both
1679, 1680 and 1684, *Political discourses. 1680. The power of kings. 1680*, and *Reflection
concerning the original of government. 1679*. Other tracts reissued by the Tories include a new
edition of the *Works of Charles I. 1681*.
\(^{83}\) Hickes, G. *A sermon preached before the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and citizens of London at
Bow Church, on the 30\(^{th}\) January, 1682*. p. 23
non-resistance and submission. Should Protestants profess what Hickes calls the popish doctrine of resistance

they are not sound and orthodox Protestants, but Protestants popishly affected, papists under a Protestant dress, wolves in sheep's clothing; rebellious and satanical spirits transformed into angels of light.84

The following year, 1683, Edward Pelling again published his Fast Day sermon; another discourse on the sin of resistance and the sanctity of kings in which the figure of Charles is again wholly absent.85 As does John Burrell, preaching on the same day in Thetford parish church. Burrell's theme echoed that of Hickes in arguing that the Church of England as the true successor of primitive Christianity, had always upheld the divine right of kings and that the Church had a particular duty in the light of Exclusion to teach true religion

For to see men run into the detestable positions of popery and presbytery, without endeavouring to reclaim them is neither charitable nor honourable in private men much less allowable in those who have it in their charge from God to rebuke with all authority such scandals to the church.86

This theme was also taken up by Francis Turner, preaching in January 1685, just before the death of Charles II; although Turner returns to an earlier tradition of Fast Day sermons by rooting his discourse in a representation of the royal martyr. In fact Turner took issue with part of that tradition in questioning the effectiveness of the Christ-Charles parallel, asking whether such parallels 'would offend the tender piety of that most Christian king if he in heaven could hear them.'87 The 'if' here is revealing, reflecting orthodox Anglican teaching on the absence of saintly intercession. It should be enough, Turner believed, that during his life Charles modelled himself on his Saviour, he is thus become our text and exemplar. Yet even whilst questioning some of the more exaggerated aspects of the parallel, he is not averse to comparing the regicides with the Jews who killed Christ!

84 ibid p. 30
85 Pelling, E. David and the Amalekite upon the death of Saul. 1683
86 Burrell, J. The divine right of kings, proved from the principles of the Church of England. 1683. p. 21
87 Turner, F. A sermon preached before the king on the 30th January 1685. p. 9
Turner chose as his text the later part of verse 28 of Acts 5: 'I and intend to bring this man's blood' for the purpose of discussing the disastrous effects of bloodguilt and the persistence of those dangerous principles which brought the innocent Charles to his untimely death. In this he reflects a common place of Tory propaganda during the Exclusion Crisis, which saw dissenting Academies as being established 'on purpose to breed up their children so as to make then rebels'. For the annual Fast could only discomfort those who secretly condoned the regicide, hence they proposed that 'it were high time the Act for observing the thirtieth of January were repealed.' Yet the Fast Day stood as a bulwark against those who still harboured 'king-killing principles', reminding the nation of the effects of resistance and the curse against bloodguilt. Not only that, it stood as an opportunity to preach the principles of true religion, not just to encourage the loyal and steadfast, but to convert those in error. As the Apostles preached to the Jews and converted many of them, so

I make no doubt. Not a few of those that were carried away with the dissimulation of the men of malice among us have been converted by the blessing of God and the preaching every thirtieth of January more than three thousand sermons.88

With the defeat of Exclusion and the peaceful accession of James II we enter upon the period known as the 'Royalist reaction'. After the dissolution of the third Exclusion Parliament in March 1681 Charles II dispensed with Parliaments and ruled alone, the improved royal finances and the subsidies from Louis XIV making the crown financially independent. With the arrest of Shaftesbury in July the tide begins to run against the Whigs, a process aided by a Tory propaganda campaign which reminded people of the results of 'king-killing principles' and accused the Whigs of being in league with papists and the Jesuits in their attempts to undermine the English constitution. The Rye House Plot of 1683 marked the end of Exclusion and when James came to the throne in 1685 the pulpits resounded with loyal addresses. It seemed that a great danger had been averted, as Dryden put it

Once more the Godlike David was restor'd
And willing nations knew their lawful Lord.89

88 ibid pp. 14, 26.
89 Mullett, M. James II and English politics, 1678-1688. 1994 p. 37
Fast Day sermons reflected this sense of relief and concentrated on expounding the 'ideology of order'; and referring back not just to the Civil Wars, but to the much more immediate anxieties of Exclusion as evidence that the Fast Day must be maintained to guard against a revival of 'king-killing principles.'\(^{90}\) Thus John Evelyn recorded that on the 30th January 1688 the curate at his parish church preached a ‘florid oration against the murder of that excellent Prince, with an exhortation to obedience from the example of David, 1 Samuel 24: 6.’\(^{91}\) Whilst the following year, rising serenely above the fact of James II's flight the previous month, Oxford University observed the Fast with its accustomed earnestness, Mr Taswell of Christ Church preaching at St Mary's to general satisfaction.\(^{92}\)

Yet Exclusion had permanently changed the nature of the Fast Day. The years of agitation, the outpouring of propaganda and the fact that the Whigs had almost succeeded in their attempts to change the succession, revealed the depth of the divisions within English society. In making the Fast Day an indispensable part of their counter-attack the Tories and the clergy had irrevocably linked the memory of the martyr with a particular party label. To but it bluntly, after 1680, Tories revered the memory of the martyr whilst Whigs increasingly tended to ignore it. Naturally, this process did not take place overnight. As we have seen, soon after the regicide Royalist Anglicans moved quickly to exclude Presbyterian influence from the cult. Charles the martyr was to be the exclusive property of the Church of England. This monopoly was maintained through a particular historiography of the Civil Wars in which Presbyterians joined the Independents as agents of rebellion and regicide, the consistent presentation of Charles as radically innocent, and a political theology of divine right, non-resistance and passive obedience. In many respects, Exclusion merely confirmed this Royalist Anglican monopoly of the royal martyr and made it explicit. The process was further encouraged by the gradual disappearance of Charles from many Fast Day sermons; from being the centre of the event, he becomes merely a pretext for a Tory political discourse. This was caused partly by the problem Burnet encountered, namely finding something new to say about the royal martyr, and partly by the development of

\(^{90}\) The sense of relief in 1685 was soon tinged with anxiety in Anglican circles at James' policy of toleration.

\(^{91}\) Evelyn: Diary. Vol.4, p. 568.

the neo-classical sermon style which emphasised discourse over rhetoric. By the late 1680s many Fast Day sermons were making only a passing reference to Charles, who becomes instead merely the occasion rather than the cause. This process was to be further encouraged by the events of 1688-89.

We have so far concentrated on the Fast Day sermon as the principal expression of the cult after the Restoration, and the large number of such sermons which were printed suggest, at first sight, a high level of popular observance. But the sermon was only one expression of the cult and it is necessary to examine other manifestations and to discuss the extent to which the cult was part of the political and social landscape of the Restoration and after. Certainly the diaries of Evelyn and Pepys record in the early 1660s both the public vengeance upon the regicides and the restoration of royal iconography which suggests a level of popular approval. The Venetian envoy recorded that the first official observance of the Fast in 1661 ‘was kept in all three kingdoms in an exemplary manner,’ and on the same day Evelyn noted that thousands of people witnessed the gibbeting of the remains of Cromwell, Ireton and Bradshaw at Tyburn.93 Even before the King was restored in person, Royalists took the initiative in restoring the royal image; for example, in March 1660, Pepys recorded that the destruction of the Commonwealth slogan 'Exit Tyrannus etc' at the Royal Exchange was greeted with a bonfire and enthusiastic crowds shouting 'Long live King Charles II.' The following month he noted that 'the King's arms are every day set up in houses and churches,' in particular in the church of All Hallows, Thames Street, where the notoriously Republican preacher John Simpson was Minister. One day he and his congregation arrived to discover that the Royalists had got there before them and set up 'privately' the royal arms which 'was a great eyesore to his people.'94 However, after the excitement of the Restoration itself, it is often difficult to determine accurately the levels of popular participation in the cult.95

The fact that a Fast Day sermon was published only tells us that the sermon was delivered, it does not tell us how many people bothered to turn up to church on the 30th January to actually hear it!93 CUSP. Vol.32. p245. Evelyn: Diary. Vol.1. p. 345
94 Pepys: Diary. Vol.1. pp. 89,113
95 One expression of the cult was the setting up of pictures of the martyr in parish churches. These images, usually based upon Marshall’s frontispiece in the Eikon Basilike, have largely disappeared, although a rather battered example can be seen in the church of St. Michael, Trinity Street, Cambridge. See also: A. B. Gray. "The portrait of King Charles I. in St. Michael's church, Cambridge". Cambridge public library record. 1935, vol.7(28).
We do not even know how many members of the Lords and Commons dutifully attended St Margaret's or the Abbey and in 1662 Ralph Josselin complained that at the Fast Day service there were 'not above 70 persons or thereabouts hearing, surely not an 100.'\(^6\) The majority of printed sermons were preached in London before either the separate Houses of Parliament or before the Mayor and Council. In the provinces most of those which were printed were delivered before the Universities or in Cathedrals. It is virtually impossible to assess the number of sermons preached each year in parish churches up and down the land, although Francis Turner refers to the 'more than three thousand sermons' preached each 30\(^{th}\) January. Between 1662 and 1683, Ralph Josselin does not mention the Fast or the martyr in his diary, except in 1678 when he notes that Parliament had just voted a sum of money to build a mausoleum for Charles. Yet despite this, we can infer that the State Prayers were being observed throughout this period as Josselin does mention in 1664 how he announced the wrong day to his congregation for the celebration of Restoration Day and in 1683 notes that he 'kept the king's day. Mr Day with us.'\(^7\) It may be that Josselin, never an uncritical exponent of Royalist Anglicanism, did not consider the Fast worth recording each year, yet it does suggest that the Fast and the other State Prayers were observed outside London, the Cathedrals and the Universities, and there are the occasional printed sermons from parish churches such as John Winter's sermon preached in East Dereham church.

For the observance of the Fast in Oxford we can turn to the diary of Anthony Wood, Oxford historian and antiquary. As one might expect, Royalist Oxford was assiduous in its yearly observance and Wood, unlike Josselin, obviously put great store by it, recording as early as January 1660 that a Fast Day sermon was preached. The following year he records that on the 14\(^{th}\) September he paid 1/3 d for a copy of S. Wood's *History of Charles I*, to which he later added Perrincheif's biography in a fine octavo.\(^8\) Wood does not record the observance of the Fast every year; there is a gap between 1661 and 1670, 1673 and 1680, but he does record most of the

\(^6\) Josselin, R. *The diary of Ralph Josselin 1616-1683*. E. Hockliffe, ed. 1908. p. 139. Perhaps today clergyman would not complain quite so bitterly at 'only' having 70 to a 100 people in his congregation for an additional service!

\(^7\) ibid pp. 145, 181

\(^8\) Wood, A. *Life and times*\# Vol.1. p. 410. Pepys also notes in June 1662 an idea to buy the two volume *Works* of Charles I as a present to 'my Lord, but I think it will be best to save the money.' (Vol.3. p. 106) However in May 1665 he bought a second hand copy for himself and records later that he thought it 'a noble book.' (Vol.6. p. 204).
observances between 1681 and 1695, revealing not only the importance of the Fast in the University calendar, but the fact that the events of 1688-89 initially caused few ripples to the surface of Oxford's Royalist and Tory convictions. Beyond a simple record of the Fast in his diary, Wood sometimes provides a glimpse of the way the memory of the martyr impinged upon the later Stuart world. In December 1670, during the visit of the Prince of Orange, the Vice-Chancellor presided at a ceremony in the Sheldonian at which the Works of Charles I were presented to the prince. The two volumes were 'finely bound in gilt, with blue strings to them, laced with gold at the ends.' During the Exclusion Crisis Oxford reaffirmed its orthodoxy by refusing to admit a probationer to a Fellowship in 1681 because he was a Green Ribbon man and had declared, perhaps unwisely, that Charles' execution had been a lawful act. Two years later the University condemned and publically burnt 'seditious' books associated with Exclusion, a list of which Wood provides; and one Mr James Parkinson was expelled from the University for, amongst other crimes, recommending Milton to his students as an antidote to Filmer. That the cult was supported by the law is revealed by the fact that one Mr Hind, a tailor, was presented before the Quarter Sessions for declaring in January 1686 that the regicide had been a good thing. At the trial the main debate seems to have concerned whether Hinds should be pilloried three or seven times; the majority voting for three appearances.

Yet even amongst the orthodox dissension sometimes occurred and a preacher's enthusiastic or intemperate remarks could occasionally offend even loyal sections of his congregation, as the following incident illustrates

30 Jan. 1694: Tuesday. King's Fast. Mr William Wyat, Orator, Principal of St Mary Hall preached. It was a (high) flown sermon, as tis said, for K. James' II reign, and not for this. He was much against the perfidiousness of the Scots and said they were the chief authors of Archbishop Laud's death, who was of more worth than all Scotland etc. At this sermon was presentà Campbell, a younger son of the Earl of Argyle, yet a high flown loyalist and nobleman of University College; who being much enraged at what he said against the Scots he did accost Mr Wyat when he came out of the pulpit and did in a most egregious manner abuse him in the face of the people - called him a red faced sot!

99 ibid Vol.3. p. 177
100 ibid Vol.3. p. 177
Mr Wyat complained to the V. C. Dr Aldrich [the V. C.] sent for Campbell; Campbell is gone and will not appear.101

In Cambridge the Fast Day was likewise absorbed into the calendar as an annual event, observed by both town and gown and attended with some pomp. Samuel Newton records that on the 29th January 1669 he was invited to wait upon the Mayor the following day. On the 30th he duly followed the Mayor and Aldermen to Great St Mary's where we had the service for the day appointed all said, but the Litany and the Offertory prayers, and then the bell rang after which done the Vice-Chancellor etc came, and then the litany was sung in the Chancel and Dr Duport, Master of Magdalen preached then on this text, the 7th Acts and the last verse, these words, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge' and made a very excellent sermon; after sermon ended, the Aldermen went from their seats with the Mayor to the churchyard and their everyone parted to his own home.102

Occasionally the sources give indications that the Fast was either not being observed with any great solemnity or that people were actually ignoring it. Pepys seems to have kept the Fast regularly until 1667, noting in 1665 and 1666 that London was quiet and the shops shut. However by 1667 things are changing; he did not attend church on the 30th January, instead working at home until the evening when he visited friends with his wife. On returning home about 8.00pm he went into the garden 'and with Mercer sang until my wife put me in mind of its being a Fast-day, and so I was sorry for it and stopped.' But his remorse did not prevent him going indoors and playing cards! The following year he again did not go to church but was busy with business all day, although he does note the Fast Day in his diary. In 1669, after a long lie-in, he does attend church, 'where Dr Hicks made a dull sermon.'103

Indirectly Pepys offers an insight into the attitude of continental Catholicism towards the cult of the martyr. According to a note in his two volume edition of *The works of King Charles the martyr*, - a second hand copy of which he purchased in 1665 - a copy of the *Works* had been seized

101 ibid Vol.3. p. 442

102 Newton, S. *The diary of Samuel Newton, Alderman of Cambridge 1662-1717*. J. E. Foster, ed. 1890. P. 40-1

from an English ship at Lisbon by the Portuguese Inquisition, who handed it over to a group of
English priests with instructions to expurgate it 'according to the rules of the Index Expuratoris.'
The books then came into the possession of one Barnaby Crafford, an English merchant in Lisbon,
who in turn gave them to an English preacher, Zachariah Cradock. Cradock in his turn presented
the books to Lambeth Palace library in 1678.

In October 1700, the ever curious Pepys took his own copy of the Works to Lambeth
Palace and there copied the deletions of the Lisbon Inquisition into his own books.104 As one
would expect, the Inquisition had censored any negative comments about the Roman Catholic
Church, and the section devoted to the discussion between Charles and Alexander Henderson is
also heavily censored. But as they consist entirely of the discourses of two Protestants on the most
appropriate way to effect Reformation, as well as a discussion of the relative merits of Anglican
episcopacy over presbytery, perhaps it is not altogether surprising! But the Inquisitors were
concerned to censor far more than just allusions to the Roman Church. All the prayers and
meditations at the end of each chapter of the Eikon Basilike are deleted, as are all the prayers in the
section 'Prayers used by his Majestie in the time of his troubles and restraint.' Any references to
Charles as martyr, Defender of the Faith, sacred etc, are also censored; as are the names of
Anglican writers such as Laud, Juxon, Hooker, Andrewes etc. Indeed anything that in any way
suggests Charles as a defender or champion of the Church of England is deleted. Even the mottoes
on the various engravings do not escape. On the title page to volume one, the phrases 'Aeternitati
sacrum' and 'More than conqueror' are removed, as is the quote from Seneca on the frontispiece
to the Eikon. As well as the mottoes, the elegies are heavily censored, that by Thomas Pierce being
completely obliterated.

Presumably the English priests entrusted with the job of censorship would have been
aware of events in England and the emergence of an officially sanctioned Anglican cult of the
martyr. Yet their deletions concentrate exclusively on the religious aspects of the cult. They are
rigorous in removing anything critical of the Roman Church, anything which suggests that the
Church of England was a true church and anything which suggested Charles as a martyr or
defender of that Church. Yet in so doing the Lisbon Inquisition unwittingly demonstrated the

104 I am grateful to Dr. J. R. Patterson and Mrs. A. Fitzsimon for access to Pepys' copy of the
Works in the Pepys Library, Magdelene College, Cambridge.
complete identification of religious and secular aspects within the cult, for in rejecting one aspect of
cult political theology the Inquisition rejected it all.

Closer to home, the Venetian ambassador reported that on the 30th January 1664
broadsheets were posted up in London denouncing the government.\footnote{CSPV. Vol.33. p. 286} Whilst the following year
in Weymouth many shops and businesses were open as usual on the 30th, despite a warning from
the Mayor. When he and his officers appeared in the town to enforce the Fast, they were met with
resistance from the shop keepers.\footnote{CSP(D) Vol.XV. p. 188} That the authorities were aware of anti-government sentiment
is demonstrated by an incident in Worcester in 1682 when a statue of Charles I was defaced. An
investigation headed by the Deputy Lieutenant of the county was immediately instigated, although
it was finally acknowledged that the damage was caused accidentally whilst the town was being
decorated for the Mayor's feast. But the seriousness with which this incident was investigated
attests to the continuing wariness of the government, particularly, in this case, in the light of the
Exclusion Crisis.\footnote{ibid pp. 477, 486-7}

Evidence of lukewarm observance or active opposition to the cult does exist, but should
be seen in perspective. Most printed sources, whether in diaries, ambassador's reports or the State
Papers, record that on the whole the Fast Day was observed solemnly by the Court, who regularly
attended chapel dressed in mourning on the 30th January; by both Houses of Parliament, at the
Universities, and in Cathedrals, parish churches and private chapels. One obvious manifestation of
the cult were the number of churches and chapels dedicated the 'Charles: King and martyr'
erected after the regicide. In fact the dedications to Charles can be said to anticipate the regicide if
one includes the Charles Church in Plymouth. Permission for a new church was granted in 1641
with the stipulation that 'the New Church to be built shall be called Charles Church'. What
emerged was a gothic church for a puritan congregation, what Mowl and Earnshaw called 'a
Presbyterian interior to an apparently Catholic shell'; this being attained by the congregation
themselves who frustrated the Laudian axis of the church to the east end by installing large
galleries facing a centrally placed pulpit.\footnote{Mowl, T. & Earnshaw, B. Architecture without kings : the rise of puritan classicism under}
The first such dedication after the regicide seems to be of the small chapel built in 1657 by Christian, Countess of Devonshire at Peak Forest, Derbyshire. The chapel was modest, about 45' long by 22' wide, furnished simply with benches and a pulpit of black oak. The Countess, although on good terms with the Lord Protector, counted herself a Royalist, which accounts for the dedication. Although there is some evidence to suggest that the original dedication was to St James, with 'Charles, king and martyr' being added after the Restoration.  

The most notable feature of this small chapel was its status as a 'royal peculiar', being built on royal forest land it did not come under the jurisdiction of the diocesan. One consequence of this was that Peak Forest became a sort of Gretna Green for couples wishing to marry outside their own parish. The first such marriage took place in 1665 with an average of sixty a year until the Fleet Marriage Act of 1753 limited the hours during which marriages could take place; the practice was abandoned at Peak Forest in 1804.

All but one of the remaining seventeenth century dedications occurred in the five years following the Restoration, and the Countess of Devonshire, having built her chapel, also donated a chalice and paten to one of these; namely the church dedicated to Charles in Falmouth. This church was built on land given by Sir Peter Killigrew and building began in 1662, the church being consecrated in 1665 by Seth Ward, Bishop of Exeter. In Shropshire a small chapel was

Cromwell. 1995. p. 12. The church was in use by 1643, the tower completed in 1657 and to this was added a spire in 1767. In 1829 a chapel-of-ease was added to the parish which was known as the Charles Chapel, or St Charles’ Chapel until formed into a separate parish dedicated to St Luke. The original Charles Church fell victim to the Luftwaffe and is now a ruin. See, Arnold-Forster, F. Studies in church dedications, or England’s patron saints. 3 vols. 1899. Vol.2, pp. 346-8


111 The continuing ambivalence towards the status of Charles I within the Church of England is revealed in a sermon preached on 28th January 1990 in Falmouth parish church on the occasion of the observance of the Fast by the Ven. Tom Barfett, former Rector of the parish and Archdeacon Emeritus of Hereford; part of which relates to the inclusion of Charles in the Calendar of the Alternative Service Book of 1980 and is worth quoting: 'When the committee, preparing the Alternative service Book, first presented their version of the Calendar to the General Synod it was immediately noticed that King Charles' name was absent and George Fox was included. This was the point at which this, your parish, made its mark on the history of the Church of England. I moved an amendment immediately to have Charles' name reinstated and George Fox's removed. I was supported by two of the leading laymen of the Church of England, Oswald Clark of the Diocese of Southwark and Maurice Chandler of Birmingham. In my speech on that occasion I related the story of the continuing hassle which there was between the Rector of Falmouth and the Fox family, who of course were Quakers, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, owing to their steadfast refusal to pay the Rector's rate which Charles II had imposed on every household in the town. This had meant that they were distrained upon by the bailiffs. The upshot of this speech
erected in the early 1660s at Newtown, Wem and dedicated to Charles the martyr, although
Arnold-Forster did not know who the original patron was and the present church is entirely
Victorian.

The first instance of dedications to the martyr appearing outside the United Kingdom
came in 1662, when Charles II married Catherine of Braganza and received the port of Tangier as
part of the dowry. The garrison chapel was duly dedicated to Charles the martyr and remained so
until the English withdrew in 1680, when Parliament refused the annual vote of maintenance
because 'the supplies sent thither have been in great measure made up of popish officers and
soldiers.' The English presence in north Africa and the martyr's first excursion overseas ended
because of the fears engendered by the Exclusion Crisis.112

Perhaps the most famous church dedicated to Charles, both for its royal connections and
because it is mentioned by Samuel Pepys, is that at Tunbridge Wells. The town grew in the
seventeenth century around its medicinal wells, being visited by Henrietta Maria after the birth of
Prince Charles in 1630, when the place was so devoid of suitable lodgings that the Queen was
housed in a tent.113 The town rapidly expanded after the Restoration as a fashionable spa, Charles
II and Catherine of Braganza paying their first visit in 1662, and two other visits were paid by the
court in the course of the 1660s. In 1670 the Duke and Duchess of York visited and in 1684
Princess Anne, who had already visited the wells many times, returned accompanied by her new
husband, Prince George of Denmark. The church was built on land given by Lady Purbeck as a
chapel-of-ease with no resident minister until 1709; before then clergy visiting the town during the
season were invited to preach and read prayers. Yet despite the royal patronage of the 1660s and
70s the subscription lists for the church were not opened until 1676, many years after the other
churches dedicated to the martyr were established. It has been suggested that the reason a church

from the beginning to 1783. 1929. p. 509 The only other dedication to Charles I outside England in
the 17th century was the chapel of the Royal Hospital, Kilmainham in Ireland. In the following
century the Church at Hollymount Co. Mayo was also dedicated to Charles the martyr. For
churches and chapels have been dedicated to Charles the martyr in the United Kingdom, as well as
others in Australia, South Africa, the USA and Japan.

113 Arnold-Forster, F. Vol.2, p. 347
was built in Tunbridge Wells was the fear of immorality, 'lest the distance from every church, together with the various amusements and continued dissipations of a public place, should entirely suspend the attention due to religious duties.' However, this does not explain why it was sixteen years after the Restoration before money was raised to build a church. In her study of the church, Fiona Greenwood suggests that it was a combination of central government policy and the relative slowness of the growth of the town which accounts for the length of time it took to establish the church. Greenwood ascribes the motivation for the church to the rise of Danby and his policy of Anglican restoration after 1672 and the return of Sheldon to favour after 1675. If this is the case then the church at Tunbridge Wells and its dedication is part of that Anglican revival and the renewed alliance between Charles II and his 'natural allies' in the Church of England. Other manifestations of this policy included the plans for a mausoleum to Charles and the efforts to press ahead with the rebuilding of St Paul's cathedral. Likewise the dedication itself, which may not have been ascribed until the 1680s, may reflect the government's continuing determination to strengthen the Royalist, Anglican interest after the defeat of Exclusion.

The first subscription list ran between 1676 and 1684 and 1,684 donors are listed who gave between them £1380 7/3d, whilst the second list spans the period 1688-96, then 962 donors gave £797 5/7d to enlarge the church. The amounts donated range from Princess Anne who gave 60 guineas, to John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys who gave one guinea each. Many prominent figures of the period appear on these lists, Clarendon, Rochester, the Dukes of Monmouth and Norfolk - the later being one of many Catholics to subscribe; as well as many local gentry. The presence of such figures as Monmouth may have been part of a campaign to reaffirm his Stuart and Protestant credentials during the Exclusion Crisis, rather than any particular devotion to the memory of the martyr. It is often thought that those who subscribed to the church were died-in-the-wool Royalists, Tories and Anglicans; yet Greenwood's examination of the lists does not support such a reading. In looking at the party allegiance of the MPs who donated money she discovered that there were as many Whigs and dissenting allies amongst the number as Tories and Anglicans.

Greenwood argues that social status rather than ideology prompted individuals to donate money.

the desire to be associated with a project which brought one in to contact with the aristocracy and court being the principal motivation.

The main architectural feature of the church is the fine plaster ceiling, the work of a local man, John Wetherall, and Henry Doogood, chief plasterer to Sir Christopher Wren, and a skilled and experienced craftsman who worked on St Paul's and Wren's other London churches. This connection with Wren is not surprising as he and his family were distinguished by their loyalty to the royal cause. Christopher Wren was nephew to Matthew Wren, the Laudian bishop of Ely who had spent 18 years in the Tower for his royalism; and son of Dean Wren of Windsor, a former Chaplain to Charles I. Christopher himself had remained loyal to the Church of England at Oxford during the Republic, and after the Restoration he attested his devotion to the memory of the martyr by his strict observance of the Fast. In 1678, the same year that work began on the church in Tunbridge Wells, Wren was commissioned to design a mausoleum for Charles, a project which must surely have pleased him both politically and architecturally.116

A. R. Beddard has detailed the story of Wren's mausoleum in depth and there is no need to repeat his work here, except to note that the mausoleum was never built. It was another victim of the Exclusion Crisis and the decision of Charles II to rule without a Parliament for the last four years of his reign. However, Ralph Josselin noted the fact that on the 30th January 1678, Parliament had voted money 'to bury the late king after 29 years in the grave. Strange things.'117 The mausoleum stands in some measure as a symbol of the divisions within English society which manifested themselves during the Exclusion Crisis and, after 1685, in James II determination to learn from the 'mistakes' of his father by not conceding to those who counselled caution and reconciliation.118 The so-called 'Restoration settlement' had left many important issues of government and religion distinctly unsettled, and for all the rejoicing at Charles' return in 1660 the experience of Civil War, regicide and Republic could not be so easily brushed aside. Many of the attitudes and beliefs which determined the course of Restoration politics were formed as a direct

---

117 Josselin, R. *Diary.* 1908. p. 172
118 In this regard it is significant that during the debate in the Common on the proposed mausoleum, Edmund Waller expressed the hope that it 'will bury all the jealousies betwixt the king and us.' (Beddard. p. 47 n.70)
result of those experiences. The cult of the martyr was formed in the crisis of defeat and exile in the 1650s and on its establishment in the early 1660s retained the characteristics of its birth and development. In its historiography and political theology the cult of the Restoration church perpetuated the typologies and parallels of the 1640s and 50s through the centrality of bloodguilt, the conviction that sin and ambition were at the root of the conflict, the presentation of the rebels as black-hearted villains without conscience or mercy, and in the exalted view of Charles' virtues and the assurance of his sanctification. After the Restoration the message to contemporaries was one of admonition and warning: repent of the sin of resistance and be on your guard 'lest '41 come again.'

This message was based upon the knowledge that not everyone shared the Royalist Anglican historiography nor agreed with their reading of contemporary events. The presence of dissenters and the politically dissident acted as a constant temptation to the exponents of the cult to make the message ever more strident. The credulity and violence surrounding the Popish Plot and Exclusion revealed the fundamental divisions which existed within English society and which rapidly crystallised into Whig and Tory; divisions which many contemporaries believed were potentially disastrous. It was perhaps inevitable in these circumstances that the figure of the martyr should be reduced to that of a party label. As the crisis of 1678-82 deepened, Charles ceased to be regarded as a sign of collective guilt and repentance, or a symbol of the dangers of arbitrary power and became instead a weapon in the propaganda war, to be paraded by one side and ignored or criticised by the other. Thus the mausoleum reveals the ambiguity of the Restoration cult. It was proposed as a means of honouring, commemorating and establishing the memory of the martyr; if it had been built, it would have given a concrete reality to the Royalist Anglican image of the martyr and the political theology which underpinned that image. However, it was not to be, and the mausoleum fell victim to the divisions and passions aroused by the unresolved nature of the Restoration settlement, many of these issues being identical to those over which Charles and his opponents fought and which had originally brought him to the scaffold.

Yet for all the divisions and crises, for all the apparent strength of the Whigs and the survival of Republican ideas it should not be forgotten that Exclusion was defeated, and that James II ascended a throne which was apparently secure, supported by the clergy and the full panoply of
Tory political theology. This victory after 1682 was not achieved exclusively by political manoeuvrings at Whitehall and Westminster, but because the Tories, just as much as the Whigs, could call upon a continuing and articulate tradition of conservative, Royalist and Anglican sentiment in the country. If such support had never existed there could have been no King's party or Civil War in 1642; Charles would not have been revered as a martyr after 1649; the Restoration would have been still-born and Exclusion passed through Parliament without debate or opposition. Royalist, Anglicans and later Tories were not isolated or eccentric figures, rather they represented an ideology and an interest as powerful and as coherent as their Parliamentary, dissenting and Whig opponents. From the crowds who greeted Charles II's entry into London in May 1660 to the mobs who attacked dissenting meeting houses in 1682, there is a continuity of conservative popular support which cannot be ignored and from which the cult drew much of its continuing strength.
Chapter five. The Madding-Day: the cult in 'the age of party', 1685-1745

While tyranny ran on the church side, the clergy could easily conjure up a divinity to be a pimp to it. *(High Church politics. 1710. p49)*

God was pleased thus severely to afflict him for the public trial and exercise of his virtues; and that he was in a particular manner chosen and appointed by Providence to exhibit a new royal example of Christian suffering, and so, if possible, to restore the decaying virtue of these last, these worst ages of the world. *(Whalley, J. A sermon preached before the House of Commons. 1740. p7)*

On Friday 18th May, 1688 six bishops presented a petition drawn up by themselves and William Sancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury to James II, requesting that he delay his order to have the Declaration for Liberty of Conscience read in churches on the following Sunday. The petition illustrates the level of tension which had developed between James and the Church of England over his attempts to ease the burden on his Catholic co-religionists since his coronation three years earlier. Then the Anglican hierarchy had been loud in their support for their legitimate King and his coronation was seen as the final defeat of the attempted Exclusion and the Whig principles associated with that policy. Papist James may have been, but as long as he defended the Church of England, it would continue to uphold the principles of the Restoration settlement and teach the duty of non resistance and passive obedience. What James, and many subsequent historians, failed to appreciate was that non resistance and passive obedience did not hand the King a blank cheque to do whatever he pleased. As Mark Goldie has so perceptively pointed out, there were definite limits to the Anglican doctrine of obedience and submission which James would have been well advised to heed.¹ Non resistance and passive obedience meant that one was obliged to obey a superior in all things lawful. If, however, the superior ordered something which was contrary to God's law or natural law, or even - and this was always more problematic - statute law, one had a responsibility to refuse one's obedience. Yet such a refusal had to be passive in construction; having refused one's obedience, one was obliged to accept whatever punishment or vengeance the slighted superior might inflict. What James failed to understand in 1688 was that the Anglican hierarchy considered a toleration of Roman Catholics and dissenters based solely upon the King's dispensing powers as unlawful and a repudiation not just of their monopoly, but of

the Restoration settlement and that uniformity which was the basis of a confessional state. James should have been aware of this if he had listened to the rising tide of criticism in Anglican sermons during his short reign; yet his anger at being presented with the petition suggests that he had assumed that the Church of England would support their King in his policy to break their monopoly and grant a toleration.

In the account of this meeting written by Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, James' response to the petition was immediate and significant. It was, he said 'a standard of rebellion,' at which the bishops loudly protested their loyalty, the Bishop of Bristol reminding the king that he had already helped crush Monmouth's rebellion in the south west 'and I am as ready to do what I can to quell another, if there were occasion.' Hyde suggests that the principal discussion between James and the bishops centred around the legality of the dispensing power, whereas J. S. Clarke in his Life of James the second of 1816 has James reminding the bishops of the dangers of resistance and, in language reminiscent of 1641, warning of the dangerous precedents they were creating. James claimed that the petition was like the 'sounding of Sheba's trumpet and that the seditious preaching of the puritans in the year 40 was not of so ill consequence as this, that they [the bishops] had revived a devil they could not lay, and that when it was too late they would see their error and would be the first that would repent it.'

James' reaction to the petition reveals not only his misreading of Anglican political theology, but also the immediacy of the Civil Wars in the late seventeenth century. James compares the petition to puritan preaching of 1640 and 1641; he fears that this is the beginning of a renewed assault upon the monarchy and the prerogative and he is furious that such a threat should come from the very people who had, apparently, spent years denouncing resistance and extolling monarchy. The bishops for their part were appalled at the suggestion that they were encouraging resistance to lawful authority. Had not the Church of England always set its face against active resistance and rebellion? Had not the Anglican clergy demonstrated the principles of

---


obedience by their constancy to the Stuarts under the Republic, during the Exclusion Crisis and in the late rebellion by Monmouth? But the immediate issue - the King's declaration on liberty of conscience - is discussed in terms of the Civil Wars and the reactions of James and the bishops is coloured and determined by their experience of rebellion, regicide and the anxiety that '41 might come again. As such, this meeting between James and the bishops represents one of the principal themes of this chapter, namely the survival and continuing relevance of Civil War imagery and rhetoric well into the eighteenth century, and the ways in which the figure of Charles I was used and abused to fight the political and religious battles of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

For one of the most striking things about this period is the way in which the experience of the Civil Wars resonates through most of the controversies and rhetoric. From James' reaction to the petition, to the London riots over an alleged Calves-Head Club in 1735, the Civil Wars were endlessly invoked, usually as a polemical device to warn against the dangers of change and to tar with the brush of fanaticism and regicide one's opponents. Indeed the survival of the Fast Day itself - despite adaptations and increasing attacks upon it - ensured that once a year the whole question of the origins of government, the grounds of obedience, the boundaries of resistance, and the nature of rebellion and regicide would be rehearsed and debated. Another reminder of the implications of the Civil Wars was the presence of the Jacobites, a constant reminder of the fate of the Stuarts. This connection was illustrated trenchantly during the Atterbury Plot when the publisher Edward Bowen produced an engraving of Atterbury in 1723 in which the Bishop is seated behind bars holding an image of Archbishop Laud (See fig.10). This draws the parallel between the persecution of the 'martyr' Laud and the new martyrdom being endured by Atterbury for his constancy to the same principles of legitimacy in government and true religion. Making the same point in a different way, the bookseller could inform Parson Adams in Henry Fielding's Joseph Andrews that

The trade is so vastly stocked with [sermons] that really, unless they come out with the name of Whitefield or Wesley, or some other such great man, as a Bishop, or those sort of people, I don't care to touch; unless now it was a sermon preached on the 30th of January
but truly, for a dry piece of sermons, I had rather be excused; especially as my hands are
so full at present.4

This chapter covers a long period of great significance. The debate over the significance
of 1688, the 'rage of party', the ferocious religious battles of Anne's reign and changes in the place
and perception the Church of England; the emergence of Great Britain as a world power, the
threat of Jacobitism, the long hegemony of Walpole, and the growth or otherwise of stability under
the first two Georges, continue to be important areas of research, discussion and revision. Much of
that debate centres around the question of stability and fragmentation in British society. At first
sight, the period is distinguished by deep and bitter divisions between Anglican and Dissenter,
Whig and Tory, Jacobite and conformist. A glance at the voluminous tract material produced in
the first decades of the eighteenth century reveals a society apparently at war within itself, with a
substantial part of the nation confident that civilised society is in the melting pot and that it is only
a matter of time before the Commonwealth is restored, the Church proscribed and monarchy
overthrown. Yet as J. V. Beckett has observed, if Britain was a divided society after 1688 why,
unlike the 1640s or during the Exclusion Crisis, were the battles between Whigs, Dissenters, Tories
and Anglicans kept largely within bounds? Why was there so little extra-parliamentary activity?
Also, if these divisions were so fundamental, why did they wither away after about 1730, to be
replaced by J. H. Plumb's famous stability?5

Returning to the confrontation between James and the bishops in May 1688; it was not
the intention of those bishops to force James into exile, neither did they expect to see William of
Orange assume the throne and exact from them an oath of allegiance the following year.
Archbishop Sancroft, who had helped draft the petition, might well have reflected upon James'
words about the dangers of offering resistance when he elected to resign his office rather than take
the said oath. Yet the momentum of events had, as James predicted, carried the bishops far beyond
anything most of them would have desired or approved. By the following year James was in exile,
William on the throne and the Bill of Rights passing through Parliament.

4 Fielding, H. "The adventures of Joseph Andrews and his friend Mr. Abraham Adams". The works
5 Plumb, J. H. The growth of political stability in England 1675-1725. 1967
For those Tories who took their principles seriously, 1688 and 1689 must have been an uncomfortable period. All the carefully constructed beliefs of the previous twenty-eight years seemed to have been rejected, the apparent victory over Exclusion had been reversed and James replaced by a Protestant. Generally three options were available to them: the first was that of the non-jurors, a total rejection of the Revolution and its principles and a dogged constancy to the letter and logic of the Restoration church. In following James into exile figures such as Ken and Sancroft were not condoning either James' religion or his attempted toleration, both of which the Church of England had criticised in no uncertain terms when James was on the throne. The King could be wrong and the King could commit sins; yet he was still the King, and as such he was God's vicegerent and their oaths to him were still binding. Thus Atterbury's loud denunciations of popery did not stop him recognising the Old Pretender as his true king in 1722. The non-jurors represented a continuing and respected strand of Anglican Jacobitism which was to be of significance throughout this period. The second option was to follow Gilbert Burnet and throw in one's lot with the Revolution and the Williamite establishment. Burnet is a classic example of a man who changed his mind after having preached obedience and legitimacy during the Exclusion Crisis. As we have seen, his enemies waited until 1710 before reprinting his Fast Day sermons of 1680 and 1681, yet Burnet's change of heart signifies that an individual's reflection upon events did sometimes result in a profound transformation of opinion and political allegiance. The third option, adopted by the majority of the Tory gentry and clergy (as well as quite a few of the less radical Whigs) was to remain within the political system and accept - often grudgingly - the fait accompli of the Revolution; whilst at the same time trying to salvage as much of the Restoration settlement as possible. In religion this meant scuppering the comprehension plans which were to accompany the toleration of 1690, interpreting that Act as narrowly as possible whilst seeking to maintain the social position and monopoly of the Church of England. In the political sphere, as Gerald Straka has shown, it meant the retention of patriarchalism and the adoption of something approximating to the 'loyalist' position of the 1650s, namely, the divine right of the powers-that-be.6

This determination of the Tories and significant sections of the Whig gentry to salvage and retain much of the Restoration settlement is evidenced in 1690 by the furore caused by the

publication of the Anglesea Memorandum. In 1686 the auctioneer Millington was instructed to
sell the library of Arthur Annesley, first Earl of Anglesea. In a copy of the *Eikon Basilike* Millington
discovered a sheet of paper dated 1675 in which Charles II and the Duke of York apparently
admitted to Anglesea that their father was not the author of the *Eikon*, but rather it was the work of
John Gauden. Millington sent the paper to Whitehall, where it was seen by Bishop Patrick of Ely
who later reflected that this might explain why Clarendon did not mention the King's Book in his
writings. The paper was political dynamite and in 1690 it finally appeared in print, annexed to a
Dutch edition of Milton's *Eikonoklastes*. The response was immediate; 1691 saw the publication of
*Restitution to the royal author, or a vindication of King Charls the martyr's most excellent book : Intitled Eikon
Basilike from the false, scandalous and malicious reflections lately published against it*, probably by Samuel
Keble, who simply claimed that the paper was a forgery designed by Charles' latter day opponents
to blacken his name. Keble included the testimony of William Levett, a page to Charles at
Newport, who claimed to have seen Charles working on the drafts of the *Eikon*. The following year
Richard Hollingworth published *A defence of King Charles I*, which went through two editions, and in
which he defended Charles' authorship and himself drew on eye witness accounts of the late King
working on the manuscript. Hollingworth entered into debate with Anthony Walker of Essex, who
attempted to refute Hollingworth's arguments and defended Gauden's claims in *A true account of the
author of a book entituled Eikon Basilike*. Hollingworth appears to have been assisted by one Luke
Milbourne who, whilst Vicar of Great Yarmouth, worked to refute the claims made against the
King's Book. In a tract published in 1692 in Amsterdam and dismissed by Madan as 'scurrilous',
Milbourne is named as 'assistant to Dr Hollingworth in his mighty undertakings'. We will meet
Milbourne again shortly!

The following year, 1693, Hollingworth preached the Fast Day sermon at St. Botolph's
Aldgate, in which he referred to the controversy over the authorship of the King's Book, dismissing
from the pulpit Gauden's claims, the Memoranda and defending Charles' authorship.
Hollingworth also announced that a new edition of Symmon's *Vindication of King Charles*, first
published in 1648, was to be shortly reprinted. Apart from those works published in the 1650s,
Madan refers to thirty-two works produced between 1689 and 1745 dealing wholly or in part with

\[7\] Madan. 1950. p. 142
the authorship controversy. Whilst Madan's bibliographical work is impeccable, he does not consider the implications of the fact that once every eighteen months another book or tract appeared which discussed the authorship of the Eikon Basilike. For it was not just a discussion of bibliographic or antiquarian interest, but one of immediate political import, and the stance one took over the authorship controversy was often pre-determined by one's opinions on the wider issues of government and society. For those who had never felt comfortable with the piety and politics of the King's Book, the doubts raised as to Charles' authorship must have been welcome. But to those committed to the cult, the doubts cast on the book's authorship must have come as a profound shock. On the one hand, the logic of the political theology surrounding the cult could never accept any questioning of the Eikon Basilike. It was in many respects the corner stone of the cult, and had for a generation been lauded as an unparalleled book, almost on a par with scripture itself. Like Charles' radical innocence in the face of his accusers, the integrity of the Eikon was essential to the maintenance of the image of the martyr. This fact was as well known to the opponents of the cult as it was to its supporters. Critics of the cult were very well aware that to undermine the King's authorship of the Eikon would strike a mortal blow at the cult itself; hence the ferocity of the exchanges and the need of the orthodox to repudiate utterly the doubts cast upon their holy book.

The Anglesea Memorandum ensured that the cult became one of many battlegrounds between Whigs and Tories, Anglican and Dissenter, conformist and Jacobite. As the battle lines of the Exclusion Crisis were re-formed after 1688 so the process detailed in the previous chapter, whereby the figure of Charles became a party label is accelerated. Defence of the martyr becomes a symbol of political and social attitudes and beliefs, identifying allies and enemies. As Richard Hollingworth put it

the reason of my zeal and labour in the vindication of this King is, that the principles by which this king was murdered and by which his murder is now justified, will, if they prevail once more, destroy our English ancient monarchy, and tear up the roots again, of the best constituted church in the world; and by the grace of God, as I will never

8 ibid pp. 139-161
contribute to such a design, so according to my small ability, I will in my place endeavour
to prevent it, let what will come of me and mine.9

One consequence of this process was that the cult was becoming increasingly
vulnerable to revisionist interpretations of the Civil Wars. A cult forged in the fire of the King's
defeat, imprisonment, execution, and the exile of his supporters, was not interested in half
measures, or accommodations with perceived enemies. The image of Charles created in the 1650s
was one of absolutes; his virtues were complete, his book was unparalleled, his innocence absolute,
and his enemies black hearted villains. During the Restoration such a view could be maintained
because church and state upheld and promoted a consistent image of the martyr. After 1688 that
consistency was under threat; the Revolution, the toleration, the rise of deism, the renewed
controversy between Whigs and Tories, all served to divorce the cult from its political setting. It
fragmented between those who wished to preserve the traditional cult and the full panoply of
Restoration political theology intact, those who rejected the martyr outright, and those who could
only maintain the cult by adapting the political theology to suit the changing situation; jettisoning
in the process some of the more high-flown concepts, and instead presenting Charles as a victim of
fanaticism and enthusiasm and turning him into a conservative defender of the powers-that-be.
One sign of this change of attitude towards the cult was that its exponents could increasingly find
themselves attacked in print for what they might declare from the pulpit on the 30th January. This
in itself is a remarkable change from the period before the Revolution, when no such public
criticism of an official Fast Day sermon would have been tolerated.

Thus in 1694, with the authorship controversy still ringing in everyone's ears, the Fast
Day sermon before the House of Commons was preached by Peter Birch.10 In many ways Birch's
sermon is commonplace and full of the typology with which we are by now familiar. Birch
catalogues Charles' virtues and constancy, he is described as 'the greatest ornament' to religion,
and 'a new example of fortitude to the decaying virtue of the age.' This innocent and virtuous
prince was murdered by the sins of the people manifested in faction, malice and envy; a murder

9 Hollingworth, R. The death of King Charles I. proved a downright murdera London, 1693. Epistle
Dedicatory, a4r.
10 Birch, P. A sermon before the honourable House of Commons, at St. Margaret's Westminster, January 30.
which entails the nation in the guilt of spilling innocent blood, and which resulted the captivity of
the Republic, when

we beheld servants on horses and princes walking as servants on the earth; that our laws,
our liberties, and our religion were a prey to such as scoffed at kings and made princes a
scorn, and that after we were restored to them again, by a miracle as great as our
ingratitude, yet then also God took the sword into his hand that he raised up a foreign
army to make war upon our coasts, that he sent the pestilence into our streets and a
devouring fire to lay waste our metropolis.¹¹

Birch is entirely conventional in his insistence that just as national sins brought Charles to the
scaffold, so only national repentance will avert God's anger and judgement; as he puts it, 'I hope
we shall never forget our interest by growing weary of the duty;' for the Church of England was
beset by papists and dissenters, foreign armies once again threatened the coasts, toleration was
used as an excuse to indulge impiety and atheism and deism grew daily. Whilst Birch accepted the
Revolution as an act of providence and called for 'civil obedience' to the powers-that-be,
nevertheless he reminded his audience that the rebels of the 1640s were also responsible for the
crisis of the Revolution in that they forced the Stuarts into the arms of the papists.¹²

Birch was not saying anything that had not been said many times before. His view of
Charles, bloodguilt, national responsibilities, the providential nature of the Revolution and the
conclusions which could be drawn from the narrative were wholly conventional. Indeed, Birch is
restrained in his view of monarchy and does not include any overt rhapsodies to divine right or
passive obedience. Yet his sermon drew forth from an anonymous Whig a studied and detailed
response, attacking the cult, the Anglican clergy and Birch personally. In fact 1694 witnessed two
such attacks on the cult, and as they are the first extant criticisms of the Fast Day they are worth
discussing in some detail.

The response aimed specifically at Peter Birch which, with leaden wit, was entitled A
birchen rod for Dr. Birch, discussed point by point the details of Birch's sermon and by implication the
thousands of Fast Day sermons delivered each years since the Restoration. The author begins by
attacking that most singular feature of the cult, the Christ-Charles parallel, calling it 'odious'. His
¹¹ ibid p. 19
¹² ibid pp. 17, 22
view of the regicide is revealed when he goes on to say that he 'wonders that men who are divines by profession are not afraid of profaning the greatest ordinances of the gospel by comparing them to so mean a thing.' The author offers his own parallel, that between Charles and Saul; for like Saul, Charles was a tyrant who died by the hand of his people acting in self defence. Here the author touches upon one of the distinguishing marks between those who did and those who did not accept the implications of the Revolution, for he uses the same biblical text as Birch - David's fight against Saul - to construct a right of resistance, or at least a right of self defence against a tyrant. Just as 'the people of England invited his present Majesty to rescue them from popery and slavery', so had David carried defensive arms against the murderous intentions of Saul. Indeed, he goes further and claims that whilst Saul was king by the express will of God and the consent of the people this 'cannot be said of any king now, no, not of those whose crowns are hereditary, seeing it was only the people's choice, or at least consent, which made them so originally, as is evident from the Histories of all nations'. An exaltation of 'the people' which William III himself would have found difficult to swallow and which leads the author onto a discussion of the place of non-resistance, which, if Birch's arguments are to be accepted, refutes that other Anglican tenet, the divine right of kings. For if we are bound to obey all governors, whether they be republican, monarchical, legitimate or usurpers, then divine right actually means nothing more than the right of the mighty to oppress the weak. The author's alternative is to assert that 'the people' have a right to choose the government which best suits their purpose. Although the author fails to define what is meant by 'the people', or to offer any mechanism for managing dissension over what suits everyone's purpose!

The author backs up this defence of resistance by providing an alternative Whig historiography to that associated with the cult. Instead of national sins leading to faction, malice and rebellion, he speaks of the achievements of the Reformation in restoring true religion and of
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13 A birchen rod for Dr. Birch: or some animadversions upon his sermon preached before the honourable the House of Commons, at St. Margaret's Westminster, January 30, 1694. In a letter to Sir T. D. and Mr. H. London, 1694. p. 13
14 As Gerald Straka has demonstrated, the right of self defense in extreme situations was not confined to radical Whigs, but was taught by the post-Revolution Church of England.
15 ob cit pp. 9-10. William may also have been less than pleased with the author's other declaration, that he held his crown only so long as he remained faithful to the original contract.
Parliament in protecting liberty. These achievements were constantly threatened by various Popish Plots, from the Armada to the policies of James II. Whilst Charles I may not have been an out-and-out papist, nevertheless he was easily seduced by those who promised to exalt the prerogative into betraying true religion and threatening the liberty of the subject.

had he [Charles] been but as willing to secure the Parliament of England in their just pretensions as he was the papists in Ireland in their unreasonable demands, the Parliament and he both might have been safe from the fury and insults of an anarchical crew who ruined them and him too.16

Likewise the author counters the usual litany of judgement adopted by the cult. Whereas Birch and his colleagues pointed to the return of the plague, the Great Fire, the popery of James II and the rise of immorality, deism and atheism as evidence of God's continuing anger over the regicide, the author of Birchen-rod posits an alternative list of events designed to provoke the Deity. His list includes the arrogance of princes who believe that they wield a power which rightly belongs to God alone; the perjury of a clergy who encourage princes in such blasphemies; to say nothing of the vice, factions, and plottings of a decadent court under two papist monarchs. 'I leave it to the Doctor's consideration' the author concludes against the next thirtieth of January to tell us whether or not the repentance of his church for these faults, and many others which might be enumerated, be not as likely a way to make God shine upon our counsels and go forth with our armies as the nations repenting for the murder of King Charles the first.17

The author singles out the clergy for particular blame. They it was who tempted Charles into tyranny and attempted to preach the people out of their liberty; they it is who now condemn the dissenters and 'rip up old sores by a yearly commemoration.'18 Yet if one examines the history of the Civil Wars one finds that it was the ancestors of those now called dissenters who were fighting a rear-guard action to defend true religion and liberty against popish clergy. Were not 'the high flown clergy' like Dr. Birch actually responsible for Charles' death, having laboured

16 ibid p. 17. It is not clear by 'anarchical crew' whether the author means the Arminians or Cromwell.
17 ibid p. 29
18 ibid p. 22
so hard to fill his head with notions of power and dominion? And was it not the Presbyterians rather than the Cavaliers who tried to save Charles' life during his trial? But what, asks the author, should one expect from a Church which had spent nearly thirty years preaching non resistance and passive obedience but which acquiesced in the deposition of James II? If, during the Republic, most Anglican clergy conformed to a regime they now affected to abhor it should come as no surprise that now they will conform to the Revolution, for self interest always takes precedent over principle; thus

if the royal martyr had imprisoned their bishops, fallen foul upon their colleges, and given liberty to dissenters, he should even have had leave to perish unattended as well as his son; and therefore it were best for the Doctor to save his breath and not brag so much for his churches loyalty to the martyr: they cut off his grandmother because they were afraid that she would be their enemy, and they drove his son from the throne whenever he began to touch their copy-hold, though they spent their lungs in crying down the Bill of Exclusion so long as they thought that the Duke was their friend. And hence I conclude in spite of the Doctor, that his Church will neither serve God nor the king for nought.

The author then turns to attacking Birch personally; questioning his humility when he claims that Charles' virtues were so great that only the virtuous could fully comprehend them - does Birch count himself among this happy few, demands the author? But it is the attitude of Birch, and by implication 'the high flown clergy', to the Revolution settlement which is at the centre of the Whig attack upon the conforming Tory position. Birch, says the author, seems envious of England's prosperity and success given the 'sin' of regicide. The historiography of bloodguilt and vengeance implies that Birch would prefer the French and the Jacobites to visit fire and sword on a perfidious nation. Does Dr. Birch refer to William III when he claims that the principles of '41 still flourish? What Birch and his peers see as a resurgence of 'king-killing principles' is in fact the victory of true religion and liberty over popery and despotism. The clergy's true motivation is anger that 'men of moderation have by his present Majesty been preferred to mitres', and the toleration restrains the clergy from lording it over the dissenters; the clergy's attitude being apparent in their frequent attempts to tar
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the whole dissenting party with being King Charles his murderers, and imparts his noble resolution to the world that they shall hear of it once a year, but hope that it won't be taken for a invective, though you may be sure that Doctor designs it for one, and the best that his talent is able to furnish. \(^21\)

Ultimately the author of *Birchen-rod*, like other Whig and dissenting polemicists, could attack the Tories at their weakest point; namely their suspected lukewarm attitude to the Glorious Revolution. Looking back at the political theology of the Restoration church it was easy to accuse the conforming clergy of hypocrisy and to question their motives. How could they justify their oaths to both James II and William III? How could they square the deposition of James with the doctrine of passive obedience, non resistance and hereditary succession? As we have seen, and as Mark Goldie has demonstrated, James was not alone in failing to understand the niceties of these doctrines and the fact that they did not entail the church in slavery but rather set limits to the power of princes. But either through ignorance or through a deliberate determination on the part of the Whigs to misrepresent their opponents, it was easier to condemn the Tory clergy for hypocrisy, double-dealing and potential treachery. As the author concludes

> How they can acquit themselves of their breach of oath to the late king, contrary to their principles of passive obedience which they do so much labour again to revive, and how they can be faithful to his present Majesty who came to the crown by such methods as they do all along condemn, I cannot conceive. \(^22\)

1694 also witnessed the publication of another anonymous tract attacking the continued observance of both the Fast Day and Restoration Day entitled *Some observations upon the keeping of the thirtieth of January and twenty-ninth of May*, in which many of the same accusations are repeated. In particular the author points out that despite clergymen of the likes of Dr. Birch and Dr. Newman using David's grief over the death of Saul as a text for their Fast Day sermons, David himself did not entail the observance of the anniversary of Saul's death upon his children and subsequent generations; thus

> to mourn for it once had been enough. When Joseph's coat was brought to Jacob he might unblameably have expressed, as he did, a great sorrow and grief thereupon, even

\(^21\) ibid pp. 24, 15  
\(^22\) ibid p. 30
to have kissed it, to lament the death of so dear a son; but if he had hanged it about his bed, or anywhere else in his chamber, there every evening and morning, or at every meal given it such salutations and done the like as at the first time thereby he might have countenanced many branches of superstition: once, and no more, is discretion about these things whose continued use degenerates into abuse. 

The murder of Charles was 'execrable, as black as words can make it' and the guilt of that innocent blood is a curse upon the land. But, the guilty were punished, the act repudiated and 'after forty-five years there ought to be an end to it'. Is every set-back and calamity experienced by the nation to be attributed to God's continuing anger over the death of Charles? Are the English condemned to live under the same curse as the Jews who can never wash off the strain of Christ's death? And does this not put Charles on a par with Christ himself?

According to the author of this tract, maintaining the Fast inevitably leads to exaggerations and superstitions which must be detrimental to true religion. Thus at Charles' death, some people in 'extravagant fits of superstition' dipped cloths in his blood to keep as relics and to cure disease, things that could not fail to make an impression 'upon the spirits of credulous and ignorant people.' Likewise Dr. Newman and others spent much of their sermons on the Fast Day flattering Charles and praising his virtues and accomplishments in the same way the papist praised their saints, and that

'if he had attributed some miracle then we might have said, as Jesuits used to speak of their Ignatius, Franciscans of their Francis, and Dominicans of their Dominic, upon their days.'

But worse even than the papists, the 'high flown clergy' take the cult to ever more dangerous heights. The author refers to a commemorative medal for Archbishop Laud, struck after the Restoration on which Laud is styled Sancti Caroli praecursor - the precursor of St. Charles. Not only does England now have its own St Charles, 'as Italians have theirs, his name is entered into

---
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the lists of saints, he hath his day, only we have not builded him a church, as is done for Charles Borromeo in Rome, but worse than this is that Laud is here identified as John the Baptist, the precursor of Christ, which means that Charles is being identified with Christ himself and 'this comparison is come not only out of a stamp, but from pulpits too, a place very improper for such doctrines; some now alive have carried on the parallel much beyond bands.'

The problem for this author was that unlike the 5th November, the 30th January and the 29th May were rooted in the celebration of a particular man, which, if carried too far inevitably becomes 'a kind of offering made for the dead'; either way it leads to idolatry and superstition. The corollary of this is that the dead themselves become the object of intercession; having appointed a particular day and time the 'next thing for us to do will be to pray to him.' What the author is saying is that the over zealous observance of the Fast Day introduces popery into a supposedly reformed faith, or 'the clogs of such superstitions and fopperies upon our holy religion.' Although the author claims that his aim is not to disparage the memory of Charles, nevertheless he does return to the thorny question of what makes a martyr and, as we saw in the Introduction, he repeats the definition given by St. Augustine; that it is the truth or otherwise of the cause rather than the courage of the individual concerned which defines true martyrdom. Charles was condemned not on account of his religion, but for pursuing policies detrimental to the peace and security of the nation. His judges were, or claimed to be, Christians, and 'his being a Christian was not the cause or pretence of his being put to death.' If Charles should be admitted a martyr 'he must be a saint and a martyr of a new coin.'

The continuance of the Fast Day can only encourage false religion, perpetuate old divisions and reawaken the passion of the 1640s. The fact that the day was established in the first flush of the Restoration ought to make people aware that it was the product of unreasonable zeal which is now inappropriate. Would not the clergy be better employed fighting profanity and

\[\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\text{ibid p. 483. The author is apparently unaware that by 1694 at least five churches and chapels had been dedicated to 'St. Charles' and that miracles associated with relics of the martyr had been reported in the 1650s.}\]
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deism, which are far more immediate concerns than the memory of Charles? Yet the high flying clergy had always been ambitious and sought to lord it in the state, hence their desire on the one hand to consolidate absolutism and to trick the people with superstition, idolatry and 'to bring again their Diana upon the stage, - the doctrine of passive obedience.' The author hopes that 'the late happy Revolution' will change all this and that the truth will uncover the real motives of the high flying clergy and then the people will realise that the doctrines of non resistance and passive obedience can only lead to slavery and popery; 'wherefore let that thirtieth of January go out of doors, and if we keep a day let it be to God and not to man.'

Both these tracts of 1694 share a deliberate misrepresentation of the Anglican doctrine of non resistance and passive obedience; and this appears even more stridently in another anonymous radical pamphlet of 1698 entitled King Charles I. no saint, martyr, or good Protestant as commonly reputed; but a favoures of papists, and a cruel and oppressive tyrant. According to the title page, this tract was 'Printed in the 10th year of our redemption from popery and slavery', and makes no attempt to hide its contempt both for Charles and his cult, as it is a studied refutation of the theory of non resistance, the reputation of the martyr and the motivation of the church in maintaining the cult. The author immediately turns the cult's political theology on its head by asserting that rather than kings being appointed by God - coming down from heaven as it were - they grow up from the people. The implication being that they are thus the servants of the people and accountable to them. If the king should be a conqueror or usurper then his rule is based merely on armed might, but if he comes to the throne peacefully by hereditary right or invitation, then there is a clear contract between him and the people. The author is obviously familiar with contract theory, as he asserts that the contemporary contract is only one aspect of the first contract which is the original of all government, and it is hardly to be supposed that

the people of England cannot harbour such hard thoughts of their ancestors, as to imagine they would make such ridiculous, foolish and nonsensical bargains as to sell themselves and (as far as in them lay) their poor posterity to a vile, miserable and lasting slavery.

---
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The absolute power of kings, so beloved of the clergy, contradicts the law of self preservation which is a law inherent in nature. It also overturns the Common Law and the coronation oath which together constitute the people's principal defence against tyranny. Passive obedience and non resistance are singled out for particular attack; the author simply cannot understand how any reasonable being could advance such 'abominable enslaving doctrines' which can only corrupt the prince and oppress the people; for

if strictly observed the people hands being tied up, and nothing but prayer and tears left, one armed tyrant may (if he pleaseth) destroy all his subjects, and they, like madmen, be accessory to their own deaths.

These ideas, rather than being derived from Scripture, were dreamt-up by 'a most ignorant, profane and vicious clergy, learned in nothing but their pride, their covetousness and superstition', who used the press and the pulpit to spread their poison and who attempted to exalt themselves by corrupting their prince and enslaving the people.

By contrast the author details at length the qualities necessary to ensure the survival of true religion and liberty, calling on Bracton to support the claim that the Common Law is above the will of a king and that Parliament is entrusted with the right and duty to admonish a king who steps outside the law. Here is represented a digest of Whig doctrine, based on the principle that the good of the people is the highest law. If kings are made by the people, then the people have a right and a duty to judge their actions and call them to account when they break their contract. Of particular importance to the author is the assertion that once a king or ruler breaks the contract, they immediately fall into tyranny and by so doing so break any bonds of loyalty or obedience they might expect from the people whilst they ruled lawfully. At this point the people are at liberty not only to defend themselves and resist the tyrant, but also to reconstitute the government on a different basis. Although, as in so many Whig discourses, the author fails to define either who constitutes 'the people', or who is to decide what constitutes their good, or how their will in such matters is to be expressed. Yet the argument put forward during the Exclusion Crisis, that no governor is above the law, is again forcefully expressed in the following litany

---

33 Ironically, Charles used this same coronation oath to justify his defence of the Church of England against Presbyterianism.
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That salus populi est suprema lex; that the king was made for the kingdom, and not the
kingdom for him.
That the king doth not maintain the kingdom, but the kingdom the king.
That the king and all magistrates are the kingdom’s ministers and servants.
That it is their duty and glory to serve the kingdom.
That kings must not reign by their kingdom’s ruin, nor be lifted up by their downfall.
That the end is greater than the means, health better than physic.
That the king was not advanced to debase and enslave his people.
That it is not the ordinance of God that millions of men should be miserable slaves and
vassals to one.
That if the king be God’s anointed Jure persona, in the right of his person, he is man’s
appointed Jure Corona, in right of the crown; and therefore though he is above every one
singly, yet not above all.

For common safety is the sole sovereign.35

Having dispensed with the ideology of the cult, the author also dismantles the
reputation of the martyr himself who is immediately introduced as ‘a bloody and tyrannical
oppressor’. Far from being a just and virtuous ruler, concerned with the welfare of his people and
opposed by a ruthless and ambitious faction; Charles was a scheming despot, ‘who hath offered at
more cunning fetches to undermine the liberties of England and put tyranny into an art than any
British king before him.’36 How, asks the author, could anyone bow before the image of such a
man? One who is happy to use a pagan prayer on the scaffold, who was content to persecute the
godly, ‘doubting that their principles to much asserted liberty’, who profaned the Sabbath by
introducing the Book of Sports, and whose overweening arrogance did not stop at comparing himself
to God. The author answers his own question: Charles’ supporters, then and now, consist of
papists, cavaliers, drunkards, blasphemers and desperate men - in a word, malignants.37

35 ibid p. 6. The author also takes a swipe at the Jacobites and non-jurors, wondering how these
arguments of self-preservation and the public good could fail to move those ‘who choose rather to
break the solemn oaths they took to feed their flocks, than to comply with swearing faith and true
allegiance to that Prince [William III] that Providence in a most miraculous manner raised up to
deliver these three kingdoms from the Egyptian slavery it groaned under’. p. 7
36 ibid p. 2
37 ibid p. 4. The mention of the prayer refers to Pamela’s prayer from Sir Philip Sidney’s Arcadia
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Charles' tyranny was evident in the imposition of Ship Money and monopolies, raising an illegal army, undermining the law by his refusal to summon Parliament and finally waging war on his own people and plotting with foreign powers. His popery was evident not only in his marriage and maintenance of a popish chapel in his palace, but also in his conciliatory gestures to the Papacy and Catholics in England and Ireland which culminated in the prospect of his using an Irish, Catholic army to subdue the English. In fact his whole reign was such a continual piece of popish tyranny and oppression that the people of England with the greatest cheerfulness, ran the hazard of their lives and fortunes to free themselves and posterity from them both.

To claim him as a martyr is false, for, if the term martyr means witness, then Charles only witnessed to error and oppression. He was not executed because he was a Protestant, or because he witnessed to the truth 'but for favouring papists and subverting in a most arbitrary manner all the laws and liberties of England'.

Yet if Charles was so obviously a villain, why had the Fast Day been so successfully maintained for the previous thirty eight years? Ironically the author offers much the same reasons as the Royalists to explain the rebellion; namely faction and self-interest. For the principal upholders of the day are the high flying clergy - the same clergy who in the 1630s had 'from the press and pulpit poisoned the people with the following abominable, enslaving doctrines of passive (or more properly assive) obedience, non resistance, obeying without reserve'. Their contemporary colleagues, consumed by ambition, know that they must flatter kings to gain their patronage; therefore their greed induces them to cry up monarchy. Yet their greed leads them not only to pronounce on matters of which they know nothing, or which does not concern them, it also gives them ideas above their station. Encouraged by their command of the pulpit and their proximity to the gentry, they think of themselves as important and worthy of deference, whereas in fact they are only 'parish boys'.

which is included in the *Eikon Basilike* and which Milton denounced as paganism. In 1697 Thomas Wagstaffe had charged Milton and Bradshaw with inserting the prayer into the King's Book with the express intention of blackening the King's reputation, see Madan, 1950. Appendix 1.
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The anticlerical nature of this tract is obvious; the clergy are singled out not only as the chief instigators of Charles' alleged plot to undermine liberty and true religion, but as an overbearing Jacobite fifth column, dedicated to undoing the Revolution settlement. That the Fast Day provided a platform for such sedition is the principal reason the author gives for its abolition. It allowed 'a most ignorant, profane and vicious clergy' to keep alive the animosities and divisions of the 1640s, demeaned the memory of Parliament and those who fought to preserve liberty and true religion. It gave comfort to Jacobites by throwing doubt upon the legitimacy of resistance, thus calling into question the events of 1688-89 as well as those of 1641, and it also gave succour to all those who opposed the government of William III. In terms of religion, the Fast Day sullied the reputation of true martyrs and in presenting blasphemous and exaggerated parallels between Charles and Christ rendered religion ridiculous.41

These three tracts from the 1690s have been discussed at some length because they are some of the earliest extant examples of outright opposition to the cult and its political theology. Having discussed the literature of the cult itself in depth, it seems appropriate to examine the contrary views in the same detail. Such views, however, did not appear out of nowhere in the wake of 1688. The internal evidence of Fast Day sermons preached during the Exclusion Crisis suggests that such views were already being expressed. Yet these tracts are further evidence that contemporary debate was often conducted in terms of the Civil Wars and the regicide, as John Kenyon observed, 'any current political dispute was likely to swoop back without notice to the 1640s and 1650s, where the contestants had to fight the Civil Wars all over again'.42 Yet it is a mistake historians sometimes make to assume that the existence of a tract or the criticism of an established principle or observance necessarily means that the principle or observance is in terminal decline. Sometimes a tract is a sign of frustration at the continuing strength and vitality of a principle, and this, I would argue, may be the case with these anti-cult tracts of the 1690s.

Whilst it is true that after 1688 the proponents of the cult had to recognise the existence of those who rejected the image of the martyr and the political theology implicit in that image,

41 To back-up these criticisms of the Fast Day the author quotes approvingly from Gilbert Burnet's 30th January sermons discussed in the previous chapter. The author seems to be unaware that Burnet - now the champion of the Revolution - had in 1680 offered his 'criticisms' of the maintenance of the Fast Day as a rhetorical device and that the sermons defend the observance.

nevertheless the 30th January still featured prominently in the liturgical and political calendar. Throughout the reigns of William and Anne the Fast Day continued to be solemnly observed at Court, by Parliament, by the City and, outside London, by the Universities, Boroughs and Cathedrals as well as in numerous parish churches and public schools. Whatever exceptions and accommodations preachers at Westminster and St. Paul's might feel constrained to make, in the provinces one would hardly know that James had ever fled. Thus at Deptford in 1694 John Evelyn records hearing a staunchly patriarchal sermon which detailed 'the excellency of kingly government above all other, deriving from Adam, the patriarchs, God Himself,' and other passages in this sermon, nearly touching the dethroning K. James, not easily to be answered.\footnote{Evelyn, Diary: Vol.5, pp. 165-6.}

None of this should now surprise us, despite the modern cottage industry in Lockean studies and the understandable interest aroused by Hobbes, Sidney, Toland and all precursors of 'modern' political theory; to contemporaries the world view of the 1690s was much as it had been in the 1680s and 1670s; Filmer was more widely read than Locke. With reference to the cult, the traditional Royalist Anglican view of the martyr was far more prevalent than a concentration upon radical Whig critiques of the cult might suggest. It is well known that Locke wrote the first of his Two treatise of government expressly to refute Filmer, as did Sidney in his Discourses concerning government; and when, in 1709, Hoadly published The original and institution of civil government discussed, he felt constrained to devote half the book to a dismantling of patriarchalism.\footnote{For a discussion of the enduring influence of patriarchalism in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century see: Filmer, R. Patriarcha and other political works. Peter Laslett, ed. 1949. Patriarcha and other writings. J. P. Sommerville, ed. 1991. Schochet, G. J. Patriarchalism in political thought. 1975. The Whig tract of 1709, Vox populi, Vox dei, attributed to Thomas Harrison is significant in that it largely ignores the whole question of patriarchalism in representing the arguments for resistance and the contract (Kenyon, 1990. pp. 123-4)
death of the saints. Whilst in the very year of Revolution, the curate in Evelyn's parish preached "a florid oration" on the duty of obedience and the sin of regicide. The following year he notes the impact of the Revolution when, on the Fast Day 'the collects [and litanies] for the King and Queen were curtailed and mutilated'. Dr. Sharp preached to the Commons that year and caused some debate over his determination to pray for James as if he were still King. At St. Martin's the preacher ducked the issue by concentrating on the dangers of popery, 'with a touch of our obligation to the King etc'.

Gilbert Burnet might assert a right of resistance in his Fast Day sermon of 1689, but in 1692 William Sherlock preached on the duty of passive obedience. In 1694 William Stephens declared that William of Orange came not as a conqueror but as a restorer of true religion; whilst in 1697 John Moore was entirely traditional in asserting that government was of divine creation and that the Church of England was unique in teaching the via media between despotism and rebellion. The diaries of John Evelyn and Anthony Wood reveal the Fast being observed in London and Oxford throughout the 1690s. Evelyn's diary records preachers discussing bloodguilt and judgement, the obligations of repentance and the duty of obedience, including the young man of 1694 who out-Filmered Filmer! When the radical William Stephens told the Commons in 1700 that the Fast Day's only purpose was to teach kings how to rule, the Commons condemned the sermon and refused their customary thanks. The following year Edmund Hickergill presented a much more satisfactory sermon concentrating on the parallels between Charles and Naboth - an innocent man murdered by an ambitious faction. In 1704 George Hooper reminded the Lords that the Fast Day existed to remind future generations of the crime of rebellion and its consequences, although the Church of England 'is not insensible of the glories of this saint, and of the lustre thence reflected on herself'. If nothing else, enlightened self-interest should keep Anglicans loyal to the memory of Charles! In the same year Joseph Clifton presented the doctrine of non-resistance and passive obedience to the City of London as the surest way of restraining popular enthusiasm and rebellion, for 'the spirit of government is a thing of which they [the people] are incapable and for which they are neither qualified nor called'. Whilst Robert
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46 Hooper, G. A sermon preached before the Lords London, 1704. p. 20
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Wynne presaged the future use of the Fast Day by presenting the Commons with a conservative reflection on the disastrous effects of change in public life, in which Charles becomes merely a pretext; a theme repeated by Thomas Sherlock before Queen Anne. In 1707, Robert Moss, whom William Nicolson described as 'a stout asserter of the old doctrine of passive obedience', preached before the Commons and admitted that Charles had made mistakes in his government and upset the delicate balance of the constitution. However, he went on to say that this could not justify rebellion and regicide which had trampled all established right under foot. For Moss, as for increasing numbers of preachers, the Fast Day was an opportunity to reflect upon the blessings of settled government. The following year William Wake could discuss non-resistance, but in the context of the limits of obedience, and he admits that in extreme situations the people might defend both themselves and the constitution against a tyrant. Even at the height of the Sacheverell trial in January 1710, Richard West could preach a hostile sermon to the Commons in which he claimed not only that the Royalists had not been blameless in their conduct of the war, but that Charles had been the victim of evil counsellors. West also condemned any extravagant parallels between Charles and Christ, remarking that

I hope we may be allowed to abominate the vile practices of wicked men against their sovereign without presuming to blaspheme for his sake. From there he argues that whilst obedience to lawful authority is a divine law, nevertheless it must be tempered by the needs of self-defence. There is a difference between resisting arbitrary power in the interests of the maintenance of the law and the constitution, and engaging in wilful rebellion. Thus there was no contradiction between honouring Charles as a martyr and the Revolution of 1688, as both were concerned with the maintenance of lawful authority and in defiance of those who would exercise an arbitrary power, for

if any one thinks they were the same principles that made both those changes, he must allow there were the same causes of them, which is doing the greatest injury possible to the memory and to the cause of his martyred sovereign.
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Thomas Hearn remarked that this sermon was not well received by the Commons and the customary vote of thanks to the preacher 'was difficulty obtained'. The sermon also produced a predictable response from an anonymous source who accused West of denigrating the memory of the martyr and of those who remained loyal, as well as using the Fast Day to teach Whiggish principles of popular sovereignty and rebellion. In particular, the author of Remarks on Dr. West's sermon, reminded him of the now familiar biblical precedents for the sacredness of kings, non-resistance and passive obedience. Referring to the Christ-Charles parallel, the author argued that whilst no-one had ever suggested that Charles' death and Christ's Passion were the same in substance, nothing 'more nearly resembled' the Jews' murder of Christ than the rebels murder of Charles; as the author puts it

Was not he God's immediate vicegerent in these realms? Was he not his representative here? And was not the affront done to him done to God also whom he represented? Was he not innocent as a lamb? And was he not made a sacrifice to the barbarity of worse than savages? Why then should you be so bitter against those who resemble his unjust (though allowing a vast disproportion) to those of that eternal God whom he personated?

Yet in the same year, Andrew Snape admitted before the City of London that in approaching the Christ-Charles parallel "it concerns us to tread warily" and that all Christian martyrs reflect something of the Passion "without presuming to equal either the merits or the sufferings of any mere man to those of our crucified Redeemer."

The following year, 1716, William Dawes walked the tight-rope between exalted views of monarchy and the evils of resistance on the one hand, with the need for self defence and the supremacy of law on the other. A theme repeated the following year when Thomas Gooch preached to the Commons on the excellence of the constitution and the ways in which the law supported the prerogative. Ralph Skerret made the same point before the City of London after the

51 Hearn: Vol.2. p. 340
52 Remarks on Dr. West's sermon before the honourable House of commons, on the 30th of January 1710. In a letter to the doctor. London, 1710 p. 10.
Jacobite rising of 1715, when the traditional injunction to submit to superiors is glossed to condemn the Jacobites as disturbers of settled government. If the rebellion against Charles in the 1640s was sinful, was not rebellion against George I also a sin?

In these sermons there is an awareness that the effects of 1688 had to be accommodated, whilst retaining the basic premise of the divine origin of government and the need for subordination in society. As time went on the 'official' sermons increasingly reflected something akin to the 'loyalist' position of the 1650s - that submission was due to the powers that be. But added to this was a respect for lawful authority and the constitution which could justify the Revolution whilst honouring the monarchy and lawful authority. In these circumstances Charles becomes - as indeed he claimed to be - a martyr for established law and a symbol of settled government overturned by a rebellious faction. However, an older and more robust tradition persisted which looked with contempt on what was considered the lax and dangerous doctrines of the fashionable, Whig dominated pulpits of London.

In 1702, Humfrey Michel in Leicestershire, Conyers Place in Dorchester and William Binckes to the lower house of Convocation, all re-presented the traditional political theology of the cult. As did, in 1704, William Tilly at Oxford, John Griffiths in Edensor, Derbyshire and, the following year, George Burghope at Clerkenwell and John Jeffrey in St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich. From 1707 Luke Milbourne sang forth the praises of the martyr in his annual performance at St. Etheldreda's, as did Nathaniel Whaley in Oxford in 1710 and John Jenings at Gaminglay, Cambridgeshire and Edward Cressfield at Witham, Essex in 1711. In 1709 a broadside elegy appeared under the title _The sacred parallel of royal martyrdom_, which could have come straight from the 1650s; full as it is of parallels between puritans and Pharisees, rebels and Jews and an innocent Charles who

was God-like when he died.

Never so great, as in his sufferings;

For suffering saints are more than conquerors and kings.

How gloriously must his bright name excel!

Following the incarnate deity so well. 54

54 _The sacred parallel of royal martyrdom. A poem for the thirteenth of January. London, 1709._
Yet for all the vitality of the traditional political theology, from the Exclusion Crisis onwards the cult existed in an environment where any re-presentation of the Royalist Anglican view of the martyr could not ignore the fact that an alternative system existed which diluted, or even denied, nearly all the tenets of its political theology. In its extreme form this alternative exalted popular rights as opposed to divine right; duplicity and attempted tyranny as opposed to radical innocence; heroic fighters for liberty and true religion as opposed to black hearted villains; and resistance as opposed to passive obedience. However stridently the traditional view might be expounded in print or from the pulpit, the exponent was always aware that he (or she) was unable to command a monopoly of interpretation, and that the person of Charles had entered the arena of debate and controversy.

That the martyr had always been the property of a particular party makes this development not altogether surprising. The Royalist Anglicans had always striven to retain the martyr as their exclusive property and to argue that Charles had sacrificed himself for their vision of church and state. They had zealously defended 'their' martyr from the claims of Presbyterians and others who in the 1650s and early 1660s tried to honour the memory of Charles without accepting all the tenets of Royalist Anglican orthodoxy. Yet after 1688, such a unanimity could no longer be maintained because the exponents of orthodoxy no longer held exclusive control of the press and the pulpit. Immediately, other voices were heard, questioning, and in some cases rejecting outright the political theology of the cult and the image of the martyr it sustained. Whilst the defenders of orthodoxy might seek to ignore these dissident voices, nevertheless their very existence only served to inspire some of the defenders to ever greater heights of invective. We have seen how this process occurred in metropolitan and provincial sermons, but nowhere is this process more apparent in the first two decades of the eighteenth century than in the sermons of Luke Milbourne and Thomas Bradbury. Here is played out, between a high flying Tory and a Whig dissenting minister the conflicts of the early eighteenth century, the continuing relevance of Civil War imagery and the uses and abuses of the royal martyr.

Luke Milbourne was born in 1649, the son of another Luke Milbourne whom we have already met as a Presbyterian who revered the memory of Charles I in the 1650s. After ordination, Luke Milbourne Jr. served as chaplain to the English communities in Hamburg and Rotterdam before returning to Harwich and subsequently becoming vicar of Great Yarmouth; in 1688 he
received the lectureship of St. Leonard's Shoreditch. It was whilst at Great Yarmouth that Milbourne cut his teeth as a Tory propagandist, as early as 1683 he preached a sermon entitled *The original of rebellion: or, the ends of separation*, in which he denounced Exclusion as an attempt to revive the principles of resistance and schism of the 1640s. In 1692, as we have already seen, Milbourne was working with Richard Hollingworth to refute the claim that Charles was not the author of the *Eikon Basilike*. In 1704 Milbourne moved to St. Ethelburga's in the City, and it was from here that he made a name for himself as a high flying divine until his death in 1720. On nearly every Fast Day Milbourne ascended his pulpit to expound, in the most strident terms, the political theology of the cult in all its Restoration panoply; whilst at the same time denouncing in the most violent language, puritans, Whigs, dissenters, papists and all those who, in their impiety, dared to question or lay hands upon the memory of the Lord's anointed.

In contrast to Milbourne stands Thomas Bradbury, a Yorkshireman, nearly thirty years younger than Milbourne. After serving in various independent chapels in Yorkshire and Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Bradbury went to London in 1703 as assistant in the independent chapel in New Street, Fetter Lane. All but one of Bradbury's political sermons were preached whilst pastor of the New Street congregation, the last being in 1718, the year before Milbourne preached his last Fast Day sermon. Bradbury is famous chiefly for his part in the split within non-conformity which occurred at Salters Hall in 1719 over responses to the alleged Arianism of the James Meeting House, Exeter. Bradbury himself boasted that he was the first to proclaim George I 'which he did on Sunday, 1st Aug. 1714, being apprised, whilst in his pulpit, of the death of Anne by the concerted signal of a handkerchief'. Milbourne, on the other hand, was famous in his day as a preacher; although having read his Fast Day sermon for 1713 entitled *A guilty conscience makes a rebel*, White Kennett regretted that he had not remained in Holland! His posthumous fame was assured through his inclusion in the preface to Dryden's *Fables*, were, remarking on Milbourne's literary efforts, Dryden asserts that 'I am satisfied that while he and I live together I shall not be thought the worst poet of the age'.
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55 Milbourne, L. *The originals of rebellion: or, the ends of separation. A sermon preached on the thirtieth of January 1683 in the parish-church at Great Yarmouth*. London, 1683

56 *Dictionary of National Biography*. Vol.2. p. 1059, from which the biographical material concerning Bradbury is taken.
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Between November 1712 and January 1714, in four sermons, Bradbury and Milbourne rehearsed between them most of the issues which separated Whig from Tory and Anglican from dissenter in the early eighteenth century. Even the timing of these sermons is significant, Bradbury using the 5th November, the anniversary not only of Gunpowder Plot but also William of Orange’s landing at Torbay, to argue the Whig/dissenting view; whilst Milbourne replied on the 30th January. Although we will be looking in particular at these sermons, in which they directly confront each other, in many respects all the political sermons of Milbourne and Bradbury of the first two decades of the eighteenth century engage with each other. It is tempting to think that even when not directly mentioned, each had an eye on the other when expounding their views.

The direct confrontation began on the 5th November 1712, when Bradbury preached a sermon entitled *The Ass: or, the serpent*, a concerted attack on the doctrines of non-resistance and passive obedience. Using the story of the tribes of Issachar and Dan from Genesis, Bradbury argued that the tribe of Dan had set a clear example to future generations by raising an army to resist tyranny, whereas Issachar sank into slavery through indifference. The sin of Issachar was the greater because they did not have to be slaves and thus the Bible, according to Bradbury, not only condemns tyranny, it also sanctions resistance. From there, Bradbury confronted the Tory clergy who, he claimed, would make submission the one thing needful, yet

> There is nothing in any one doctrine of Christianity that will tie up the hands of an injured people. One that hath tasted that the Lord is gracious must have pity to the desolation of mankind. He cannot endure to see that nature ruined by a tyrant that hath been honoured by a Saviour. 58

Milbourne responded on the following Fast Day in a sermon printed as *A guilty conscience makes a rebel*, and set the tone of that response in his preface where he calls Bradbury ‘H. Peters, Junior’ and observes that ‘I read the ass in every page and found, though not the wisdom, yet abundance of the malice and venom of the serpent’. 59 Milbourne launches into a rigorous
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58 Bradbury, T. *The ass: or, the serpent. A comparison between the tribes of Issachar and Dan, in their regard for civil liberty. Nov.5. 1712.* 1712. p. 20 This sermon was reprinted in Boston, US in 1768 (DNB. Vol.2. p1058)

59 Milbourne, L. *A guilty conscience makes a rebel; or, rulers no terror to the good prov’d in a sermon preached on the thirtieth of January, 1713.* Preface p. 1
defence of non-resistance using the Bible, the early Christians and the canons of the Church of England as evidence that orthodox Christianity had never sanctioned resistance to those in authority. Such a doctrine was the product of the overweening ambition of the Papacy and the likes of Hobbes, Spinoza and Toland; in other words, it was a novelty, an innovation, and contrary to scripture and tradition. Milbourne challenges Bradbury - or 'Mr. Hugh' as he calls him - 'to give us one single instance out of the book of God of one truly pious man whoever appeared in arms against his lawful sovereign'. What are, Milbourne asks rhetorically, Bradbury's motives in preaching such a sermon? Milbourne argues that it is the same now as it ever was, namely:

down with religion, down with spiritual and temporal government, let sword and fire disturb the rest of a happy people and desolate a pleasant land So sang the rebellious saints of old; so preached Hugh Peters, and we see that devil of sedition is not yet cast entirely out of the party.  

With this as the preface, Milbourne then moves on to the sermon proper where the Christ-Charles parallel is contrasted with that of the biblical Pharisees and the seventeenth century puritan, who he dismisses as 'the unhappy spawn of that hypocritical generation.' Is it surprising that the rebels should seek to pull down the magistrate and escape justice? This is the way the rebels of '41 sought to hide their crimes, and the contemporary sowers of sedition are about the same game! The spirit of rebellion, Milbourne warns, can never be entirely defeated as it is a mark of man's fallen nature, but we can and must guard against it, and the Fast Day is the principal day in the years when we can not only praise God for the defeat of rebellion, but warn succeeding generations to be on their guard lest rebellion return by identifying those in the community who would bring '41 back again.

The following 5th November, Bradbury printed his Gunpowder sermon under the title *The lawfulness of resisting tyrants*, and in the preface responded to Milbourne's attack of the previous January. Bradbury begins by reprimanding Milbourne for being rude and inconsistent, but more importantly Milbourne's attacks on the foundations of civil liberty demonstrate that he has no understanding of the Revolution, why it was undertaken, what it achieved or why if should be defended. If Milbourne is so enamoured of absolutism, Bradbury declares, then he ought to move
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to France where he could have his fill of absolute government! He then goes on to rehearse from the Old Testament the now familiar examples of resistance to tyranny, acknowledging as he does so that scripture might not be the most reliable source for political debate for 'there are few allusions that may not be turned several ways, and the same metaphor does equally serve a commendation and a reproof. Yet most of the preface is devoted to a consideration of the 30th January and the way in which it had been abused by the high flying clergy, who use the day to peddle lies and to rant on old themes. Bradbury confesses that:

I have read many a thirtieth of January sermon, and they are so much the same that I can observe very little new in them but a transposition of terms. Let but any one take a few rattling words for his materials, such as schismatic, atheist, rebels, traitors, miscreants, monsters, enthusiasts, hypocrites; Lord's anointed, sacred Majesty, God's vicegerent; impious, blasphemers, damnation; stir these together in a warm head and after a little shaking, bring them out, scum and all, distribute them into several periods and your work is half done. If such expressions as religion, conscience, justice, privilege of Parliament, innocent blood, liberty and property come in your way, take off the crudities of some of them by softening epithets; call it mock Parliament, false religion, pretended conscience, and tell the world roundly that their privileges, civil rights and liberties are chimeras; that such talk smells rank of '41, and a certain mark of a villain and an enemy to the government. But shall tilling an hour with such stuff as this go for a fast? Is this being humbled for our sins?

To these depths, Bradbury would claim, had the honouring of the martyr been reduced by a clergy solely intent on their own ambition and moved by nothing but their own passions. Even their much vaulted friendship to monarchy is proved to be false by their treatment of James II, and Bradbury sees the Fast Day as the principal reason why James lost his crown. For the clergy had cried up his powers as sacred and told him all his actions were uncontrolled; he no sooner took them at their word but they left him in the lurch. And he judged
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extremely right in his troubles when he cried out, upon seeing a clergyman, 'Ah, sir, it's the men of your cloth that have brought me to this.\textsuperscript{64}

James believed the clergy when they talked of non resistance, passive obedience and divine right, yet, says Bradbury, the clergy themselves only believed in their own freeholds and stipends and were ready to throw over all principle when their livelihoods and incomes were threatened. The logic of their principles meant that after the flight of James they must either be 'a non juror or a knave', and it is obvious in which category Bradbury saw Milbourne and his colleagues!

Given such ranting hypocrisy is it any wonder that the Fast is ignored? The high flyers have brought the day and the name of the martyr they claim to revere into disrepute and they must think the people fools if they cannot see through the double standards and falsehoods of their preaching. Is it any wonder that the congregations leave such performances 'with either anger or mirth' and one cannot help but wonder how many attended Milbourne's Fast Day sermon in expectation of an entertainment rather than out of regard for the memory of Charles I. Moving onto the sermon proper, Bradbury provides a spirited defence of the Revolution and of resistance in principle based on David's resistance to Saul. He puts his trust in the people who will not tolerate oppression passively because they know that the desire for liberty is a God-given instinct which it is right to pursue.

Enough has been said so far to make Milbourne's reply fairly predictable. When it came in January 1714, printed under the title \textit{The traytor's reward: or, a king's death revenged}, the preface again engaged with Bradbury on the question of non-resistance, the duty of obedience and the relevance of the 30\textsuperscript{th} January. On the later point, Milbourne wondered what a priest of the Church of England is supposed to say on such an occasion? He is more than ever convinced of the sacredness of kings and the utter repugnance of rebellion and that the Fast Day - 'one of our political days' as he calls it on another occasion\textsuperscript{65} - is a most suitable opportunity to teach the people their duties; to reprimand their political failings and to expose those, such as Bradbury, who would lead the nation astray. 'But I find that he who would please this gentleman must speak on the 30\textsuperscript{th} of January, the 29\textsuperscript{th} of May, or the 8\textsuperscript{th} of March, just as he does on the 5\textsuperscript{th} of November, i.e.

\begin{itemize}
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Not one word to the purpose."\(^{66}\) James II was ruined not by listening to his Anglican clergy, who warned him repeatedly of the limits of non resistance and passive obedience, but rather by papists and dissenters who, always ready to undermine the Church of England, encouraged James in his policies of toleration. Then, thinking they could get more out of an Anglican toleration, they abandoned him.\(^{67}\) Not that this should surprise anyone, Milbourne continues, for it is well known that puritans and papists have long been in league to destroy the church and reduce the king to a cipher. Does not the 5th November itself recall papists who, to further their liberty and ease their consciences, tried to murder the Lord's anointed, and is not this exactly the same reasoning which led to the murder of Charles in 1649?\(^{68}\)

In this sermon Milbourne also takes the story of David and Saul to 'prove' the biblical warranty of non resistance and passive obedience, and this sermon is full of images and typologies from earlier Fast Day sermons. Thus Charles appears as Josiah, for 'when I give you Josiah's case as a proof that God will not always spare a wicked nation for the sake of a virtuous and exemplary governor; methinks Charles I, the martyr of this day of blessed memory, may, above all others, be looked upon as his perfect parallel.'\(^{69}\) Charles was full of all the virtues; paraphrasing Clarendon, Milbourne summed him up as

\[
\text{the worthiest gentleman, the best master, the best friend, the best husband, the best father, and the best Christian the age in which he lived produced. And if such virtues could not secure a Prince's life from the villainies of his own subjects, who can ever wear a crown safely?} \]

\(^{66}\) Milbourne, L. *The traytor's reward: or, a king's death revenged.* London, 1714. a6

\(^{67}\) Whilst Milbourne's reading of events may be at fault, nevertheless Bradbury, like many before and since, equates passive obedience and non resistance with unlimited power, which was not the Anglican position. Although Milbourne is usually so concerned to refute his adversaries that he rarely qualifies his exposition of these doctrines. This is an example of the way in which the arguments on both sides declined into slogans and lost their qualifications and nuances as the debate continues.

\(^{68}\) op cit p. 6

\(^{69}\) ibid p. 29

The rebellion of '41 was rooted in sin, ambition and faction, and the crime of regicide has left a curse upon the land which succeeding generations must endeavour to clear, not just through
repentance of the crimes of their fathers, but by resisting any attempt to resurrect or excuse those principles which caused the regicide in the first place.

Where Milbourne goes beyond the traditional Fast Day sermon is in his espousal of absolutism, and this derives not from the logic of divine right - that could just as easily be used to justify an accommodation with the Revolution as Gerald Straka has demonstrated - but from Milbourne's preoccupation with achieving peace and security within the state. A government 'absolute and unlimited in every respect' not only reflects the authority of God, it is the surest guarantor of peace, for the 'subjection of all person's whatsoever and of what rank or degree soever, to their lawful superior would introduce and secure peace in all states and kingdoms in the universe.\textsuperscript{70} He concludes that the only way to end faction and controversy and the threat of rebellion is to crush those seditious principles which brought Charles to his death and which have now been resurrected as 'revolution principles, i.e. principles of sedition and faction,' whilst at the same time submitting to a monarch, absolute and unlimited in his power.\textsuperscript{71}

From this discussion of the dialogue between Milbourne and Bradbury it is apparent that little or no common ground existed between them. Milbourne's sermons in particular are striking in that they develop no new arguments about Charles, the Civil Wars, the regicide or the contemporary situation, apart from the introduction of continental absolutism. From 1683 through to 1719, Milbourne simply re-presented the typology and political theology of the 1650s and 1660s. That he did so in a particularly forthright, eloquent and aggressive manner may account for his popularity as a preacher, but Bradbury was nearer the truth when he observed of Fast Day sermons in general 'that I can observe very little new in them but a transposition of terms'.\textsuperscript{72}

In sermon after sermon, Milbourne thunders out the old parallels of Charles and Josiah, Charles and Christ, rebels and Jews, puritans and papists. The political theology is pure Filmer, a patriarchal absolutism based upon God's original donation to Adam from which is drawn the full doctrine of divine right, non-resistance and passive obedience. Still going strong are notions of bloodguilt and the concomitant threat to the nation of God's continuing anger and vengeance. Milbourne is entirely consistent with the development of the Fast Day sermon in that Charles is

\textsuperscript{70} ibid pp. 15-16
\textsuperscript{71} ibid p. 31
\textsuperscript{72} Bradbury, T. The lawfulness of resisting tyrants London, 1714. Sig A4
simply a pretext rather than the central figure in the drama. The majority of the sermons either ignore Charles completely or introduce him only in passing as an example of the miseries and injustice of rebellion, or to catalogue his virtues. What is also absent is any obvious parallels between the political theology Milbourne presents and its implications for the succession. It is significant that none of the extant high flying sermons were preached during William's reign, the majority belong to the period after 1707 when it was safer to espouse such potentially dangerous opinions. The wonder is that he should have continued to preach on divine right after 1714, although these sermons do contain enough qualifications to accommodate the Hanoverians. Milbourne, whilst a high flyer of the deepest conviction, does not seem to have taken the logic of his arguments to the extent of throwing up his preferment for the Pretender, a point not lost on Bradbury who, as we have seen, argued that such principles must make one either a non-juror or a hypocrite!

This point was taken up in an anonymous Whig attack on Milbourne in the wake of the Sacheverell trial of 1710, when, in a pamphlet entitled High church politicks, he is accused of gross inconsistency in, on the one hand, excusing Anglican resistance to James II, whilst damning Presbyterian resistance to Charles I. Was this, the author wonders, because his father had been a Presbyterian, 'a worthy, godly minister, who was ejected in 1662 from Roxall in Warwickshire, [who] always kept the 30th of January as a fast to his dying day for the sin of the kingdom in cutting off the king's head?'

The author claims to abhor the regicides, but discusses the reasons why the activities of Milbourne and his colleagues on the 30th January 'is the very ground of my jealousy and distrust of it'. Bradbury had scoffed at the repetitive and tedious nature of many Fast Day sermons, whereas the author of High church politicks draws out the political implications of the high church 'abuse' of the day. Bradbury had also remarked that the Anglican clergy had been quick to support James until he invaded their interest, at which point he was abandoned. An accusation High church politicks repeats, before going on to contend that such 'railing sermons' were never intended by Parliament when it established the observance in 1662 as it would be inconceivable that Parliament should
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establish an instrument for its own destruction. But having hijacked the Fast, the high flying clergy would now raise the regal power upon the ruin of civil liberty, and add church tyranny to that of the state; enslave the consciences of men as well as their fortunes and make themselves lords of God's heritage and have dominion over our faith. Thus I have known the extravagant praises of the royal martyr run men not only upon irreligious rants, but civil seditions, and lead them at once to talk blasphemy against heaven and treason against the state.75

Such 'irreligious rants' only serve to keep alive the animosities of the Civil Wars and ensure that each January the causes and consequences of events which took place sixty or seventy years previously are discussed, refuted and generally disputed once again; as the author puts it:

'The grave has silenced all the great transactors of divisions of the last age and how well would it be if all their debates were buried with them. But alas, the mischief is entailed, it is propagated with their beings, as if contention was the common inheritance of a degenerate clergy.76

As time went on and the events being commemorated each 30th January receded ever further into memory, it became ever harder to invoke the immediacy of the events of the Civil War and regicide. We have already seen how the person of Charles receded from Fast Day sermons around the time of the Exclusion Crisis; by the reign of Queen Anne, few were alive who could remember the Civil Wars; Milbourne himself was only 11 at the Restoration, therefore the immediacy of the events, apparent in the cult literature of the 1650s and 1660s, is lost. What is left is the image of the martyr, the second-hand recollection of events, and their contemporary application to conflicts and battles. By 1710, such usage was increasingly controversial and critics of the cult were not slow in pointing out that the image of the martyr did not correspond with the reality of the man Charles Stuart, nor the events of the 1640s.

Perhaps it is not surprising that the author of *High church politicks* should single out for particular criticism the Christ-Charles parallel as being both offensive and unnecessary. Whilst accepting that Charles was a great king and a virtuous individual
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yet sure we must allow he came infinitely short of divinity. This is enthusiasm beyond
expression, to raze the very foundation of Christian religion, to create a veneration to a
poor perishing mortal who had nothing to distinguish him from the common frailties of
human nature but the title and authority of a monarch.

Such parallels would, the author claims, have been abhorrent to Charles himself and, in what is
perhaps of particular note to the eighteenth century reader, the parallel seems ridiculous to any
person 'of sense and learning'. Such extravagant and unreasonable enthusiasm not only brings
the Fast Day into disrepute, more importantly, Christianity itself is made to look foolish and
absurd; it can only arouse superstition in the ignorant and atheism or deism in the educated.

In 1717, High church politick was joined by another attack on the high church and Tory
clergy in which they were accused of undermining not only the Revolution, but the new
government of George I. Entitled a rebuke to the high-church priests, for turning the 30th of January into a
maddening-day, by their railing discourses against the Revolution and (by consequence) the laws which settle the
Protestant succession on King George and his royal family. This tract was unusual in reprinting primary
sources to 'prove' that the Arminians and the Stuarts were intent on establishing popery and
arbitrary power. Charles' treaty with Spain, his marriage to Henrietta Maria, and the Laudian
reforms are seen as a consistent policy to introduce popery and tyranny. The high church party,
continued the author, ignore the 'facts' of history and seek to spread lies about the origins of the
Civil Wars, and in denouncing the Revolution they are by implication traitors to King George and
rank Jacobites.

Thus was the 30th January singled out for particular criticism by the more extreme Whigs
as the day on which their opponents paraded their principles. They implied that the Fast Day had
been hi-jacked by fanaticism and that if the day could not be rescued by the right thinking party,
then it was better abandoned. In reality this was a way of weakening their opponents by tarring all
those who observed the day with the same fanatic and Jacobite brush and by so doing accelerated
the process by which the 30th January descended into a mere party event - a day observed by
Tories and ignored by Whigs.

Certainly the major weakness of the traditional cult was its inability to engage with
criticism. The image of the martyr presented by Milbourne in the first decades of the eighteenth
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The Calves-Head Clubs can be interpreted in a number of ways. On the one hand belief in these profane and sacrilegious parties held by Whigs and their associates on the 30th January was a manifestation of a growing crisis of confidence within the cult in the first decades of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, the fact that so many could be genuinely shocked to think that the solemn day could be abused in this way attests to the continuing observance of the Fast and the significance of the martyr. The clubs were also an extremely potent weapon to use against the enemy; the Jacobite Charles Leslie referred to the existence of such a club in 1702 in which radicals, Whigs and republicans

feast every 30th of January, and have lewd songs, which they profanely call anthems, new ones composed every years, in ridicule of the King's martyrdom and justification of those principles and praise of those patriots by whom it was perpetrated! I have seen some of
these their horrid anthems, brought from some of their Calves-Head feasts, for they have many of them every year in London.\(^78\)

The existence of the clubs was referred to even in so respectable a publication as Clarendon's History. But the main revelation of the activities of the clubs came in 1703 with the publication of The secret history of the Calves-Head Club: or, the Republican unmask'd. Wherein is fully shown the religion of the Calves-Head heroes in their anniversary thanksgiving songs on the thirtieth of January, by them called anthems; for the years 1693, 1694, 1696, 1697. This tract went through ten editions between 1703 and 1744, the first eight being produced before 1714. It has been attributed to Edward Ward, and H. W. Troyer does not discount this, although he argues that the tracts were a collaborative effort between Ward and other Tory writers.\(^79\)

The first edition was a fairly simple affair; it included a preface, the Secret history itself and the anthems purportedly sung at the meetings. The club was apparently founded during the Commonwealth by Milton to counter the spontaneous keeping of the 30\(^{th}\) January as a fast by Juxon, Hammond and Sanderson. The fifth edition, which came out in 1705, was substantially expanded and included A vindication of the royal martyr written in the time of the usurpation by the celebrated Mr. Butler, author of Hudibras. A character of a Presbyterian by Sir John Denham. The character of a Calves-Head-clubman, and new anthems. To the next edition the following year was added An appendix to the continuation of the secret history of the Calves-Head Club which recounted a supposed club discovered in Southwark. In the eighth edition of 1713, the dedication was changed to An epistle to the worthy members of the Calf's-Head-Club. The modest quarto pamphlet of twenty-two pages which originally appeared in 1703 had, by 1714, grown to an octavo volume of over two hundred pages. But 1713-14 marked the end of the almost annual revelations of Calves-head villainy, although there were editions in 1721 and 1744.\(^80\)

Accusations of feasting and merry-making on the Fast Day were levelled against the Whigs throughout the first half of the eighteenth century. For example in 1726, Thomas Hearn
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recorded the statement of the widow Clarke who lived in the Turl in Oxford, and who claimed that when young she and her sister were invited by White Kennett, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough, to play cards on the 30th January. There 'they played many hours and were very merry, a thing I mention because of its being so solemn a Fast day. It shows Kennett's regard to it even then, though he was then much better than he hath been since.' In 1728 a major scandal occurred in Oxford when one Mr. Meadowcourt, a Fellow and sub-warden of Merton, ordered a dinner in the College's refectory for 1.00pm on the 30th January 'in which many others of the same stamp with himself (for he is a most vile wretch) joined'. The dinner caused great offence in Tory Oxford, and news of it soon reached London where some of the bishops made enquiries. Hearn reports that 'the Whigs themselves being nettled at it, for even the generality of them would have the day observed, being afraid lest a usurper should undergo the same fate as that blessed martyr K. Ch. I.' In 1735 a riot occurred in London on the 30th January when a group of Whigs were discovered allegedly celebrating the regicide. The Earl of Oxford recorded that the group had 'lit a bonfire and drank some outrageous healths in relation to the murder of King Charles the first', and an author in the *Grub Street Journal* came up with all the old identifications between Whigs, dissenters and Roundheads when he wrote

> At last, 'tis plaip, some Whigs are as of yore;  
> The same in forty-eight and thirty-four;  
> Kings and all kingly government they hate;  
> And Whig and Roundhead differ but in date.  
> Take care, great George, who's next: for those who dine  
> On sacred Charles's head, would sup on thine.

There was always a strong element of tabloid journalism in the Calves-Head stories, and although there were those who were hostile to the cult, and many more who were simply indifferent, the existence of such an organised club is improbable. What the Calves-Heads do signify is a level of popular credulity, and the willingness of sections of society to believe the Whigs
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and their allies guilty of almost any infamy. This might spring from an anxiety about the state of society and the belief that a fifth column existed within the state dedicated to the overthrow of all traditional authority. Beyond mere indifference, one's reaction to the stories about the clubs also indicated one's reactions to contemporary events and issues. If one believed in the existence of the clubs in the early eighteenth century, one might also believe that the church was in danger, that Whigs were dangerous fanatics inspired by levelling and dissenting principles, and that without ceaseless vigilance it was all too likely that '41 would come again! As such it is another example of the persistence of Civil War rhetoric and imagery and the length of the shadow the martyr cast across the early eighteenth century.

The decline of the Calves-Head revelations after 1714 is indicative of a shift of emphasis in politics and society which accompanied the peaceful accession of George I, the eclipse of the Tories in government and, the following year, the defeat of the Jacobite rebellion. In 'official' sermons, that is, those delivered before Parliament or the City, the regicide became either a political lesson in the blessings of settled government; or a moral lesson on the rewards of constancy and legality. The favourite text for such studies in conservatism being Proverbs 24:21. 'My son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change.'

Richard Willis observed in 1716 that this text had

frequently been the subject of discourses made upon this day, and indeed they suggest to us the chief use that a nation should make of that sad calamity and horrid wickedness which occasioned our meeting upon it.84

The enemy, which up to 1714 had been dissenters and papists, was now Jacobites and non-jurors. They came to represent, in 'official' sermons at least, the principal threat to the happy state of affairs presided over by the Protestant King George. Thus in 1740, Thomas Herring, whilst noting the problems facing a preacher on the Fast Day, nevertheless hoped that they would perform their duty 'and preserve such equality of temper in his reflections and observations as does no injustice to either side'85, an attitude incomprehensible to the likes of Luke Milbourne and the high flying clergy of Anne's reign.

84 West, R. A sermon preached before the honourable House of commonst London, 1716. p. 5
85 Herring, T. A sermon preached before the House of Lords London, 1740, p. 3.
Lancelot Blackburne reminded the Commons in 1716 that their duty was to defend the Church of England and King George; and in 1727 Henry Egerton warned the Lords against change. By all means, he said, affect such changes as are necessary after mature debate, but they should beware lest such changes as they sanction release the lower orders from their duty of subordination, for

having once set themselves at liberty from the troublesome restraints of law and religion they make no scruple, when they have it in their power, to bring about any other changes that are most subservient to their lusts and interests, or of committing the most barbarous and inhuman acts of cruelty and injustice that may help to accomplish them.

This theme was repeated in 1729 by Edward Young and Francis Hare in 1731. In 1735, William Crowe observed that the purpose of the day was

to raise some good moral, some wholesome lesson of religious instruction, useful either for informing the judgement, or for regulating the behaviour.

Whilst in 1743, John Burton believed that the Fast Day ought to promote unity 'among all true friends of our establishment in church and state.'

In 1741 Joseph Butler summed up this view when he argued that:

The confusions, the persecuting spirit and incredible fanaticism, which grew up upon its [the constitutions] ruins, cannot but teach sober minded men to reverence so mild and reasonable an establishment, now it is restored.

In 1734, Thomas Sherlock remarked that during the Civil Wars, 'one would think that truth and reason had left the world, or that men were universally fallen blind.' And in 1737 Francis Ayscough observed that the Fast Day provided an excellent lesson

against every degree of enthusiasm. We have had too many instances of men who have extinguished the light of reason to pursue a supposed illumination from heaven and have
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pleaded a divine impulse for actions directly contrary to the principles of nature and all
the established maxims of morality.\textsuperscript{91}

Yet even when these preachers were agreed on the blessings of 'reasonable' government,
controversy could arise, as the Bishop of Chichester discovered in 1731. Hare's sermon for that
year had been unexceptional in its conservative conclusions, and his belief that the Fast Day was
useful in teaching the painful consequences of rebellion. But in an anonymous \textit{Letter to the right
reverend the Lord Bishop of Chichester}, the author condemned not only Hare, but the clergy generally
for preaching, what the author regarded as, high church doctrines of slavery and absolutism,
particularly on the 30\textsuperscript{th} January. The author takes issue with the conservative injunction to 'meddle
not with those given to change', asserting instead the people's right to alter the government to suit
their changing purpose. He, or she, gives thanks that

the influence of the church is not so strong upon us now as it was then; we are grown too
wise to be preached out of our liberties, and the clergy will not be half so useful as they
formerly were to any Prince who shall have a mind to enslave us, if such a design should
ever be formed again.\textsuperscript{92}

The inevitable reply defended Hare against this attack, pointing out that he had always defended
the Revolution and liberty and, in a masterly statement of the eighteenth century via media,
asserted that Hare believed truth and virtue

lies in the middle between extremes; he distinguishes between liberty and licentiousness\textsuperscript{a}
he distinguishes between toleration\textsuperscript{a} and an indifference about religion\textsuperscript{a} He distinguishes
between a modest, decent liberty\textsuperscript{a} in matters of religion and that wild, extravagant,
outrageous freedom that is daily taken, and daily defended, of turning all things sacred
into contempt and ridicule\textsuperscript{a} Lastly, with respect to government, he thinks there is a wide
difference between slavery and such a spirit of liberty as makes men impatient under all
authority.\textsuperscript{93}

The defender ends by quoting from Bishop Moore’s sermon to the Lords in 1697, Fleetwood’s of
1710 and Richard Baxter’s \textit{Defence of the principles of love}, to demonstrate that Hare’s sermon was
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restrained in comparison to previous early views of Charles, even by those who could in no way be
called high church. The one notable feature of this defence is that the author considers the
freedom of the press an inessential to 'a modest, decent liberty'. Indeed, a free press only serves to
foster licentiousness rather than liberty.

The defender is in turn answered in *A letter to the author of the defence of the Bishop of Chichester's
sermon upon King Charles's martyrdom*. In which the remarks on press censorship are taken as a starting
point for a detailed critique of the defender and Hare. In essence the debate was over the nature of
change; the attacker disagreeing with Hare's advocacy of gradual change affected after mature
deliberation by lawful authority. On the contrary, where change was necessary it should be made
and the people are the best and only judges of their own circumstances, just as they were in 1640,
for

a nation is not to be talked or scribbled into a Civil War. Oppression must be felt, and
deeply too, before men will give up the advantages of security and peace to a hazardous
design for change.

Concern for liberty cannot be abandoned because of the possible disasters implicit in contending
for change, otherwise nothing would ever improve and every tyrant would be secure. In a parting
shot, which blew apart not only the traditional political theology of the cult, but also the carefully
constructed balancing act of the conservative via media, the author asserted that

I can well conceive that a republican may be a very good Christian and sure it is not
impossible that an unbeliever may be a dutiful subject to the government.94

We have come along way from the cult literature of the 1650s!

In the provinces the picture is more varied. In Edinburgh the non-juror Andrew Cant 6
'one of the suffering clergy there' - preached three sermons on non resistance, passive obedience
and the sacredness of monarchy in 1707, 1711 and 1715. Luke Milbourne continued to preach the
divine right of kings at St. Etheldreda's until 1719. In Nottingham in 1722 John Disney preached a
conservative sermon in which monarchy was extolled and the regicide condemned as parricide -
'the most shocking, horrid and unnatural of all murders'.95 The same sense of duty and
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subordination which honoured Charles as a martyr also demanded that an individual honour King George and live quietly under his government, for as Edward Young asked in 1729, 'can we sincerely mourn for a martyred sovereign and not honour his successors?'

That such conservatism could encompass moderate Tories as well as Whigs is demonstrated in the Fast Day sermon of Jonathan Swift, delivered in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin in 1726. A notable feature of many of these eighteenth century sermons was that the preachers feel it necessary to defend themselves against those who criticised the keeping of the Fast. Swift is no exception; he argued that the Day stood as a lesson to Princes not to trust their prerogatives to the hands of ambitious men, or to upset the delicate balance of the constitution in favour of certain interest groups. It was also necessary to maintain the Fast whilst the principles of rebellion and resistance were still being disseminated. For the enemies of monarchy and settled government were still active, they being

> either people without religion at all, or who derived their principles, and perhaps their birth, from the abettors of those who contrived the murder of that Prince, and have not yet shown the world that their opinions have changed.

Swift urges the dissenters to repent and, if they cannot bring themselves to observe the Fast Day, at least they could 'renounce in a public manner those principles upon which their predecessors acted'.

The consequences of these principles and the legacy of the Civil Wars was a 'wild confusion, still continuing in our several ways of serving God, and those absurd notions of civil power, which have so often torn us with factions more than any other nation in Europe.' Swift is no advocate of absolutism; he may have had a high view of monarchy and believed that a Prince who ruled within the law should be honoured as God's image on earth, but the individual had a right and a duty to maintain true religion and the fundamental law. Thus could Swift accommodate the events of 1688 into a conservative framework. Even in Oxford such conservative views were heard, for instance, in 1737 by George Fothergill in a sermon entitled *The danger of*...
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excesses in the pursuit of liberty, which presented the familiar themes of the blessings of settled government and the duty to honour lawful authority.

Yet even in sermons suffused with 'the light of reason', there were still vestiges of an older view of kings, and Charles in particular, which indicates that theories of patriarchalism and divine right did not simply disappear overnight. The exponents of the conservative view were preaching in an age which had witnessed two changes of dynasty in 1688 and 1714, a long and exhausting war with France, fierce and protracted party strife and the threat of Jacobite rebellion. Whilst they were obliged to modify the traditional political theology of the cult to accommodate these various changes and threats, nevertheless they were concerned to ensure that authority and the institutions of monarchy were still invested with enough divinity and splendour to make it worthy of reverence. Richard West had argued in 1716 that a king who ruled within the law was the most powerful of rulers

because as he acts so far with full and supreme authority so it cannot be supposed that laws, made by common consent of the kingdom, should ever be so far prejudicial to it as any respect to justify resistance in the execution of them.\textsuperscript{98}

In 1722, John Disney referred to Charles as our 'political parent' and that kings were God's deputies.\textsuperscript{99} Whilst in 1724, William Lupton used the Christ-Josiah parallel to show that Charles was a virtuous Prince who was removed by the providence of God so as not to witness the judgement of a wicked people. Young in 1729, in a sermon to the Commons which discussed the blessings of settled government, re-presented the great chain of being and says of a Prince that he is far above us, which some have disputed. Subjects, from the lowest to the highest, press gradually on one another; but there is a mighty interval between the highest and a Prince. At the highest subject the chain ends. The Prince is separate, cut off as an island and surrounded by a sea of power.\textsuperscript{100}

In the same year, Joseph Trapp re-presented not only bloodguilt but the Christ-Charles parallel to the City of London. Observing, in relation to the later, that he could not understand the objections to the parallel, and that if done properly

\textsuperscript{98} Willis, R. 1716. p. 28
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I cannot understand where the blasphemy, or even indecency, or impropriety lies in making some sort of comparison between them.\footnote{Trapp, J. A sermon preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and Alderman of the City of London\(\textsuperscript{101}\) London, 1729. p. 1}

In 1740, John Whalley told the Commons that Charles, 'though he be long since dead, yet continues to speak and to preach upon this day to all the people of this nation.'\footnote{Whalley, J. A sermon preached before the House of Commons\(\textsuperscript{102}\) London, 1740. p. 3.} Charles' virtues were contrasted with the afflictions he suffered and the cruelty of his enemies. They were God's way of showing forth virtue and constancy to a decaying world, and any defects and limitations Charles may have had were swallowed up in the splendours of his martyrdom.

The same year Thomas Herring reminded the Lords that good kings could 'in a right and sober sense\(\textsuperscript{103}\) be styled the life and soul' of the nation. Yet such an organic view of society did not lead Herring into absolutism; rather the honour accorded the king reflected the honour and obedience necessary to make society function. No family could survive where the parental authority was disregarded, and likewise he warns the Lords that

The two extremes, which are the ruin of government, are the tyranny of Princes and the licentiousness of the people\(\textsuperscript{104}\) when once the vulgar are taught to set at naught that high distinction they will pay little regard to all inferior ones; the parent, the magistrate and men of all rank and station will suffer in the general licence, there will be an end of all order and decorum, and, in a little time, of society itself.\footnote{Herring, T. A sermon preached before the House of Lords\(\textsuperscript{105}\) London, 1740. p. 13.}

At Oxford in 1743, John Burton also presented the king as 'the life and soul of the community, which\(\textsuperscript{106}\) in this view is to be esteemed sacred and to be distinguished by a more awful regard'.\footnote{Burton, J. The principles of Christian loyalty\(\textsuperscript{107}\) Oxford, 1743. p. 13}

John Newcombe could tell the Commons in the same year that Charles was adorned at his death with 'all the virtues which can adorn a Christian martyr'. He also included, like Herring, the warning that any slighting of royal power threatened to unravel the structure of society, for

if the authority of the King be not kept up there will arise contempt and wrath; no species of authority can be upheld either in Church or State, or even in societies and private families, and then everyone will do only what is right in his own eyes.\footnote{Newcombe, J. A sermon preached before the honourable House of Commons\(\textsuperscript{108}\) Cambridge, 1743. pp. 9, 233}
Yet for all the injunctions to honour the king and meddle not with those given to change, the image of the martyr present in the majority of these eighteenth century sermons is shadowed and ill-defined. In the majority Charles is not present at all, the Fast Day is simply a pretext to meditate on questions of government and society. Also, the number of references to those who oppose the day and the constant need to justify the preaching of such sermons, reveals a growing hostility to the cult. John Burton remarked in 1743 that teaching loyalty might now be thought 'unfashionable or perhaps unpopular', and that 'modern politicians may perhaps laugh at this old fashioned primitive scheme of uncourtly politics'.

Jonathan Swift observed in 1726 that dissenters and not a few Anglicans failed to observe the Fast. Whilst as early as 1700, Edward Hickergill lamented the lack of zeal for the Fast, even amongst the clergy, who even 'dare to appear in public against the celebration of this necessary Fast'. Regarding the observance of the Fast, William Nicolson, the Bishop of Carlisle, kept a diary between 1702 and 1718 which reveals something of the attendance pattern of the Lords. In 1703 Nicolson himself preached the Fast Day sermon before eight bishops and the Earl of Carnavon, whilst in 1706, only three lords, the Lord Keeper and five bishops attended the Abbey to hear Beveridge preach. Although the day obviously provoked some discussion of the regicide, as Nicolson records hearing the story that some of the soldiers around the scaffold were Jesuits in disguise! In 1707 he records only one peer, apart from the Lord Keeper and ten bishops, in the Abbey; whilst in 1711 there were nine peers and nine bishops. But this seeming indifference to the Fast needs to be treated with caution. What Nicolson's diary does record is that the tradition of Parliament adjourning for the day and the processions to the Abbey and St. Margaret's were maintained, and that for all the paucity of attendance by peers and MPs, many ordinary citizens may have attended to hear the sermons. Certainly the evidence suggests that the Fast Day was being observed in many parish churches and chapels up and down the country, and that without too much difficulty, one could still hear the old political theology of divine right and bloodguilt re-presented each 30th January.

18.
A glimpse of the cult in Oxford in the first decades of the eighteenth century can be gleaned from the diary of Thomas Hearn, nonjuror, historian and antiquary. We have already seen his remarks on a Calves-Head club, but his Remarks and collections record the yearly observance of the Fast Day by the University between 1712 and 1734, usually with a note of the preacher. Occasionally Hearn comments on the event; for instance, in 1706 he notes at length the sermon preached before the University by Mr. Wiles of St. John's, who spoke on the excellence of the Church of England, which trod a via media between Rome and Geneva; the dependence of the state upon true religion and how those who wished to undermine the state will always begin by attacking the Church. Thus 'for the same reason the Presbyterians and the other fanatics cut off Archbishop Laud's head as ye surest way of destroying the state was first to ruin the church'.

Charles was presented as a martyr for the Church, whose constancy and resolution in the face of his enemies ensured the church's survival and for which 'there is no doubt he is rewarded with a crown of life'. In 1708 he noted that the Bishop of Lincoln had preached before the House of Lords on passive obedience, whilst Dr. Ayers sermon to the Commons 'would have made the ears of the Whigs glow had they heard it; which is the more extraordinary considering who the persons were that got him put up.' The remark 'had they heard it' is interesting, and confirms that those out of sympathy with the cult were already absenting themselves from the Fasts at this date.

In 1710, Hearn noted the excitement surrounding the trial of Dr. Sacheverell, including the arrest of Sir Seymour Pile for proposing his health. The University sermon, delivered by Mr. Whalley, a Fellow of Wadham, consisted of a discourse on divine right and the assertion that things are not always what they seem - the apparently moderate Parliamentarians of 1641 being transformed into the rebels and regicides of 1649. Hearn also noted that in London 'the doctrine of passive obedience was preached up in all the churches' and they positively 'rang with the heinousness of the crime of murdering that excellent Prince', with the exception of Dr. West of St. Margaret's. In 1712 he observed of Mr. Stockwell's sermon that it 'twas a handsome discourse.
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enough.' Although in 1715 he complained that Mr. Middleton's sermon contained words against
the pretender and in praise of King George, 'tho' what he said of K. George was nothing near so
much nor so full as what he said of Q. Anne'. 1724 sees Hearn noting the scandal over the sermon
preached at Carfax by the Principal of New Inn Hall, 'that blockhead Dr. John Brabourne', 113 in
which Brabourne defended the regicide and the principles on which it was based. 'The Mayor,'
notes Hearn, 'is much blamed for putting him up'.114 Whilst in 1729 he heard that the preacher at
the University observance, one Dr. Banner, had 'spoken mightily for passive obedience. And yet at
the same time he is one of those great number that act quite against the doctrine.'115

Hearn's antiquarianism and his Jacobite principles combined not only to his being
debanned from his post as Assistant Keeper at Bodley for not taking the oath to George I in 1716,
but also in his continuing fascination with anything to do with the royal martyr. His diary records
many snippets of information about, for example, the whereabouts of Charles' body and the
reports that Cromwell had had the body destroyed, or buried secretly in an unknown place. His
interest in medals and coins included a reference to a medal struck after Edgehill, showing Charles
and Henrietta Maria, he with a sun and she with a moon above their heads, and both trampling
the serpent of rebellion. His book lists included the Eikon Basilike, the Vindication and various works
defending the Charles' authorship of the Eikon.

He was also concerned to document eyewitness accounts of the Civil Wars. Thus in May
1727 he records having spoken to a Mr. Bremichem of St. Peter's in the East, who, then aged 92,
told Hearn of Susan Styler, a relative, who had witnessed the regicide and dipped her
handkerchief in the King's blood, 'which she kept as a sacred thing to her dying day, above thirty
years since'.116 Three years later, Hearn is noting a piece from the Northampton Mercury concerning
the death of Margaret Coe at the age of 104. Apparently she too had been present at the regicide
and remembered the groan that went up from the crowd when the head was displayed by the
executioner.
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This fascination with the events of the 1640s and 1650s and the person of Charles is also apparent in a set of ten paintings by various artists produced during the 1720s, telling the story of Charles' life and death. Nine of the paintings refer to incidents from the Civil Wars, such as the repulsion before Hull, the raising of the standard at Nottingham, the trial and Charles taking leave of his children. The last picture shows the apotheosis of Charles; he is being borne aloft to heaven and crown with the laurels of victory (See fig.11). The series was engraved and advertised for sale in 1728. These pictures and engravings illustrate not only the enduring power of the martyr, but the distinction which must be drawn between the cult and Jacobitism. As Kenneth Sharpe and Robert Raine pointed out in their discussion of the paintings, the 1720s and 30s witnessed no diminution of interest in the royal martyr.117 In 1723 the Presentments of the Grand Jury denounced The Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer for 'a very scurrilous, villainous and wicked libel, upon the memory, sufferings and character of our late blessed sovereign King Charles I'. In 1727 Perrinchef's The royal martyr reappeared after twenty-five years in a new edition. In 1735 a new edition of The works of King Charles I appeared, and two years later William Havard produced his play King Charles I: an historical narrative, 'in imitation of Shakespeare', at the Theatre in Lincoln Inn Fields.118

Raine and Sharpe make the point that the prints and paintings did not appear until after the peaceful accession of George II; when both the French and the Papacy had demonstrated that they were not prepared to assist a Jacobite rebellion. George was in the paradoxical position of having to acquiesce in the glorification of the martyr, from which he claimed his Protestant descent and thus his occupancy of the throne; whilst at the same time denying the legitimacy of Charles' grandson, James III. Yet the honouring of a dead Stuart did not automatically entail devotion to a living. Many who deplored the regicide and shrank from the principles of the Republic, equally deplored the claims of the Catholic Stuarts to the throne. During the exile, Edward Hyde had always opposed concessions to the Roman Catholics and sought to thwart Henrietta Maria's

118 ibid pp. 43, 46. It is worth noting that pictures of the martyr were still being set up in parish churches. In 1721, Thomas Lewis referred in The scourge, a vindication of the Church of England to such a picture in St. Clement Danes and remarked that such pictures were 'a solemn ornament to some churches in the city.' See: Legg, J, Wickham. English church life. 1914. p. 130.
11. The apotheosis, or death of the King. Painted by Mr. Vanderbank, 1728.
attempts to convert members of the royal family. He knew that this was the surest way to alienate Protestant Royalist opinion in England. Such attitudes seem to have been a factor in Tory attitudes to the exiled Stuarts.

At first sight, the silence of the non-jurors and the Jacobites on the subject of the royal martyr is puzzling; after all, he summed up everything they were suffering and fighting for. On closer examination, however, certain themes emerge, the most obvious being the Catholicism of the Stuarts and their dependence on the French. But even such major obstacles as these did not stop full-blooded Anglican Tories as Francis Atterbury could serve the Pretender and for many the regrettable fact of the King's religion did not absolve them from their allegiance. We can assume that the attitude of Tory Jacobites and non-juring clergy towards the martyr and the cult was wholly traditional. One of the few non-juring sources to support this view is Thomas Ken's *The royal sufferer: a manual of meditations and devotions. Written for the use of a royal tho' afflicted family* of 1699. Ken regrets James' Catholicism which does not, however, provide an excuse for resistance. But James' steadfastness in adversity shows you to be the heir not only of your royal father's crown, but of his afflictions and sufferings. Exerting the like constancy and courage under them as that blessed martyr did.119

Ken reveals a wholly traditional view of the martyr, who died 'for his so firm adherence to the Church of England'.120

For the conforming Tories, Jacobitism provided a tantalising alternative to the trimming and fudging necessary to adapt to the changing dynasties and parties. But there were reasons why one could remain loyal to the memory of the martyr and reject the Jacobites. For one thing it was possible to retain far more of the traditional political theology than had once been thought; as my discussion of the sermons has hopefully demonstrated. Straka, Clark and Colley, to name but a few, have shown that patriarchal theories of divine right were very resilient in the eighteenth century. If this is linked to the defence of the Church of England then one could argue that little had been lost in either 1688 or 1714. Linda Colley observed that in 1715, when George Berkeley endeavoured to restrain his fellow Tories from joining the rebellion, 'it was to the Church of
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England and the obligation of non-resistance that he confidently appealed. Glendinning remarks of Jonathan Swift that although he would 'fight like a wild cat' to save the Church from dissenters, he was nevertheless 'an enthusiast for the Williamite Revolution' and a believer in the Protestant succession. In other words, political allegiance was more fluid and flexible than has been traditionally allowed, the espousal of Tory attitudes towards the Anglican Church and high views of monarchy did not necessarily make one either a Jacobite or a non-juror.

This is not to deny the place of conviction and loyalty in defining political allegiance, but after sixty years of preaching non-resistance and passive obedience many Tories and Anglicans were not about to engage in armed rebellion on behalf of a Catholic King whose attitude to the Anglican monopoly was, to say the least, ambiguous. By the 1740s it is possible to argue that many Tories had accepted in broad outline the conservative imperative contained in so many official sermons, and were prepared to live under a government that at least preserved the hierarchy of society and did not overtly attack the Church of England. Colley has argued that the cult helped sustain a party which believed in monarchy whilst having little confidence in the reigning monarch. Praise of the martyr could indeed be covert Jacobitism, but it could also be a way of reminding King George who were the true friends of kings. Whatever the reasoning - and this is an area which needs more systematic study - the Tories did not rise up and join the Jacobites in 1745; they were apparently unwilling to risk all in the service of the grandson of the royal martyr they honoured.

What has emerged from this wide-ranging chapter is that the traditional views of society did not collapse in 1688, but proved to be far more resilient than has traditionally been allowed. Alongside 'the light of reason', deism, and rational philosophy, existed much older assumptions based on patriarchalism, divine right, the sacredness of kings, the power of magistrates, husbands and parents, and the duty of submission and obedience. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the success of *The new whole duty of man*, published in 1744 - at the end of the period covered by this chapter. This was an anonymous new edition of the original *Whole duty of man* first published in
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1659 and attributed to Richard Allestree. That first edition went through fifty-nine editions and printings between 1659 and 1745, and taught the by now familiar political theology associated with the cult. *The new whole duty* went through thirty-eight editions between 1744 and 1838 and retains the political theology of its predecessor. Here we see again a wholly traditional view of the world based upon a hierarchy of reciprocal duties and responsibilities between parents and children, men and women, rulers and ruled; all rooted in the positive rights of the superior over the inferior. At the apex of this hierarchy is the king, God's vice-regent, whom all must serve for they have a right to be obeyed in all things, wherein they do not interfere with the commands of God. For in obeying them we obey God, who commands by their mouths and wills, by their laws and proclamations.\[123\]

The cult of the early eighteenth century existed in the ambiguity created between the survival of views such as this on the one hand, and on the other the rise of rational philosophy, the contractualism of Locke and the political jobbery of Walpole. Within that ambiguity men and women wrestled with problems of allegiance and loyalty, oaths and duties. Depending on their point of view, the enemy was either the fanatic disguised as a Whig dissenter, or the Jesuit disguised as a Tory Jacobite. The cult reflected these problems and debates; from the traditional views of the non-jurors and Milbourne, through the conservatism of the official sermons, to the ever present attacks upon the Fast by those who saw it only as an opportunity for the high-flying clergy to undermine the Glorious Revolution. To this extent the cult reflected the ferment and uncertainty of early eighteenth century society. But perhaps more importantly it revealed the extent to which many in that society held to a view of the world which was essentially conservative. As William Crowe put it in 1735, the Fast Day stands

as a perpetual monitor against sedition and rebellion which appear hereby in the most odious and detestable view imaginable and as a powerful remembrancer of that obedience and regard which is due to our governors and which the institution, the importance and the ends of this high office require of us.\[124\]

\[123\] *The new whole duty of prayer*. London, 1754. p. 188.
Chapter six. Conclusion

He keepeth the paths of judgement, and preserveth the way of his saints.
(Proverbs 2:8)

The Church Times for the 23rd January 1998 included in its classified section five notices for services in honour of King Charles the martyr. Two notices were from the Royal Martyr Church Union and the Society of King Charles the Martyr, the principal Anglican societies dedicated to preserving the memory of the King and his place in the Calendar. Two notices were from churches of the 'Traditional Anglican Church', a group which separated from the Church of England over the ordination of women. The other notice, from the church of St. Gabriel, Warwick Square, Pimlico, advertised a Solemn Eucharist for the 30th January using the rite of 1637. The regicide was commemorated in many more churches than the five which advertised in the church press and, after more than 350 years, witnesses to the continuity and survival of the cult. For other Anglicans this continued observance is regarded either with indifference, or as an embarrassment. What relevance, they ask, does a not particularly attractive seventeenth century king have for the late twentieth century? Does not such an observance encumber the church with historical baggage which prevents it from witnessing effectively to the modern world? As we have seen, there is nothing new in such attitudes; by the end of the seventeenth century voices were raised questioning not just the appropriateness of the commemoration, but even the claim that Charles was anything more than a failed tyrant.

Such questions lay behind a report commissioned by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1957 and which was published under the title The commemoration of saints and heroes of the faith in the Anglican Communion. This report is, to date, the most complete statement of the theological position of the Church of England in regard to the recognition and honouring of saints and martyrs. The report rejects any need for a bureaucratic procedure within the Church of England similar to that of Rome and suggests instead a return to an older tradition where saints were 'home grown'. In other words, commemoration developed spontaneously from the 'grass-roots' which were then given sanction by the church. Using this model, Charles is an ideal type of Anglican saint,

1 For example, according to information supplied to the author, the parish church of St. Mary, Lewisham held a Solemn Eucharist in memory of Charles the martyr on the 30th January 1998.
spontaneously venerated by the faithful; a veneration which was then acknowledged and regularised by ecclesiastical authority and the provision of a suitable liturgy. As the report observed

King Charles is a clear example of popular canonization; in which Church, state and popular feeling concurred, and that with a vehemence surprising to the modern generation. The Propers did indeed reflect the deep emotion of their day too vividly for modern use; but their framing and the Calendar entry was as genuine a canonization - that, too, of a martyr - as the historic Church can show, Convocation, Parliament and popular acclaim acting in passionate unity.²

What the report did not address was changing perceptions towards individuals accredited as saints. If the criteria for commemoration was a situation where 'Church, state and popular feeling concurred', how was the Church to regard such a 'saint' when popular feeling changed and the perspective of history cast doubt upon the extent of the individual's sanctity? Such ambiguity has accompanied the cult of Charles the martyr since its inception, for the simple reason that his 'martyrdom' occurred within the context of Civil War.

These ambiguities became increasingly marked in the official observance of the cult throughout the eighteenth century. A glance at the catalogue of any large research library reveals that Fast Day sermons, continued to be preached and printed throughout the century. Yet on closer investigation the sermons reflected increasing tensions with the observance. As early as 1753, Thomas Fothergill preached before the University of Oxford on *The reasonableness and uses of commemorating King Charles's martyrdom*, in which he attacked the 'fashionable clamours' raised against the Fast as impious and destructive of good government.³ Two years later, according to the *Memoirs* of Horace Walpole, a Mr. Fox proposed in the Commons that they should sit on the 30th January to expedite certain urgent business. The Speaker reminded the House that the 30th January is set aside 'for the commemoration of what is ridiculously termed King Charles's

³ Fothergill, T. *The reasonableness and uses of commemorating King Charles's martyrdom. A sermon preached before the University of Oxford at St. Mary's on Tuesday, January 30. 1753*. Oxford, 1753. p. 6
martyrdom'. In the ensuing debate, Sir Francis Dashwood proposed the abolition of all the State Services on the ground that

one can scarce conceive a greater absurdity than retaining the three holy days dedicated to the House of Stuart. Was the preservation of James the first a greater blessing to England than the destruction of the Spanish Armada, for which no festival is established? Are we more or less free for the execution of King Charles? Are we this day still guilty of his blood? When is the stain to be washed out? What sense is there in thanking heaven for the restoration of a family which it so soon became necessary to expel again? What action of Charles the second proclaimed him the sent of God? In fact, does not the superstitious jargon rehearsed on those days tends to annexe an idea of sainthood to a worthless and exploded race? And how easy to make the populace believe that there was a divine right inherent in a family, the remarkable events of whose reign are melted into our religion and form part of our established worship.4

Yet Dashwood's motion was rejected by the Commons, George II observed the Fast Day regularly and preachers were still invoking the dangers of bloodguilt and comparing Charles to Josiah, David and Christ. Indeed, Benjamin Kennicott could say of Nathan Wetherell's sermon of 1755 that he had 'out-Filmered Filmer' and in 1761, George Horne drew the Christ-Charles parallel without any apology.5 The iconography of divine right monarchy was still being invoked in 1763, when, at the fete devised by Queen Charlotte to celebrate George III's twenty-fifth birthday at the newly refurbished Buckingham House, the tableaux portrayed scenes of the King as the bringer of peace to the earth, whilst envy, malice and rebellion are cast into the abyss; scenes reminiscent of a Whitehall masque of the 1630s.6 In the same year the Commons again debated the abolition of the State Services, and Charles Jenkinson warned that to interfere with the Fast Day might provoke 'disturbances among the lower kind of people'.7

5 Mathers, F. C. High Church prophet: Bishop Samuel Horsley (1733-1806) and the Caroline tradition in the later Georgian Church. 1992. pp. 227-30
6 Healey, E. The Queen's house: a social history of Buckingham Palace. 1997 p. xiii
7 Sack, J. From Jacobite to conservative: reaction and orthodoxy in Britain c.1760-1832. 1993. p. 157
Yet for all this continuity, in 1758 Richard Terrick, the Bishop of Peterborough could denounce Charles before the Lords as a subverter of the constitution and wonder why the observance continued; whilst in 1762, Samuel Squire, Bishop of St. David's criticised those who advocated 'high' views of the royal prerogative in the context of the Fast. In 1766 David Lloyd's *State worthies*, originally printed in 1665, was reissued; this version came complete with additions by Charles Whitworth which undermined Lloyd's militant Restoration royalism by suggesting that Charles' motives were open to question and his dependence on his wife and 'evil counsellors' unfortunate, particularly as

> it is no easy thing to give a just and exact character of Charles I, amidst the excessive commendation bestowed on him by some, and the calumnies wherewith others have endeavoured to blacken his reputation. There is not an impartial English historian upon this subject.\(^9\)

In 1772 Shute Barrington, Bishop of Llandaff, made essentially the same point, and when in the same year Sir Roger Newdigate defended the memory of Charles in the Commons as the Church of England's 'only canonized saint' he 'occasioned an universal laughter throughout the House'.\(^9\)

Unlike his father, George III never attended a Fast Day sermon and an examination of the thirty-six surviving sermons in the British Library preached to the Lords and Commons between 1764 and 1811 reveals that seven were critical of Charles, ten defended the traditional political theology of the cult, whilst the remaining nineteen were fairly neutral dissertations upon the need for submission to lawful authority and the excellence of the British constitution.\(^10\)

Newdigate's intervention in 1772 occurred during one of the periodic debates about the abolition of the State Services, this time inspired by a sermon preached to the Commons that year by Dr. Thomas Nowell of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. Nowell had offered a spirited defence of the
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\(^10\) Figures taken from Sack. 1995, pp. 126-30
royal prerogative and a traditional view of the martyr which inspired Boswell to say of Nowell that he was - along with himself and Johnson - the 'very perfection of Toryism'.\footnote{Whitehall Evening Post. March 13-16, 1784, quoted in Sack. 1996, p. 81} In the debate over Nowell's sermon, Mr. Thomas Townsland proposed that it be burnt by the hangman for containing 'arbitrary, tory, high-flown doctrines', and that the preachers for the Fast Day should in future be confined to those of the rank of Dean or above, were chaplains to the House, or at least those who had taken the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Lord Folkstone ironically 'defended' Nowell by stating that his views were in conformity with the service itself, which, he claimed, had been composed by one Fr. Peter, confessor to James II. In other words, the service was popish and exalted the doctrine of arbitrary and tyrannical monarchy. A week later Mr. Montague proposed the abolition of the Fast, stating that there was 'impiety' in the Office, 'particularly in those parts where Charles the first was likened to our Saviour'.\footnote{Parliamentary. 1806 pp. 312, 320} As we have seen, Nowell was defended by Newdigate, who observed that no historian had defended the regicide, except Mrs. Macauley, 'but no regard was to be paid to that work, as the author was known to entertain notions and profess principles diametrically opposite to our religion and government'.\footnote{Parliamentary. 1806 p. 316} Whilst the proposals to abolish the Fast and burn Nowell's sermon were defeated, the vote of thanks given by the Commons to the preacher was revoked.

What makes the furore over Nowell's sermon so significant is not the content - in 1764 William Richardson had preached a sermon in as high a key as Nowell's without comment - nor the fact that it inspired some MPs to attack the continuation of the State Services; but the fact that the debate revealed that hardly any MPs actually heard the sermon preached! In the course of the debate it emerged that only the Speaker and four MPs attended St. Margaret's to hear Nowell preach; the rest only discovered the contents when the sermon was printed, by which time the five MPs present had already offered Nowell the thanks of the House. This prompted Townsland to suggest that in future the thanks should only be voted after the Commons had had time to study the printed version. James Sack has studied Parliamentary attendance at the Fast Day sermon and concluded that 1772 was not an exception. In 1764 only five MPs and the Speaker had been
present to hear Richardson's oration on divine right; whilst only one Lord had attended the Abbey. In 1779, the *Morning Post* wondered why only eight bishops had attended that year's observance; whilst in 1784, after the signing of the Anglo-American Treaty, the same paper records only the Speaker attending St. Margaret's. Before the outbreak of the French Revolution the pattern of official observance was one of continuing indifference, akin to that observed by Nicolson earlier in the century. In 1788 only one peer attended the Abbey, whilst the following year the Bishop of Lincoln, friend and tutor to William Pitt, preached the most hostile Fast Day sermon of the eighteenth century, in which he condemned Charles as a tyrant and praised the Parliamentarians as the true defenders of English law and liberty.\(^\text{14}\)

The one exception to this indifference was in January 1793, a few days after the execution of Louis XVI. St. Margaret's and the Abbey were 'thronged' with MPs and Peers, including Pitt and the entire Cabinet, making the point that the French had copied the crime of the English regicides; and there is a noticeable change in the establishment attitude to Charles after the execution of Louis and the outbreak of war with Revolutionary France. Instead of the bland injunctions to obey the powers that be, or even attacks upon Charles for allegedly claiming an unacceptable prerogative, Charles became a martyr to the rule of law and just rights, a victim of the horrors of revolution. The puritans and regicides of the 1640s were transformed into the revolutionaries and Jacobins of the 1790s.\(^\text{15}\) Such a change of emphasis did not, however, encourage more MPs or Peers to attend the Fast Day sermons, for the following year the *Times* recorded that only two lay Lords attended the Abbey and after 1795 the Parliamentary observance of the Fast ceased altogether until 1807 when it was resumed at the request of George III - although on that occasion only three MPs attended St. Margaret's. In January 1810, Spencer Perceval wrote to the King, acknowledging his desire that the Fast be observed, but pointing out that

\(^{14}\) Whilst MPs and Peers might have been indifferent to the Fast, it is worth noting that the Abbey was often well attended by the general public, particularly if the preacher were well known.

the attendance of the two Houses of Parliament on these occasion [January 1808 and 1809] as well as upon the same occasion in the preceding year 1807, was very discreditably thin, as there were not above three or four Members exclusive of the Speaker in St. Margaret's, nor above as many Lords besides the Chancellor in the Abbey. Perceval proposed that instead of the Services, Parliament should simply adjourn for that day rather than that they should express collectively a determination to observe it, and should individually so entirely neglect it'. The King's reply expressed regret at the low attendance and felt that the Fast Day should be continued because it was established by Act of Parliament and its abandonment 'might be considered as encouraging the too prevalent wish to introduce changes and innovations'. But George agreed to leave the final decision to Perceval and the Archbishop of Canterbury.16

In 1811 only two MPs attended St. Margaret's and with the establishment of the Regency, Perceval again attempted to have the observance quietly dropped; writing to Colonel McMahon, the Prince Regent's secretary, in January 1812, explaining the reluctance of the King to give up the observance but pointing out

the fact that the two Houses attend so very scantily that the pretence of their attending defeats the object of paying attention to the day by making the real neglect of it more apparent Under the circumstances I should rather think it would not be advisable and would request you to state these circumstances to him [the Prince Regent], adding that I would not determine against the Houses of Parliament attending without first receiving H.R.H's pleasure. If the two Houses do not attend, the two Houses will adjourn over that day and no notice will be taken of it in Parliament.17

The Prince Regent agreed that the low turnouts invalidated the Parliamentary observance of the Fast and the practice was discontinued after one hundred and fifty years.

What is noticeable from Perceval's correspondence is that he is not objecting to the observance on ideological grounds; rather it is a practical recognition that the situation was illogical and needed amending. Neither was Perceval proposing that the Office be removed from 16 Aspinall, A. (ed) The later correspondence of George III. 5 vols. 1962-72. Vol.5. pp. 489-90 17 Aspinall, A. (ed) The correspondence of George, Prince of Wales 1770-1812. 8 Vols. 1971. Vol.8. p. 350
the Book of Common Prayer. The individual was still free to observe the day if they wished and there is evidence that the Office was read at the Public Schools and Universities, in Cathedrals and parish churches throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Parson Woodforde records reading the State Services for the 30th January and the 29th May in 1785, and in 1789 Samuel Johnson wrote a Fast Day sermon in which he meditated upon the condition of man and the necessary evils which ensue when the barriers of law, civilisation and society are swept aside by zealots and fanatics.\(^{18}\) Owen Chadwick notes that

A 'high churchman' in (for example) 1800 would probably reverence King Charles I and keep the day of his death as a day of martyrdom. He would think that Charles died for the maintenance of the Church of England and its episcopal or apostolic ministry; that the responsibility for his death lay with the Roundheads who were the ancestors of the Whigs, and with the Presbyterians and independents who were the ancestors of the modern dissenter.\(^{19}\)

In other words, not a lot had changed since Luke Milbourne's annual denunciations of rebels and schismatics a hundred years or so previously.

The individual who personified such attitudes and who provides a link between the high church tradition of the eighteenth century and the tractarianism of the nineteenth is Dr. Martin Routh. Born in 1755, Routh was President of Magdalen College, Oxford until his death in 1855, and maintained throughout his long life the theological and political views of the old high church, stating that he was 'attached to the Catholic faith taught in the Church of England, and averse from all papal and sectarian innovations'. Part of this attachment was the annual observance of the Fast Day, and in a letter to General Rigaud, Dr. Bloxam recalls Routh 'fasting on this day on account of Charles I until dinner time, when Mrs. Routh gave him a calf's head.'\(^{20}\)

It was once thought that the churchmanship associated with the likes of Routh was a relic of the seventeenth century and doomed to extinction; that 'high and dry' was the province of
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\(^{19}\) Chadwick, O. *The spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian essays*. 1990. p. 5

\(^{20}\) Middleton, R. D. *Dr. Routh*. 1938. pp. 136, 151
reactionaries or eccentric dons and a symptom of the decrepitude of eighteenth century Anglicanism. Recent research has done much to revise this view and to rescue the eighteenth century church from obscurity. In the process the vitality and durability of the high church tradition has been demonstrated. Despite the indifference of Parliament to the Fast Day, Charles was about to be rediscovered by a new generation of high churchmen in the early nineteenth century who would add an emotional and romantic aspect to the image of the martyr.

The rise of the Oxford Movement was to give new life to the cult in the sense that Charles I was honoured as a defender of the establishment and an ‘orthodox’ view of Anglicanism which saw it as both Catholic and reformed. It is in such a role that Charles appears in Keble’s *The Christian year*, first published in 1827. As Brian Martin observed, *The Christian year* was one of the best sellers of the nineteenth century; between 1827 and 1873, when the copyright expired, it went through 140 editions, with 305,500 copies being printed and that for Victorian Anglicans it occupied an honoured place after the Bible and the *Book of Common Prayer*. In the poem Keble offered for the 30th January, the emphasis was on Charles the patient martyr and defender of the Church, rather than as the symbol of a particular political system. Keble has retained the pathos of the martyrdom whilst quietly discarding the political conclusions derived from the regicide.

Although having said that, it is clear that Charles could not be completely depoliticised; indeed it is difficult to see how any rendering of the regicide could be completely apolitical. Keble’s view of Charles was consistent with his regard for the historic integrity of the Church of England; the importance of establishment and the retention of Anglicanism at the heart of English life. In the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century the Oxford reformers discovered what they considered the classic exposition of Anglicanism as both Catholic and reformed, grounded in scripture, reason and tradition. Although Charles was not included in the great Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology produced by the Oxford reformers in the 1840s, he was included in the
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one volume presentation of classic seventeenth-century Anglicanism edited by More and Cross published in 1935. But for the Oxford Movement Charles was accorded the status of 'honorary member' as he had given his life defending their vision of the Church of England and was thus a true martyr. Politically, Charles was enlisted by those who sought to defend paternalist values against the onslaught of Whig utilitarianism and was thus part of a nostalgic view of England which included gothic architecture, chivalry and resistance to the Poor Law.

It is as such a conservative figure that Charles appeared in a number of paintings in the early nineteenth century. The Victorian taste for historical narrative was matched on the continent by such paintings as 'Charles mocked by the soldiery' by Paul Delaroche, which is the most explicit visual representations of the Christ-Charles parallel ever produced (See fig.12). The scenes depicted tend to concentrate upon the tragedy of Charles' martyrdom, and sought to engage the viewer emotionally in the sufferings Charles endured either by contrasting the halcyon days of the 1630s with the horrors of Civil War, or by a direct presentation of Charles' sufferings and humiliations. Obviously in so doing there is an implicit political sub-plot. Presenting an image of a stoic Charles taking leave of his weeping children on the eve of his execution tends to arouse sympathy for the King rather than his persecutors. But arousing indeterminate conservative regrets is different from presenting detailed political doctrines, and Charles was not to be used again to justify divine right monarchy, passive obedience or non-resistance.

Peter Nockles has pointed out the extent to which the political and religious elements of Anglican identity began to part company in the 1830s so that

the gradual divorce of the two in subsequent decades made it increasingly difficult for later generations of high churchmen to appreciate the mental framework within which the pre-Tractarian high church operated.
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24 See Strong, R. And when did you last see your father?: the Victorian painter and British history. 1978. Wright, B. S. Painting and history during the French restoration: abandoned by the past. 1997

The figure of the martyr inevitably partook of this process; it became increasingly difficult to maintain the traditional political theology of the Restoration cult because that was rooted firmly in an identification of political and religious allegiance, an allegiance which became increasingly untenable in the face of Catholic Emancipation and Whig reforms in the 1830s. Charles' martyrdom was a political act, inspired by and illustrative of theological truths; whilst simultaneously the theological truths implicit in the image of the martyr entailed distinctive political implications. Ironically the renewal of high church Anglicanism associated with the Oxford Movement witnessed the almost inevitable demise of the political aspects of the old tradition of Royalist Anglicanism.

The extent of this divorce is revealed in the debates surrounding the proposal to remove the State Services from the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1858. On the 28th June, Earl Stanhope moved in the Lords that an address be presented to the Queen requesting her to revoke the proclamation issued at the beginning of her reign enjoining the observance of the State Services, with the exception of the Accession Service which would be retained. He referred to a similar motion moved the previous year in Convocation by the Dean of St. Paul's. This had failed due to lack of time, yet the question was referred to a committee which reported inconclusively that the Services depended on the prerogative power of the crown which, it was implied, made them legally vulnerable.

Stanhope referred specifically to the political aspects of the Services as a principal reason why they should be removed. He asked whether the Services were designed to make the Church political rather than help the Church make political society religious; traditional high churchman would have argued that the two aspects were synonymous. That the clergy could argue from the same position was demonstrated by the Bishop of Oxford who, in supporting the motion, argued that the Services were 'far too political, far too polemical, far too epigrammatical'. In referring specifically to the Fast Day, Stanhope denied Charles the title of martyr precisely because the regicide had been a political act undertaken by, admittedly misguided, Christians; whereas the term 'martyr' could only be applied to one who gave their life in defence of religious truth. Thus far had Parliament moved from the recognition that Charles' defence of the political structure of
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the Church of England was an expression of religious and theological truth. Apart from the political aspects of the Services, Stanhope singled out the Christ-Charles parallel as being particularly unacceptable and condemned the language of the Fast Day Office as being 'utterly repugnant to the religious feeling of the present day', whilst the Bishop of Oxford thought the language of all the State Services was inappropriate for 'humble, pious and devout men, removed from the strife of party'.

Apart from the Bishop of Oxford, the motion was supported by Sumner, the Archbishop of Canterbury; Lord Ebury, who earlier had tried unsuccessfully to table a motion for the comprehensive revision of the Anglican liturgy, the Bishop of Cashel and the Lords Campbell, Cranworth and Malmesbury. The Archbishop of Canterbury stated that the State Services were virtually obsolete, although Stanhope had earlier weakened his case by admitting that they were in regular use in many cathedrals, schools and colleges and that when the commemoration fell upon a Sunday, prayers from the State Services were annexed to the usual Offices of the day. Rather startlingly for an Archbishop of a liturgical church, Sumner declared that 'praise or prayer which does not issue from the heart is mockery', a sentiment which Milton would have endorsed and which placed Sumner firmly on the 'modern' side of the romantic movement. It was a sentiment which a high churchman of the preceding century would have condemned as not only undermining the public liturgy of the Church but also the duty the individual owed to society to participate in those communal observances enjoined by law; a duty which transcends the individual's emotional commitment to specific actions.

The Services were defended by the Duke of Marlborough who argued that whilst some of the language might need changing, the State Services commemorated three of the seminal events in the history of the nation and, what was more, stood as a constant reminder that the nation stood under the providence of God; a point also made by the Bishop of Bangor and Viscount Dungannon. But the majority of the Peers rejected the appeal to providence and voted to present the address to the Queen. When the issue was again debated, on the 19th July, Marlborough attempted to salvage something of the Services by suggesting that some commemoration of the
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events be included in a revised Accession Service, although he only mentions the Gunpowder Plot, the Restoration and the 'Glorious Revolution'; Charles was simply ignored. He was only supported by Dungannon; Lords Stanhope, Ebury and Derby opposed the suggestion, as did the Bishop of London, and Marlborough declined to put his proposed amendment to the vote. To the majority in Parliament the state services were an irrelevance and their removal from the *Book of Common Prayer* the following year, after nearly two centuries, occurred almost without comment.

With the removal of the State Services from the *Book of Common Prayer* it seemed more than likely that, with the exception of the 5th November, the commemorations would fall into oblivion. But the strength of the Tractarian and ritualist revival within the Church of England ensured that the legacy of older, high church allegiances would persist. The figure of the martyr, shorn of a specific political agenda, remained as an inspiration to those who cherished a vision of the Church of England which was both Catholic, reformed and woven into the fabric of English society. With the deletion of the State Services, Charles' name also disappeared from the Calendar and in 1894 the Society of King Charles the Martyr was founded to honour his memory and to urge the return of his name to the Calendar. This was finally achieved in 1980, when Charles was restored to the Calendar of the *Alternative Service Book*, albeit under 'minor commemorations'.

In 1906 the Royal Martyr, Church Union was founded by Henry Stuart Wheatley-Crowe, who two years previously had published *In defense of a king*. The Union shared with the Society of King Charles the Martyr a desire to defend Charles' reputation and restore his name to the Calendar, but as time went on the Union developed Royalist political ambitions evident from Wheatley-Crowe's book of 1922 entitled *Royalist revelations*. This set it apart from the Society and has ensured that the two Anglican organisations dedicated to honouring the memory of Charles hold separate commemorations to this day.

This overview of the cult since 1745 has necessarily concentrated on its decline, yet it is appropriate at this point to ask why the cult should have persisted for so long. Indeed, it is one of

29 See fn 111. on page 195 for an insight into the way this restoration was achieved.
30 Wheatley-Crowe, H. S. *In defense of a king*. 1904. *Royalist revelations and the truth about Charles I*. 1922. The Union also instituted in 1911 the Memorial of Merit of King Charles the Martyr, to be awarded to Anglicans who - in the opinion of the Union - 'had served the Church in some special way: and to be a special Memorial to the sacred memory of Charles I, King and martyr, who gave his life for the English church.' *Royalist revelations* p. 149
the underlying questions of this thesis, in contrast to much historical work which is concerned with why things change. Perhaps we have become so conditioned to a neo-Maoist environment of permanent change that we instinctively look for change in history rather than for those things that persist. Whilst assuming that any idea or institution which does persist over time must be moribund, reactionary or unworthy of serious study. Undoubtedly apathy and inertia play a part in the persistence of any idea or institution, nevertheless the cult does reveal the extent to which an idea and an institution can survive because it is valued by succeeding generations and helps to define and articulate the values of those generations. Hence the longevity must be accounted for: from the presentation of Charles as an icon of legitimacy and suffering kingship in 1648, to the report of the Church of England acknowledging his sanctity as a legitimate expression of Anglican spirituality in 1957. Why was a King who for most of his reign was neither successful nor popular, and who was decisively defeated in a bloody Civil War, the only English king since the Reformation to be canonised?

Perhaps the answer to this question lies in the very fact that he was defeated so decisively and the subsequent trauma and fear of social breakdown this defeat aroused in significant sections of the community. In retrospect the tensions and anxieties of the Personal Rule seemed trivial compared to the radicalism, exactions and depredations of Parliament and the Army. The ensuing reaction of the late 1640s ensured that the figure of Charles, now a helpless prisoner, would be reassessed. What this reaction also reveals is the extent to which the idea of sacred kingship was part of the fabric of contemporary life. The king was not just an executive officer, but sacred both in his person and his office. He partook of both secular and religious functions, uniting church and state in his person. Therefore the relative merits of the King were irrelevant and the sight of the King as a prisoner, bearing his captivity with dignity and firm in his determination to resist his enemies, not only set an example of resistance to the all-conquering Parliament and Army, but also became a symbol of the sufferings of the nation. In affirming and encouraging these stereotypes and addressing directly the anxieties of his contemporaries, Charles ensured the success of the *Eikon Basilike* which both confirmed contemporary experience and schooled future generations into a particular relationship with the Civil Wars, the rebels and the person of the King.
Yet to be successful and survive the cult needed more than the personal example and testimony of Charles; it needed a vehicle to sustain and propagate the martyr's image. That vehicle was provided by the Church of England, which shared Charles' defeat and persecution; in this shared suffering the particular bond between the martyr and Royalist Anglicanism was formed. This process was facilitated by the fact that defeat and exile allowed the Arminians to purge the Church of Presbyterians and Calvinists, who could be accused of unleashing the conflict in the first place. Thus in the 1650s the identification of Charles with a liturgical and Arminian Anglicanism was forged and the Church could appropriate the martyr to their own use without qualification, a luxury denied the Presbyterians. With the victory of this reconstructed Anglicanism in 1662 the cult entered upon its golden age. The political theology implicit even before the regicide became an orthodoxy sustained by the near monopoly of Royalist Anglicanism to print and pulpit until the Exclusion Crisis for the first time challenged this orthodox view of the martyr and revealed the depth of the tensions and divisions within Restoration society.

From 1680 the nature of the cult began to change; from the ideal of uniformity implicit in the newly restored Church, the cult became the property of a party. Yet ironically in so doing, the cult was assured of survival, for whilst the ideology of order based upon patriarchalism and divine right retained any vitality, the figure of the royal martyr would also remain. The work of Sack, Colley, Clark, Nockles and others has demonstrated that patriarchalism and theories of divine right did not disappear in 1688, 1714, or even 1789, but persisted well into the nineteenth century. Reverence for the martyr was part of this tradition, hence the survival of the cult as an integral part of high church and Tory ideology.

In looking at the iconography of the cult one can again ask why it was so consistent and why it emerged so rapidly in the late 1640s? When examining Marshall's famous frontispiece to the *Eikon Basilike* one can distinguish a number of sources, not least the Bible and the classical authors, which were refracted through late medieval and Renaissance theories of royal power. To this was added the Foxian tradition of Protestant martyrdom which was combined with an older, Catholic tradition which posits death as the gateway to life, and the utter defeat of the earthly career as a sign of a transcendental victory. All these themes were united in the concept of suffering kingship, seen most effectively in the 'Behold your King' woodcut of 1648. This image unites the
anxieties of contemporaries with the heroism of the King and suggests a parallel with Christ's sufferings, which in turn contains the assurance of ultimate victory. The persistence of these images can be explained in similar terms to that of the cult itself; they corresponded to people's understanding of the world around them, and the hierarchy of family and society. They also served to identify one's opponents - those who rejected the imagery, the political theology and the vision of society contained therein. Yet it is notable that cult imagery was to collapse before the political theology; the rationalism of the eighteenth century finding the 'baroque' images of William Marshall too rich for its taste!

Yet having discussed the persistence of the cult, one has to acknowledge a steady decline in its vitality throughout the eighteenth century. Paradoxically the identification of the martyr with a particular party, which I have suggested as one of the mechanisms of its survival, may also be seen as a symptom of its decline, in that the martyr is reduced to the position of a party label, and what is more, is rejected or ignored by those not identified with that particular party. This process can be seen taking place from the 1680s onwards, until one's credentials as a good Whig or Tory were measured in part by one's attitude towards the martyr. A feature of this polarisation was an increasing divergence in the historiography of the Civil Wars. In claiming the martyr as their own the Royalist Anglicans constructed an historiography of the wars and the regicide based upon national sins, ambition, rebellion and bloodguilt; a view which sustained Charles' radical innocence whilst presenting his opponents as black hearted villains. Such a view had never been entirely accepted and the Presbyterians in particular argued consistently that they had never sought the King's death or approved of the Republic. Again, the Exclusion Crisis was to be the catalyst which exposed the divisions over Civil War historiography, with the dissenters and their allies remembering a different process of events and motivations to that enshrined in the cult's political theology. The battle over historiography was to dominate many of the conflicts and controversies surrounding the cult in the early eighteenth century.

This conflict over historiography was related to the question of memory and the process of remembering. Because the political theology of the cult was tempered in the fire of Civil War and defeat it reflected the immediacy of those events. Faced with an apparently ruthless and successful enemy who had destroyed the foundations of monarchy and religion, the Royalists were
not inclined to tread softly in asserting the innocence and heroic virtue of 'their' martyr. Not only that, but the cult in the 1650s was important in maintaining morale and cohesion amongst a defeated and scattered party and confirmed the belief that, whilst earthly success might elude them, the truth was on their side. But as time went on it became harder to remember these events and the strong emotions they aroused. By 1710, a twenty-year old witness of the regicide would have been over eighty, which means that later generations were obliged to make a leap of imagination in an attempt to understand the significance of the events and people they were being asked to commemorate. This may go some way to explaining the gradual fading of Charles from the Fast Day sermons at the end of the seventeenth century. Taken together with the change of sermon style, the growing distance from the event of 1649 made it easier to use the Fast Day to discuss contemporary political and constitutional issues in the light of the regicide, rather than attempt to evoke in the minds of the listeners an image of Charles the individual facing the predicament of defeat and death.

One other possible reason for the disappearance of Charles from the sermons was the lack of intercession. Whatever individual's private practice may have been, there is little evidence to support the view that Charles was invoked directly by the faithful in the period covered by this study. The public manifestations of the cult were strictly in accord with Anglican teaching on intercession; namely that whilst the saints undoubtedly prayed for the church on earth in a general sense, there was no possibility of the individual believer invoking the aid of a particular saint with a particular petition. The saints were not intermediaries between man and God, but examples and witnesses to be admired and emulated. This lack of intercession breaks the emotional link between the believer and the saint and, over time, reduces the saint to the position of a benign older relative of whom we know virtually nothing beyond the fact of their existence, which ultimately may seem an irrelevance.

A further aspect of this lack of immediacy is that the details of the cult were drawn in ever broader brushstrokes. From the detailed invocation of Charles' life, virtues, trial and execution present in some of the early sermons, by the eighteenth century this in replaced either by a purely political debate, or by the broad assertion that the regicide confirms, as a general principle, the role of providence in human affairs. That God intervenes directly in society was a 'truth' accepted
by almost all in 1649 - hence the potency of bloodguilt for both regicides and Royalists. Much of
the passion of the 30th January Office is based upon this conviction of God's providence and the
fact that God is intimately concerned with the form of government in England. Modern
scholarship on the eighteenth century, in the wake of Jonathan Clark, makes us wary of
pronouncing the death of providentialism, but on the other hand, no one in the 1730s believed
that Walpole ruled by divine right, and the fear of 'enthusiasm' tended to limit providential activity
to a general rather than a particular intervention in government - whilst the grounds of
government and society were divine, the particular forms adopted were left to the reason and
needs of the people concerned. Yet in 1859 it was to providence that the defenders of the State
Services appealed, the Duke of Marlborough reminding the Lords that politics were not merely a
secular or utilitarian activity and that nations as well as individuals lived under the providence of
God; an appeal the Peers chose to ignore.

This changing view of providence was part of a wider problem faced by the cult and its
inability to adapt to changing circumstances. Born out of the trauma of Civil War the cult
encapsulated the philosophy of order, monarchy and society inherited from the Renaissance. On
to this was grafted a particular view of Charles as innocent and heroic, and the two features
became so closely wedded in orthodox thought that an attack on any aspect of this political
theology threatened the integrity of the whole. This accounts for the increasingly shrill assertions of
the orthodox after 1680, and the fact that in 1719 Luke Milbourne's image of the martyr and the
implications of the regicide were identical with those of 1660. Instead of adapting the political
theology in the light of changing circumstances, the proponents of the cult responded to changes in
sermon style, the rise of mechanistic philosophy and the fear of 'enthusiasm' by simply discarding
aspects of the cult which did not fit the contemporary world. Thus, the person of Charles is lost as
the epideictic technique went out of fashion. Theories of divine right and high views of the
prerogative are transmuted into assertions of the divine right of the powers that be; particular
instances of providential action are replaced by general assertions of God's benevolence towards
lawful government; and Charles the hero of Royalist Anglicans becomes Charles the victim of
fanaticism in all its forms. So much of the original cult was jettisoned that by 1859 Earl Stanhope
could argue that much of what was contained in the Office was irrelevant and ridiculous.
Yet in one important respect the central point of the political theology of the cult had been conceded as early as 1688; namely the distinction between public utility and private conscience. Even a cursory reading of the *Eikon Basilike* reveals the extent to which Charles appeals to conscience to justify his actions. Kevin Sharpe has demonstrated that in so doing Charles was entirely consistent with one tradition of Renaissance thought, which posited the Prince as the head of the body of society, the source of reason, the soul and conscience of the state. At his trial and on the scaffold Charles faced the temptation to expediency squarely, declaring that 'If I would have given way to an arbitrary way I need not to have come here'. For Charles the conflict between private conscience and public policy was resolved through the organic union of the two; public policy was the King's private conscience writ large. Yet the conflict between conscience and expediency remained, until Locke declared that conscience was the property of the individual and divorced from the individual operating in the public domain. This privatisation of conscience marks the beginning of the systematic deconstruction of the Renaissance view of the Prince as the animating principle within the state. It was left to the nonjurors, Jacobites and high churchmen to fight a rear guard action on behalf of the organic nature of the state and to assert that private and public conscience were but two aspects of the one moral imperative.

The figure of the martyr remained to remind future generations of this principle, and as confirmation that constancy in politics does matter and does make a difference. Whatever Bradshaw, Cook and the rest might claim at the trial about the authority of Parliament, the people or providence, Charles' composure was rooted in his assurance that he represented a legitimate and lawful authority against what he called 'a power' and that constancy to this belief in the embodiment of lawful authority in his person resulted in the harmony of private conscience and public duty. Perhaps Charles' most enduring influence, and the one aspect of the cult which is still relevant, is as a reminder that legitimacy is a fundamental feature of good government, which a community abandons at its peril, and that legitimacy represents the vital link between private conscience and public duty and security. As Charles so aptly observed at his trial, 'if power without law may make laws, may alter the fundamental laws of the kingdom, I do not know what subject

32 Wedgwood, C. V. The trial of Charles I. 1964. p. 191
He is in England that can be sure of his life, or anything that he calls his own.\footnote{ibib pp. 144, 138.} a statement as true today as it was in January 1649.
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