



# CREATE

Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

<http://create.canterbury.ac.uk>

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g. Dursley, J. (2017) Publicising sovereignty: a study of sovereignty during the late Interregnum and early Restoration periods through propaganda and polemic. M.A. thesis, Canterbury Christ Church University.

Contact: [create.library@canterbury.ac.uk](mailto:create.library@canterbury.ac.uk)



Publicising Sovereignty:  
A Study of Sovereignty during the late Interregnum  
and early Restoration Periods through Propaganda  
and Polemic

by

James Parker Dursley

Canterbury Christ Church University

Thesis submitted

For the degree of MA by Research

2017

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	2
Acknowledgements .....	3
Abstract .....	4
Abbreviations .....	5
Introduction.....	6
Chapter One: Reporting a Ruler.....	23
Chapter Two: Advertising Sovereignty .....	44
Chapter Three: The Disappearing Sovereign? .....	65
Conclusions .....	88
Bibliography.....	92
Primary Sources .....	92
Newsbooks .....	95
Secondary Sources .....	96

## Acknowledgements

Throughout the completion of this thesis I have accumulated several debts of gratitude to those whom, without their support, would have seen this thesis fail before it had even began. Principally, I must thank my supervisors Dr. Sara Wolfson and Dr. David Hitchcock, who have gone above and beyond to push me to explore different areas during this thesis to make it the best that it can be, and for their invaluable advice in expressing my subsequent thoughts. Further, I would like to thank the entire History department, and the Early Modern History department at Canterbury Christ Church University in particular, for introducing me to the Early Modern period, which has now become a source of eternal fascination for me. And finally I must thank my parents, Alison and Barry Dursley, for supporting me both emotionally and financially, and for their willingness to listen to the hundreds of ideas that I have considered throughout this study.

## Abstract

The Interregnum and Restoration are among the most studied periods of Early Modern History, for they were key events in an era of sweeping political change and experimentation which engaged the entire population. Building upon the work of Kevin Sharpe, Jason Peacey and Joad Raymond in the realm of propaganda and image making, this thesis will examine how sovereign theory evolved after Oliver accepted the greater spread of powers offered to him in 1657. Specifically, this analysis will focus on the regimes of Oliver Cromwell, Richard Cromwell, the Republican governments of 1659, and Charles II, to explore how the concept of sovereign authority developed by Thomas Hobbes in his 1651 book *Leviathan* was tested amid the six changes of government between 1657 and 1663. Key to this study will be an investigation into the newsbooks of the period which, as Peacey and Raymond have shown, were instrumental in the state's attempts to communicate with its population, particularly during the Interregnum. Furthermore, this thesis will examine the political tracts advertised within the various newsbooks to expand upon the relationship between news and state, highlighting how the complex issues of Hobbes' sovereign theory were broken apart by seventeenth century writers to attack and defend their ideal sovereign. The result of this study will reveal that Oliver Cromwell, and the role of Protector, were actively promoted as having sole sovereign authority until the end of his rule, effectively forming a template that Charles II's propagandists and supporters would follow after the Stuart Prince's Restoration in 1660. Finally, this thesis will demonstrate that the sovereign arguments used to promote the Republican experiments of 1659 were too artificial to ensure stability in 1659 after Oliver's death, concluding that a single ruler was the only tolerable form of sovereign rule in Early Modern England.

## Abbreviations

CSPD	Calendar of State Papers Domestic
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

## Introduction

The year 1657 was a crucial one for the future of the Commonwealth of England. It would see the end of the rule of the Major Generals in the localities, and saw the crown of England offered to Oliver Cromwell, in spite of eight previous years of attempted republicanism. Despite the fact that Cromwell rejected the title of king, his acceptance of increased powers under the Humble Petition and Advice effectively ensured that the Lord Protector became a 'Prince'.<sup>1</sup> This study will therefore analyse how the perception of the Cromwellian regime was manipulated from 1657 to enhance Cromwell's stature as a champion of the Commonwealth, and promote the Protector as having sovereign authority. Issues, such as whether the image of Cromwell moved closer to that of a king in print culture, had popular support for republicanism waned, and what pro-Commonwealth writers were publishing come to the fore. Similarly, this transfer of power also raises questions about the influence of royalism, and more specifically, the potential for the return of the Stuart family to the throne. The Humble Petition and Advice, as well as the Restoration, raise questions such as whether there was a growth in pro-Charles Stuart or pro-monarchical literature, was there a major literary resistance to monarchy, and whether royalism had truly disappeared during the Commonwealth years. Further, this thesis will explore the twelve month period between the fall of Richard Cromwell on the 25 May 1659 and the formal restoration of Charles II on the 25 May 1660 with the aim of understanding how the definition of sovereign authority evolved to justify sweeping changes in government.

To enable any study into the public manipulation and debate over sovereign authority, it is important to establish a broad definition of what the term sovereign meant in seventeenth

---

<sup>1</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 94 – 3 August – 10 August 1657', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.1535

century England. According to Jason Peacey, in his study of political theory within Thomas Hobbes 1651 book *Leviathan*, sovereign authority was manipulated ‘sought to develop a consent-based theory of sovereignty where individuals transferred their natural power and forswore their natural rights in return for safe and secure government.’<sup>2</sup> Hobbes’ definition approaches the royalist approach to sovereignty, although royal sovereignty may become closely entwined with the concept of the divine right of kings, a personal belief of Charles I who stated that “‘God’s sovereignty”, ...[was] “King of men’s consciences””, a view passed to his son Charles II.<sup>3</sup> By definition, everyone who was not the king was a subject, and therefore restricted to an advisory role.<sup>4</sup> For republicans the idea of public sovereignty emerged with the writings of Henry Parker in the early 1640s, which developed, Mark Kishlansky states, into ‘parliamentary sovereignty’ or ‘*singulas major, universalis minor* – “greater than any but less than all”.’<sup>5</sup> In this sense, every Englishman had the right and authority to challenge a Parliament’s authority, regardless of whether it was Monarchical or Republican, as they were citizens rather than subjects. They had given the House the authority to act by electing them, ergo they could take that authority away by resisting them. However, while republican theories were enough to see monarchy banned and the Commonwealth established, Cromwell’s immediate promotion as the figurehead of the Commonwealth in 1649 instantly fulfilled Hobbes’ definition that sovereignty could only be held by a single figure, for Cromwell ‘consisteth the Essence of the Commonwealth ... One *person, of whose Acts a great Multitude ... have made themselves every one Author*’.<sup>6</sup> The Lord Protector’s belief that monarchy had no place in England through divine intervention

---

<sup>2</sup> J. T. Peacey, ‘Nibbling at *Leviathan*: Politics and Theory in England in the 1650s’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (1998), p.241

<sup>3</sup> Cited in Kevin Sharpe, ‘Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I’, *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (Sept., 1997), p.654

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, in Richard Tuck (ed.), *Hobbes: Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), p.121

<sup>5</sup> Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603 – 1714* (London: Penguin Books, 1997), p.39

<sup>6</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.121



meant that he could not accept the title of King, yet the powers granted to him led to the pro-Protectorate author of *The Publick Intelligencer* to call him a 'Prince'.<sup>7</sup> Arguably, Robert Zaller comes closest to defining sovereignty during the Cromwellian rule, who states that Cromwell, while personally rejecting Thomas Hobbes' definition of sovereignty, 'embodied the characteristics of a Hobbesian sovereign to a striking degree: his rule was based on the promise of security; he molded institutions according to his pleasure; and he did not hesitate to use force.'<sup>8</sup> Therefore, for the purposes of this study, polemic and debate regarding sovereignty in print will be compared against the Hobbesian definition.

Because this study will focus on the public debate and manipulation of sovereign authority, it is important to understand two of the major titles of the period: Lord Protector and Monarch. The original constitution of the Commonwealth, the Instrument of Government, made clear that the title Lord Protector was one to which a person was 'elected' rather than gained through hereditary right, a marked change from the understanding of monarchy in the seventeenth century.<sup>9</sup> Other terms in the Instrument spread power and authority between a single house Parliament and a minimum thirteen member Council of State, which would 'advise' the Protector during his rule.<sup>10</sup> However, J. R. Tanner states that Cromwell sought to dissolve his first Parliament, called on 3 September 1654 as per the terms of the Instrument, at the first opportunity after it spent the majority of its existence debating amendments to the constitution.<sup>11</sup> Sharpe draws a similar conclusion, commenting that Cromwell's use of the word 'calling' in a speech to the First Protectorate Parliament was a

---

<sup>7</sup> Canne, 'Number 94', *Publick Intelligencer*, p.1535

<sup>8</sup> Robert Zaller, 'Breaking the Vessels: The Desacralization of Monarchy in Early Modern England', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Autumn 1998), p.773

<sup>9</sup> Samuel Rawson Gardiner (ed.), '97. The Instrument of Government', *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906), pp.405-7

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> J. R. Tanner, *English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century 1603-1689* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp.182-3

means to demonstrate his authority over them.<sup>12</sup> The issue of Parliament being dissolved and called at the behest of the ruler had been a key element in the start of the English Civil War, where Charles I's Personal Rule had seen Parliament uncalled from 1629 until the spring of 1640.<sup>13</sup> The fact that Cromwell was handed these powers suggests that the title of Protector was far closer to that of a Monarch when dealing with the everyday business of Parliament, fulfilling the Hobbesian definition of a sovereign.

To legislate against the prospect of a single ruler, the Instrument included a provision that the Protector must call a Parliament every third year, and that every Parliament must last a minimum of five months before it could be dissolved, while the Council of State would remain in power throughout.<sup>14</sup> However, this concept of a Triennial Parliament had been tried during the 1640s, where Charles I had been forced to accept the Triennial Act in 1641 after the work of the Long Parliament, and had been another key feature in sending England down the path to civil war in 1642. Combined with this is the fact that the Council of State was to be made of advisers who would serve for life, with replacements nominated by Parliament, and other Council members, before the Protector himself made the final choice.<sup>15</sup> This bears a striking resemblance to the monarchical Privy Council, which had been vilified during the 1640s and had remained in exile with Charles II, a fact that Peter Gaunt is quick to note.<sup>16</sup> Although Gaunt identifies Cromwell's choice was to be limited to whom the Council nominated, the actual effectiveness of the Council was restricted to day to day business, regardless of whether Parliament was in session or not.<sup>17</sup> However, Cromwell still required

---

<sup>12</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Authority and Representing Rule in Early Modern England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), p.186

<sup>13</sup> Jonathan Watts, 'John Pym' in Timothy Eustace (ed.), *Statesmen and Politicians of the Stuart Age* (Hong Kong: MacMillan, 1985), p.125

<sup>14</sup> Gardiner, 'Instrument', pp.405-7

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Peter Gaunt, 'The Single Person's Confidants and Dependents? Oliver Cromwell and His Protectoral Councillors', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (Sept. 1989), pp.546-7

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p.547, 549

the consent of either Parliament or the Council to make major reforms to law, taxes or foreign affairs, his power of veto only extending to block changes those groups proposed, a key difference between the role of Protector and that of Monarch.

However, this outward balance of sovereign authority would be readdressed with the Humble Petition and Advice, which made Cromwell a 'Prince' according to the editor of *The Publick Intelligencer* in May 1657.<sup>18</sup> By definition the Humble Petition and Advice without the provision for Oliver Cromwell to be crowned, meant that 'King Oliver' could never be proclaimed, despite the fact that Cromwell himself had rejected the title when the Humble Petition was originally proposed in February 1657.<sup>19</sup> Gaunt has completed an extensive analysis on the debate of whether Cromwell actively used his Protectoral powers as a king, while Sharpe highlights Cromwell's personal rejection of the title of king due to a belief that God himself had made the title redundant.<sup>20</sup> However, Cromwell was handed vastly greater powers than before, including the right to declare an heir rather than nominate someone whom would have to be elected as Protector, essentially reflecting the well-established monarchical concept of hereditary rule.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, the Humble Petition also reinstated the upper House of Lords, another device abandoned in 1649 and strongly associated with monarchical rule, drawing the perception of the Protector in 1657 ever closer to that of the traditional, view of a monarch's sovereign authority.<sup>22</sup> Thus, the Protectorship would come to reflect the definition of sovereignty proclaimed in Hobbes' *Leviathan*, which stated that only

---

<sup>18</sup> Canne (ed.), 'Number 94', *Publick Intelligencer*, p.1535

<sup>19</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England 1603-1660* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2010), p.475

<sup>20</sup> See Gaunt, 'Protectoral Councillors', *Historical Journal*, pp.542-3; Sharpe, *Image Wars*, p.475

<sup>21</sup> Samuel Rawson Gardiner (ed.), '102. The Humble Petition and Advice', *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (1900), pp.405-7

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

a single figure could hold sovereign authority, regardless of whether they ruled a Kingdom or Commonwealth.<sup>23</sup>

The concept of a monarch was a far more simple title to grasp in 1657, although there would still be constant repositioning by Charles II in order to conform to its ideals. Arguably the most important factor for a King of England was to be a Protestant, something which Charles II and his advisors were keen to maintain during his exile as Anna Keay has stated.<sup>24</sup> Whether the King had to be Presbyterian or Anglican was more of an unknown, with the court in exile containing a sizable faction of Anglicans, whereas England's administrators were largely Presbyterian.<sup>25</sup> To solve this issue an outward ambiguity from Charles II and chief advisor Edward Hyde was used to ensure that the king's personal preference remained largely unknown until the religious settlements of 1662.<sup>26</sup> Divine right was another element to which a monarch would be expected to conform to, meaning that the king was to govern as God's representative and as the 'father' of the nation, arguments that Cromwell used to define his role as Protector through divine providence.<sup>27</sup> Divine right played to Charles II's main argument that he was the rightful, and therefore legal, heir to the throne and had, under the rights of hereditary rule, effectively been made king on the 30 of January 1649, the day of his father's death.<sup>28</sup> It was unlikely that the wider population of England truly wanted to have Charles I executed, and it had required numerous purges of Parliament before the Rump approved his execution, highlighting a natural support for monarchism. Popular support for

---

<sup>23</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.121

<sup>24</sup> Anna Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (London: Continuum, 2008), p.65

<sup>25</sup> Timothy Eustace, 'Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon', in Timothy Eustace (ed.), *Statesmen and Politicians of the Stuart Age*, (London: Macmillan, 1985), pp.166, 169-70; For Catholics in the Stuart Court in exile see Mark Williams, *The King's Irishmen: The Irish in the Exiled Court of Charles II, 1649-1660* (London: Boydell & Brewer Ltd, 2014) and Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile 1640-1660* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

<sup>26</sup> Eustace, 'Edward Hyde', pp.166, 169-70

<sup>27</sup> Sharpe, *Image Wars*, p.471

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.529-31

divine right was unknown, although many key figures among the Stuart court recognised that it was the most efficient way for a country to be governed, as long as the king took and acted upon the advice of his people.<sup>29</sup> To rule without would leave a king to be labelled as a tyrant, an accusation levelled at both Charles I and Charles II during the Interregnum by Commonwealth propagandists, but one which was also used to describe Cromwell by his opponents.<sup>30</sup>

To expand upon this understanding of sovereign rule, it is necessary to understand how the period of 1657 to 1663 has been analysed previously, particularly in terms of propaganda and polemic. Kevin Sharpe and Jason Peacey are the principal writers on this period, both of whom had commented on propaganda and print emerging from the final years of the Interregnum. Peacey's work has highlighted censorship during the Cromwellian era, highlighting the work of John Thurloe in suppressing Royalist writers prior to and after the Humble Petition and Advice.<sup>31</sup> This case study forms part of Peacey's much wider study into print during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum, which has focused on Royalist, Parliamentary and Republican attempts at propaganda during the period.<sup>32</sup> Peacey concludes that Royalists were forced to use printed material on an ever increasing scale throughout the Interregnum, through techniques and innovations developed by the Commonwealth's propagandists.<sup>33</sup> Peacey's work provides an excellent start into looking at the activities of royalist writers at the dawn of the Restoration. As Peacey's study ends in 1660, questions can be raised about how pro-royalist literature developed or were utilised by the state after the restoration of Charles II, until the cessation of newsbook printing in 1663.

---

<sup>29</sup> Eustace, 'Edward Hyde', pp.167-8

<sup>30</sup> D. Border, 'Number 26: 21<sup>st</sup> October – 28<sup>th</sup> October 1659', *The Loyall Scout* (London: 1659), pp.202-3; John Canne (ed.), 'Number 222: 12<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> March 1660', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1660), p.16

<sup>31</sup> Jason Peacey, 'Cromwellian England: A Propaganda State?' *History*, Vol. 91, No. 2 (April 2006), p.182-4

<sup>32</sup> Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p.307

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p.307

This thesis consequently asks what were the aims and purpose of royalist writers post-1660; did republicanism continue to feature in discourse about the nature of government; and were propaganda and polemic still required to reinforce rule or ideas of sovereign identity.

A similar limitation affects Sharpe's major contribution to the debate around pro and anti-royalist propaganda between 1657 and 1663, which also stops with the invitation for Charles II to return to England.<sup>34</sup> In the study entitled *Image Wars*, Sharpe analyses a variety of means of propaganda production undertaken during the Commonwealth period including print, coinage, state artworks and architecture as part of the various government's attempts to generate popular support for their respective regimes.<sup>35</sup> Although Sharpe's focus is on visual propaganda rather than an analysis of the perception of a royal 'subject' or republic 'citizen', Sharpe does suggest that the Royalist campaign in print was enhanced by the more 'natural' concept that monarchy was 'God's ordinance'.<sup>36</sup> It was because of this understanding that Commonwealth propaganda was ultimately focused around the figure of Cromwell from the start, which Sharpe infers by highlighting the offer of the crown to Cromwell in 1653.<sup>37</sup> Sharpe's analysis therefore reveals that instead of changing the concept of how England was run via the 'old Constitution [of] King, Lords and Commons', the Commonwealth propagandists only exchanged the powers of the king with that of Protector, as symbols of Charles I were replaced with symbols representing Cromwell and the Protectorate.<sup>38</sup> Sharpe takes this further when analysing John Milton's *Eikonoklastes*, a key Commonwealth text written to counter Charles I's posthumously published *Eikon Basilike*, with both texts serving as the basis for other pro and anti-royalist works throughout the Interregnum.<sup>39</sup> In this

---

<sup>34</sup> Sharpe, *Image Wars*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.433, 442-4

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.454-5

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p.468

<sup>38</sup> Richard Baxter, *A Holy Commonwealth, or, Political Aphorisms* (London: 1659), p.ix; *Ibid.*, pp.436-7

<sup>39</sup> Sharpe, *Images Wars*, pp.400-1

analysis Sharpe states that Milton ‘struggled to refigure Charles the man as well as the monarch’, effectively ensuring that the Basilike, and by extension Stuart Royalism remained unchallenged.<sup>40</sup> A similar conclusion can be drawn from Annabel Patterson’s study into Censorship and Interpretation in Early Modern England, which has highlighted Milton’s desire to challenge the literacy work of Basilike, instead of challenging its message directly.<sup>41</sup> In spite of these conclusions, Joad Raymond points to the fact that *Eikonoklastes* was burned in significant numbers during the first year of the Restoration, hence suggesting that a text that failed to achieve its political aim, in this case to counter the royalist memory of Charles I, still held provided a threat to the state’s public polemic.<sup>42</sup> With this long-lasting impact of texts and ideas, regardless of success, this thesis will attempt to analyse how mass printed media was countered in print, as well as physically, beyond their immediate release.

An analysis into Republican and Commonwealth theory in the latter part of the Interregnum also provides questions about the impact of political tracts, some of which have yet to be fully explored. Timothy Eustace’s study into the life of Sir Henry Vane, a prominent Republican and Fifth Monarchist M.P. who was ousted from Cromwell’s Protectorate Parliament after voicing his concerns about the regime in the 1656 pamphlet *A Healing Question*.<sup>43</sup> However, Eustace does not analyse the content of *A Healing Question*, or whether it spawned any more pro-Republican works, so further study is required into Vane’s public influence. Nigel Smith, in contrast, suggests that pro-Republican thinking did not disappear after the events of 1657, stating that Milton’s 1660 published *The Readie and Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* as a bewailing report on the fight for a free state.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p.401

<sup>41</sup> Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), p.178

<sup>42</sup> Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p.365

<sup>43</sup> Timothy Eustace, ‘Sir Henry Vane, the Younger’, in Timothy Eustace (ed.), *Statesmen and Politicians of the Stuart Age* (London: Macmillan, 1985), pp.150-1

<sup>44</sup> Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (London: Yale University Press, 1994), p.193

Furthermore, both Smith and Raymond's studies suggest that there was very little pro-Republican literature produced after 1657, with only a minor resurgence during the chaotic events of 1659, when Protectorate, Army and Republican rule were all attempted.<sup>45</sup>

Conforming to this is Christopher Hill's *The World Turned Upside Down* which lists, rather than fully analyses, pro-Republican material produced in 1659, concluding that the majority of those works were produced from an economic, rather than political stand point.<sup>46</sup> This essay will take these points on motivation to print into consideration when analysing the polemic of sovereign authority in 1659.

For Charles II and Royalism the period of 1657 to 1663 was also a chaotic time, although many historians agree that it was a time when both became increasingly popular. Tim Harris, for example, suggests that the overwhelming majority of the population of London were keen to see the return of Charles II by the spring of 1660, having remained ambivalent before the chaos of 1659.<sup>47</sup> Harris' analysis expands that of Christopher Hill, which suggests that support for Charles II was through the unrelated combination of the minority interests of radicals, royalists and Anglicans in the final months of the Republic.<sup>48</sup> The former's study goes further than Hill's into how radical groups attempted to support Royalist conspiracies during the Interregnum, while also focusing on ambiguous public attacks on the Rump and Army governments in the final months of 1659.<sup>49</sup> Yet, Harris does not include any analysis of either newsbooks or pamphlets through his study, only referencing printed petitions around the time of the Restoration, rather than focusing on polemical pieces. Hill's analysis is also limited by his choice to focus on radical groups

---

<sup>45</sup> Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, pp.182-3, 187-9, 191, 193

<sup>46</sup> Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London: Penguin Books, 1991), p.346

<sup>47</sup> Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p.37

<sup>48</sup> Hill, *World Turned Upside Down*, pp.347-8, 350-1, 353-4

<sup>49</sup> Harris, *London Crowds*, pp.42-5



throughout the Civil War and Interregnum, before drawing conclusions on those groups in the year 1660, further restraining its use.

A more focused study into newsbooks printed after the Restoration, with analysis on pro-royalist and pro-Stuart propaganda can be found in the work of James Sutherland, who states that post-Restoration news was carefully controlled and presented in ‘a reassuring manner’.<sup>50</sup> Yet, Sutherland’s input into the issue of propaganda at the time of the Restoration, and the years preceding it, is limited to an overview of what was being done by editor Henry Muddiman, with much more focus placed on newsbooks printed after the Great Fire of London. J. B. Williams has also completed a study focused entirely around newsbooks, although his work focuses entirely around those printed during the events of 1659, through to the first year of the Restoration. Williams highlights the fall of prominent pro-Cromwellian propagandist Marchamont Nedham in May 1659 from control of the Commonwealth newsbooks, *Mercurius Politicus* and *Publick Intelligencer*, only to be replaced by ‘incompetence’ in the form of John Canne.<sup>51</sup> Williams’ study then analyses the machinations of General Monck, commander of the Army in Scotland, in the realm of print, who employed Muddiman to control newsbooks upon Monck’s arrival in London in early 1660.<sup>52</sup> The career of Muddiman is then broken apart, with Williams highlighting Muddiman’s three year monopoly granted by Monck and Charles II, before moving through to the work of Roger L’Estrange, a famed Royalist propagandist from the mid-1660s onwards.<sup>53</sup> The career of L’Estrange has received a lot of focus from numerous historians, with Williams’ work in particular focusing on his early career as a royalist pamphleteer in the months surrounding the

---

<sup>50</sup> James Sutherland, *The Restoration Newspaper and its Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p.93

<sup>51</sup> J. B. Williams, ‘The Newsbooks and Letters of News of the Restoration’ *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 23, No. 90 (April 1908), pp.253-4

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.257-8

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.258-60

Restoration.<sup>54</sup> Others, such as Raymond, have mentioned L'Estrange's pamphleteering career in brief, choosing instead to focus on his work as head of the royal censorship campaign that would come into effect during 1663.<sup>55</sup> Likewise, Harold Love has mentioned, rather than analysed, L'Estrange as a pamphleteer, choosing instead to focus on his career as a censor under Charles II, while Sutherland provides an extensive analysis of L'Estrange's control of post-1663 newsbooks.<sup>56</sup> Ultimately, it is Williams who provides the most balanced examination of royalist news before, during and immediately after the Restoration, although he does not provide an in depth analysis of what Muddiman was publishing, or the content of L'Estrange's pamphlets. This study will therefore analyse these Royalist writers and their remarks on sovereignty, and examine what Muddiman would print while working on behalf of General Monck, and later L'Estrange.

An important element of the period after the offer of the crown to Cromwell is how the image of Charles II himself was manipulated to generate support from the English population. The work of Andrew Lacey suggests that there was a strong foundation for pro-Stuart writers to work from, with the emergence of the Cult of the Martyr King in the wake of his father's execution. Lacey's study focuses on the Cult's development from the execution block and its de facto founding text, *Eikon Basilike*, a move which effectively ensure a sympathetic memory of Charles I survived into the 1650s.<sup>57</sup> Lacey speculates on the attempts by royalist supporters to mark the regicide on the 30 of January, although ultimately concedes that it is impossible to judge to what extent these celebrations, which survived through the 1650s, were kept hidden from official view.<sup>58</sup> Lacey's study also incorporates the work of the

---

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.159-62

<sup>55</sup> Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, pp.324-6

<sup>56</sup> Harold Love, 'L'Estrange, Sir Roger (1616-1704): Author and press censor'. From H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds.), *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Sutherland, *Restoration Newspaper*, pp.9-11

<sup>57</sup> Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), pp.18-9, 81-6

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.131, 135

post-Restoration government in refocusing the Cult's energy, with the Office for 30 January incorporating various celebrations of Charles I into a campaign to enhance the legitimacy of Charles II, and to change the 'historiography' of the Civil Wars and Republic.<sup>59</sup> However, the overwhelming focus of Lacey's study is on the portrayal of Charles I rather than the influence of the Cult on his son Charles II, instead suggesting that the Cult was a means for Anglicans, rather than Charles II, to re-establish their control. Anna Keay, in contrast, completes an in-depth analysis of the life of Charles II, incorporating various elements of 'ceremony' before, during and after the Restoration, in order to outline how Charles II portrayed himself publically.<sup>60</sup> Keay's analysis notes that Charles II was 'unusually tall', and had carefully maintained his image as a prince during his exile, maintaining the loyalty of royalists both in England and abroad.<sup>61</sup> The study also highlights Charles' coronation in Scotland on the 1 January 1651 but only mentions, rather than analyses, the subsequent spread of reports regarding the event.<sup>62</sup> Indeed, Keay's study does not focus on the polemic surrounding Charles II's exile, only making minor remarks on how the Commonwealth propagandists used Charles' reputation for being "devoted to pleasure" as a means to attack the exiled court.<sup>63</sup> This thesis will therefore examine how the Protectorate attacked the sovereign authority of 'the Scottish King', as well as the Restoration government's attempts to enhance Charles II's sovereignty once he was on the throne.

Arguably the most valuable element of Keay's study for the purpose of this thesis comes in her analysis of Charles' entry into London from Dover in May 1660, although her focus on the ceremony surrounding Charles as he moved through Kent eliminates the

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p.136

<sup>60</sup> Keay, *Magnificent Monarch*

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., pp.47-8

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., p.57

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., p.77

unofficial celebrations held elsewhere.<sup>64</sup> David Underdown has highlighted the celebrations in the south west of England and concluded that there was a widespread joy in the return of monarchy across the country, so much so that areas with strong Puritan links were unable to prevent banned practices, such as maypole dancing, from returning to their jurisdictions in 1660.<sup>65</sup> The royal procession has also been covered by Underdown, who states that from the moment that Charles II landed at Dover genuine joy at his arrival spread along the route.<sup>66</sup> Sharpe has also analysed the procession, highlighting the fact that Charles kissed the ground at Dover and the promotion of the royal oak which, according to Sharpe, would be adopted as a symbol of the regime after Charles had hidden inside an oak after the battle of Worcester.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, Sharpe suggests that it was Charles' period in exile that made him a popular figure among the population, becoming known for being witty, affable, familiar and vulgar, a stark contrast to the Puritan figure of Oliver Cromwell.<sup>68</sup> Godfrey Davies has also commented on Charles' image, stating that his escape from Worcester became more valuable to him as a romantic image, rather than a symbol of his failure.<sup>69</sup> Davies also comments on the sharp rise in 'Lives' about Charles that appeared in the first months of the new regime, which were a counter to those produced celebrating Oliver Cromwell.<sup>70</sup> Furthermore, although Davies finds criticism in Charles' attendance of the theatre, his preference for satire and vulgarity would have appealed to the wider population as Sharpe suggests.<sup>71</sup> This study will analyse whether these depictions of Charles II were reflected in either pro or anti-

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., pp.81-4

<sup>65</sup> David Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp.271-3

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., p.273

<sup>67</sup> Sharpe, *Reading Authority*, p.194

<sup>68</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p.218

<sup>69</sup> Godfrey Davies, 'Charles II in 1660', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (May 1956), pp.250-1

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., pp.257-8

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p.262

monarchical works printed around the Restoration, and whether they affected the debate surrounding sovereign rule.

Based on the questions raised by the historiography regarding a ruler's image, sovereign rule and the manipulation of public perception, this study will be split into three chapters. The first element of this analysis will focus on newsbooks, allowing this study to emphasise how both the Cromwellian or Restoration regimes' used official newsbooks to promote their sovereign identity, while attacking other concepts. In order to complete this investigation, various comparisons will be drawn between the two regimes' sets of newsbooks, with the issues of *Mercurius Politicus* and *Publick Intelligencer*, printed during the Interregnum, and *Mercurius Publicus* and *The Parliamentary Intelligencer* of the Restoration years the main focus. The portrayal of key figures, such as Oliver Cromwell and Charles II provide a crucial area of this analysis, drawing comparisons between how they are referenced in years of support and when viewed as opponents. Similarly, the representation and reporting of various plots against each regime will be compared, as well as how the plotters themselves were portrayed after their arrest. Through these various comparisons this study will demonstrate that the perception of royalism changed very little in spite of the Cromwell's denial of the crown, and demonstrate that portraying a Protector as a sovereign ruler was akin to promoting a monarch.

The second part of this study will analyse miscellaneous printed media, including widely published books, pamphlets and ballads that were advertised within the newsbooks printed during the late Cromwellian and early Restoration periods. As newsbooks were among the most widely available sources of information in mid-seventeenth century England, it is likely that printed works advertised within them would have a far wider readership than those that were spread by word of mouth. Using Sharpe and Lacey's concept that *Basilike* provided a foundation for royalist polemic during the Interregnum, this study will

demonstrate that works advertised to support monarchy used *Basilike's* central concept that the king represented God; ergo any other form of rule could not be legitimate.<sup>72</sup> Additionally, Hobbes' *Leviathan* will be used as a principal means of comparing concepts suggested by both Protectorate and Royalist writers, who needed to justify a definition of sovereign rule to establish the legal authority of their respective rulers. Furthermore, the attempts of anti-monarchical, and pro-Cromwellian, writers to promote their interests will also be examined, in order to demonstrate that there were too many factions in the English Commonwealth to promote a united front against royalism. Without a united front, the concepts of royalism and monarchy defined by *Basilike* and *Leviathan* would never truly disappear under Oliver Cromwell, while royalist writers in the 1660s had a universal polemic that they would bring to the fore as they attempted to ideologically restore England to a Kingdom.

The third and final part of this essay will focus on the chaotic year of 1659, which saw numerous changes of government and a sharp rise in unlicensed pamphlets and newsbooks, as well as a complete change in who the state used to write their own propaganda. This section will analyse the final month of Richard Cromwell's reign as Lord Protector, highlighting how even the state backed newsbooks *Publick Intelligencer* and *Mercurius Politicus* turned on Richard as more pro-Army editors D. Border and Richard Collings emerged with their own works.<sup>73</sup> This section will also incorporate the public print battle between Republicans and pro-Army writers in newsbooks and the books they promoted, a debate which followed public posturing from various figures, including General John Lambert and General George Monck. This element of the study will effectively demonstrate that too many definitions of a Commonwealth, and its authority, were proposed between the fall of Richard and the return of Charles II to grant the English Republic stability. Without

---

<sup>72</sup> Sharpe, *Image Wars*, p.453

<sup>73</sup> D. Border (ed.), 'Number 1: 22<sup>nd</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> April 1659', *The Faithful Scout* (London: 1659), p.1

that stability, and hence security according to Hobbesian sovereign theory, this study will ultimately support Underdown's claim that a significant portion of the population moved to back Charles II in the final months of the Republic.<sup>74</sup>

The overall aim of this thesis will be to demonstrate that the royalist concept of sovereign authority was one that the Commonwealth could not eliminate after a decade of rule, although it was in an overall dormant state until Oliver Cromwell was offered the crown in 1657. Once Cromwell gained the enhanced powers under the Humble Petition and Advice, it became clear that the titles of King and Protector were far more similar than previously thought. This study will show that the methods with which state backed newsbooks referred to their respective rulers differed little, and is an important factor in understanding why the Restoration was possible and, ultimately, survived. Furthermore, the analysis of the books and pamphlets advertised within the newsbooks will expand upon their influence, allowing the more theoretical discussions into sovereign authority to come to the fore. Additionally, separation of 1659 into its own chapter will allow this study to better explore the sudden swings in sovereign theory that emerged in the public sphere during that year, and demonstrate how the royalist definition of a sovereign became more appealing to the wider population as the Republican experiment drew to a close.

---

<sup>74</sup> Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, p.272

## Chapter I: Reporting a Ruler

The newsbook became the main form of state controlled propaganda distribution during the English Civil Wars, a trend that would continue through the entire Interregnum and into the Restoration period. The Commonwealth government had two established state newsbooks by 1657, *Mercurius Politicus* and *Publick Intelligencer*, which together provided one of the most efficient forms of communication between the State and population, and were used throughout the 1650s to show that the newly re-invested Protector was a sovereign leader. In 1660, under the Restoration government, these issues would be supplanted by two similarly named newsbooks, *Mercurius Publicus* and the *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, although the change in names did not change their purpose for both would be used to demonstrate that the returning Charles II was also a sovereign ruler.

This chapter will therefore analyse the content of the newsbooks in their attempts to display the sovereign authority of both the Protectors and Charles II as monarch, comparing it against the template dictated by Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*. Hobbesian theory dictated that the sovereign must display the ability to protect their people both spiritually and physically, as well as their legal right to rule, either by succession or force.<sup>1</sup> As such, this chapter will focus on various terms such as Highness, Majesty, high treason, divine authority and both foreign and domestic perception to examine how Protectorate and Restoration propagandists used newsbooks to display, or deny, sovereign authority.

The aims of chief Commonwealth and Protectorate propagandist Marchamont Nedham is an interesting area of analysis for a study of newsbook propaganda and sovereignty, with

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*. In Richard Tuck (ed.), *Hobbes: Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp.121, 126, 136, 139, 199



Joad Raymond stating that Nedham found the Hobbesian definition of a Sovereign ‘Provocative’.<sup>2</sup> The word ‘provocative’ suggests that Nedham sought to counter Hobbes’ implication of sovereignty being restricted to kingship, and he would do so by attacking the most viable successor to the throne: Charles II. Nedham’s newsbooks *Public Intelligencer* and *Mercurius Politicus* frequently used the term ‘Titular King of Scots’ to identify Charles Stuart, a name that Benjamin Woodford has stated was a means of attacking Charles as an ineffective ruler: a king without a throne.<sup>3</sup> This is not shown by the newsbooks printed after 1657, however, which instead apply the title ‘King of Scots’ when referring to Charles’ military plans. In the first issue of *Mercurius Politicus* printed in 1657, Nedham comments on the ‘designs of those Fugitives of your Nation, that are scattered up and down on this side of the Water,’ referencing the troops of the ‘Titular King of Scots’ amid Charles’ negotiations with Spain for support.<sup>4</sup> As the leader of a ‘scattered’ group of ‘Fugitives’, Charles’ credibility as a military leader was being questioned by Nedham, who was aiming to undermine any potential support for Charles that existed in England. The association of the ‘King of Scots’, and military failure dated back to the Battle of Worcester on the 3 September 1651, which saw the newly crowned King of Scotland resoundingly beaten by an army under the command of Oliver Cromwell.<sup>5</sup> Although not directly referencing the battle almost six years previously, Nedham plays to the established concept that Charles, the ‘King of Scots’ was not a threat, implying that he would require the support of Spain to have any chance of impacting on England.

Further comments on Charles, ‘King of Scots’ and his military force can be found in other editions, with comments on the morality of his troops, as well as his true role as a leader.

---

<sup>2</sup> Joad Raymond, ‘Nedham [Needham], Marchamont (bap. 1620, d.1678)’. From H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds.), *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

<sup>3</sup> Benjamin Woodford, ‘From Tyrant to Unfit Monarch: Marchamont Nedham’s Representation of Charles Stuart and Royalists during the Interregnum’, *History*, Vol. 100, No. 339 (January 2015), p.10

<sup>4</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 342 – 24 December – 1 January 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.1-2

<sup>5</sup> Anna Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (London: Continuum, 2008), p.59

On the front page of edition 68 of *Publick Intelligencer*, Nedham reported that the ‘Mustering of [the] Scottish Kings Forces’ was ‘Said to be about six thousand ... very ill conditioned in their ways, and rob people in the high ways, and pistol passengers.’<sup>6</sup> An earlier edition stated that there was ‘a Popish Chaplain in every one of his Regiments’, although here Nedham speaks of ‘Charls Stuart’ rather than the ‘King of Scots’ in an attempt to avoid associating the title of King with Catholicism.<sup>7</sup> Nedham made this distinction to support the work of his employer Secretary of State John Thurloe, who would be among those to push Oliver Cromwell to take the crown under the Humble Petition and Advice.<sup>8</sup> By effectively aligning Charles Stuart the man with Catholicism, Nedham was undermining any moral basis for the return of a Stuart monarch for, as the English Civil Wars had shown, only a Protestant could rule England. Furthermore, while this detachment was designed to enhance the prospect of Cromwell taking the crown with backing from the public, it would survive past his rejection of the offer, for Charles continued to consult with known Catholic power Spain, England’s most significant rival.

Furthermore, it was not just the morality ‘Charls Stuart’ that Nedham sought to attack, as the editor of the Protectorate newsbooks sought to form a juxtaposition between Charles the younger’s supporters in exile, and ‘those that fear God’ in support of the Cromwellian government.<sup>9</sup> Paul Rahe has suggested that Charles and James were referred to as one in the earliest editions of *Politicus* and *Publick Intelligencer*, but Nedham distinctly referenced them separately in the final two years of the Cromwellian rule.<sup>10</sup> None would receive as much moral questioning as the future King’s brother James Stuart, Duke of York. Murder would be among

---

<sup>6</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 68 – 26 January – 31 January 1657’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.1

<sup>7</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 66 – 12 January – 19 January 1657’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.15

<sup>8</sup> Timothy Venning, ‘Thurloe, John (bap. 1616, d. 1668)’. From H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds.), *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

<sup>9</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 363 – 21 May – 28 May 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.14

<sup>10</sup> Paul A. Rahe, *Against Throne and Altar: Machiavelli and Political Theory Under the English Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp.200-1

the charges levelled at the 'Pretended D. of York', who was reported to have 'inhumanely killed' one of sixty surrendered English soldiers after they 'utterly refused' to join Charles' ranks.<sup>11</sup> Nedham also associated James with piracy, as his colours were reportedly used by 'The Pirat[e] commander' of the Frigate Little Michael as it raided French and Dutch ships heading to England.<sup>12</sup> Nedham moved to associate the Duke of York, rather than Charles II, as the principle aggressor against England, particularly after the pair reunited with each other after a personal fallout in early 1657. Other reports stated the Duke was fighting alongside Spanish troops against England's allies France, while also being one of the leaders in the Spanish-Royalist defeat to the Anglo-French forces at the battle of the Dunes on the 14 June 1658, the last physical battle between Cavaliers and Commonwealth.<sup>13</sup> This transfer of responsibility was a calculated one by Nedham, for it ensured that James became a target of suspicion, the second in line to the defunct throne, while simultaneously eroding the perception of Charles as a Hobbesian style sovereign. A seeming reliance on his brother's military prowess, which like Charles' had more frequently ended with defeat than victory, meant that Charles could not ensure 'safe government' as Hobbes' theory suggested he must do to retain legitimacy.<sup>14</sup>

To alleviate the memory of Charles II and his brother being in arms against England throughout the 1650s, Charles' propagandists set about re-establishing his right to rule as the successor to a 'murdered' king. To do so was to go beyond the Hobbesian theory on succession; that a democracy, or Parliament could not nominate a successor, for Charles had been invited to take the throne by the Convention Parliament on the 25 May 1660.<sup>15</sup> Instead, Charles' propagandists were highlighting his right to rule via Divine Right, for Charles carried the blood

---

<sup>11</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 375 – 6 August – 13 August 1657', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.15

<sup>12</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 66 – 12 January – 19 January 1657', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.15

<sup>13</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 131 – 21 June – 28 June 1658', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1658), p.1

<sup>14</sup> J. T. Peacey, 'Nibbling at Leviathan: Politics and Theory in England in the 1650s', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (1998), p.241

<sup>15</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.136; Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 22: 21 May – 28 May 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), pp.2-4

of an anointed king, God's representative, within him.<sup>16</sup> Within the first month of the Restoration, before Charles had even set foot on English soil, Mercurius Publicus published a report 'That John Bradshaw deceased ... be one of those that shall by Act of Parliament be attained of High Treason, for the murdering of the late Kings Majesty. The same order was made concerning Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, Thomas Pride deceased.'<sup>17</sup> The editor of Publicus was seeking to undermine the memory of the old Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes by attacking their foundation: the illegal execution of Charles I. It was the Regicide that came to dominate the early issues of the Restoration newsbooks, with near-weekly updates on the state of the trials against the 'murderers' of Charles' father, including transcriptions of the court proceedings themselves. Issue 41 of Mercurius Publicus, for the week of 4-11 October 1660 listed the first 28 regicides to be arrested, as well as the opening of proceedings against 'those wretched men ... who contriv'd, arraign'd, sentenc'd and executed that most vertuous [sic] Prince our late Sovereigne Lord King Charles the First'.<sup>18</sup> The subsequent edition of Publicus makes similar statements, including the concept of the 'Martyr'd Sovereign' when reporting the trial of Hugh Peters.<sup>19</sup> Identifying Charles I as 'Sovereigne' reinforced the concept that the former King had legally ruled England in 1649, and therefore restored the concept of the monarch being the embodiment of the state and sovereignty. The report also includes the two pleas of guilty by Sir Hardress Waller and Mr George Fleetwood, whom both were said to 'be preferred to His Majesty for mercy.'<sup>20</sup> This was a significant bonus for the new Restoration government, for the recognition of guilt by Waller and Fleetwood backed up the concept that there had been a genuine crime committed in 1649, while their submission to Charles II for 'mercy' enhanced his role as the 'fountain of justice' or source of legal authority

---

<sup>16</sup> Kevin Sharpe, 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (September, 1997), p.654

<sup>17</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 20 – 10 May – 17 May 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.15

<sup>18</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 41 – 4 October – 11 October 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.13

<sup>19</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 42 – 11 October – 18 October 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.13

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.14-5

in England.<sup>21</sup> By focusing on the trials of the Regicides, Charles II's propagandists are publicising that both he and his father were sovereign lords, one becoming a martyr of monarchy, the other displaying his sovereignty by seeking justice for his predecessor.

Furthermore, highlighting that it was of high treason as the central charge against the Regicides was one which propagandists used effectively to validate further the sovereign authority of Charles II for, according to Hobbesian theory, attacking the sovereign was to go against the state itself.<sup>22</sup> Additionally, the charge of high treason, according to Hobbes, was one which meant that the transgressor was going against the 'Fundamentall' or God's law, for which the monarch was responsible for maintaining as the 'fountain of justice'.<sup>23</sup> For Royalist propagandists, high treason fitted naturally with the concept that the king was sovereign, ergo any attempt to attack the king was a treasonable act. High treason was the principle charge levelled against the main figures behind the Regicide in the reports of the Dury edited newsbooks, with Cromwell, Ireton, Bradshaw and Pride all tried and executed as a result of the charge.<sup>24</sup> Likewise, John James was accused of High Treason for 'preaching maliciously, and trayterously, against the life and safety of our Sovereign Lord the King, and against the Peace and Government of this Realm', having been caught stating his intent to 'destroy his Majesty' Charles II in October 1661.<sup>25</sup> The Marques of Argyle was reported to be standing trial for 'fourteen Articles of High Treason', which included conspiracy against both Charles I and Charles II, as well as 'Confederacy with Cromwel'.<sup>26</sup> Labelling traitorous acts against the king

---

<sup>21</sup> J. H. Baker, 'Criminal Courts and Procedure at Common Law 1550 – 1800', in Cockburn, J. S. (ed.), *Crime in England 1550 – 1800* (London: Methuen, 1977), p.25

<sup>22</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, pp.212-3

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.212-3; Baker, 'Criminal Courts', p.25

<sup>24</sup> Dury, 'Number 20', *Mercurius Publicus*, p.15

<sup>25</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 48 – 14 November – 28 November 1661', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.15

<sup>26</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 8 – 18 February – 25 February 1661', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.15

as treason was a key method of linking monarchical rule with sovereignty for Charles II's propagandists, for it effectively united national security with the safety of the king.

Likewise, the government under Oliver Cromwell used the charge of high treason as a means to reinstate the Lord Protector as the sovereign, for it was deployed by the state's propagandists to promote the need to secure the Protector's safety. As Alan Marshall has stated, it was the Sindercombe Plot that 'revived discussions as to whether the Lord Protector should become king,' a plot which Nedham took great care to report in his newsbooks.<sup>27</sup> Nedham states that the plot was a 'Treasonable conspiracie', designed to 'ruine the good People, if they could first destroy his Highness person, Whom God preserve.'<sup>28</sup> In attacking Cromwell the 'notable desperate Fellow' Miles Sindercombe was shown to be attacking the state, a reflection of the Royalist definition of treason against the state.<sup>29</sup> To reinforce this notion, Nedham's report includes reminders that it was God who was responsible for 'this discovery and great deliverance', while the 'House do wait upon His Highness the Lord Protector to congratulate him for this great Mercy and deliverance,' outlining that Parliament were not the equals of the Lord Protector, who had divine protection.<sup>30</sup> The subsequent edition of *Mercurius Politicus* reminds the reader that the people must 'set ourselves to use our utmost endeavors for the preservation of his Highness Person as may secure him and us, and after him the preservation of this Cause, and of the Publick peace', a demonstration that the role of the Protector as sovereign for Cromwell was charged with protecting the nation.<sup>31</sup>

Indeed, the trial of Sindercombe became a centre piece for the regime as Cromwell toiled with the issue of taking the crown, with Nedham continuing to bond the position of

---

<sup>27</sup> Alan Marshall, 'Sindercombe, Miles (d. 1657)'. From H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds.), *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

<sup>28</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 345 – 15 January – 22 January 1657', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.15

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p.13

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.15-16

<sup>31</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 347 – 29 January – 4 February 1657', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.15

Protector with that of a sovereign by highlighting that Sindercombe was ‘conspiring against the Life of his Highness.’<sup>32</sup> Furthermore the full indictment against Sindercombe included in the report stated that the plot was to ‘imagine the death of the said Lord Protector, and to subvert and alter the Government of the Commonwealth.’<sup>33</sup> There is no suggestion of the plot being against Parliament, meaning that understanding of the charge of ‘High Treason’ during the Protectorate period was that it was only to be applied to the ‘Life’ of the Protector. Therefore, Nedham reinforced the concept that the Protector was a sovereign ruler by playing to the seventeenth century understanding of treason; that only God can judge a legitimate ruler. To confirm this the following issue of *Politicus* describes Sindercombe’s suicide on the eve of his execution, including the coroner’s report which recounted a ‘brain much inflamed, red, and distended with Blood,’ before printing the ‘Verdict’ on his death that stated that he had done so ‘by the instigation of the Devil.’<sup>34</sup> Nedham continued on to recount the execution of Sindercombe’s lifeless body later that day, with the ‘stark naked’ corpse of Sindercombe left with a pike ‘driven through him into the earth’ at Tower Hill having been hung ‘as an example of terror to all Traytors for the time to come.’<sup>35</sup> Through sensational language, Nedham was reinforcing the ‘example’ that the court had set for the charge of Treason against the Lord Protector, and ensuring that the Lord Protector was viewed as a sovereign.

The term ‘His Majesty’ was one inherently tied to kingship in the seventeenth century, and it was one that the Restoration propagandists used extensively when Charles II was restored to the throne to secure understanding of his sovereignty. ‘Majesty’ was used in the edition of *Mercurius Publicus* dated the week 26 April – 3 May 1660, which presented the reader with news that it was the ‘Birthday of our Sovereign Charls the Second, whom God preserve;’ before

---

<sup>32</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 348 – 5 February – 12 February 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.15

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12

<sup>34</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 349 – 12 February – 19 February 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.14-15

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16

a discourse on ‘His Majesties gracious Letter and Declaration’.<sup>36</sup> This ‘Declaration’ would be the famed Declaration of Breda, which the editor summarises over the following pages, highlighting that ‘His Majesty promises upon the word of a King’ when speaking of the pardon that later became the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion.<sup>37</sup> It is ‘His Royal Majesty’ that ‘declare a Liberty to Tender Consciences’, ‘His Majesty’ that will ‘consent to any Act or Acts of Parliament to the purposes aforesaid’, and that ‘all Arrears due to the Officers and Soldiers of the Army under the Command of General Monck’ will be paid and considered to be ‘in His Majesties service’ as a result of this Declaration.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, the editor of *Publicus* focuses on the reaction to the attached letter when it was read in Parliament, focusing on the remark of Mr. Luke Robinson that ‘If a Message from His Majesty hath such influence as to beget so eminent a Concert, why may we not hope that His Glorious Appearance will be an universal healing to the Nations; Men will recover their Senses again, as well as their Liberties.’<sup>39</sup> The editor of *Publicus* is reminding the reader that Charles II’s ‘Majesty’ was his identity as a sovereign ruler, using the term in place of using Charles’ name as a means of conferring authority to him directly.

To counter the title of ‘Majesty’, the Protectorate propagandists opted to use the alternative distinction of ‘His Highness’ as a means of distancing the title of Protector from that of king, for it was a title not regularly used in England since the reign of Elizabeth I. Nedham consistently reminded his readers that ‘His Highness’ was above the Parliament in terms of authority, stating that there would be a ‘Humble and earnest Prayer of the Parliament to Almighty God ... preserve his Highness, and watch over him for good’ in the wake of the Sindercombe Plot.<sup>40</sup> In early 1657 the colony of Jamaica received ‘news here, which

---

<sup>36</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), ‘Number 18 – 26 April – 3 May 1660’, *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.9

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.9-10

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p.10

<sup>40</sup> *Publick Intelligencer*, 68 – p.7



encourages us that His Highness the Lord Protector will suddenly send us relief, while it was ‘on behalf of His Highness the Protector’ that Louis XIV handed control of Dunkirk to Lord Lockhart in 1658.<sup>41</sup> Here, Nedham is again demonstrating that the role of Protector as ‘His Highness’ was above that of Parliament, for there are no thanks for Parliament from Jamaica, nor recognition from France reported. In everyday parliamentary business, Nedham consistently stated the fact that Parliament had to send legislation to Cromwell ‘for his Highness Consent’, both before and after the offer of the crown.<sup>42</sup> Nedham takes this relation further during reports of Cromwell’s investiture on the 26 June 1657, reporting that ‘His Highness standing thus adorned in Princely State, according to his merit and dignity’ in the moments after swearing an oath to ‘endeavor, as Chief Magistrate of these Three Nations.’<sup>43</sup> Additionally, the Anglo-French capture of Fort Mardyke, which overlooked Dunkirk, was reported on the 26 September 1657 as having been done so ‘on behalf of His Highness’.<sup>44</sup> The language of these statements, and that of the fully transcribed oath, demonstrated to the nation that Cromwell was the sovereign ruler, while the honour of ‘His Highness’ was actively engineered by Nedham to be shown as the representative of the entire state.<sup>45</sup>

Intriguingly, there appears to have been some overlap in how the terms ‘Majesty’ and ‘Highness’ were interpreted in the Protectorate newsbooks, although this balance would change as the English Republic under the Protectors sought to gain international recognition. Nedham’s reports of foreign correspondence, as Peacey has stated, were a valuable tool for

---

<sup>41</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 348 – 5 February – 12 February 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.1; Hall, ‘Number 421’, *Mercurius Politicus*, p.2

<sup>42</sup> Issue 365 of *Politicus*, for example, included a full list of bills sent to the Protector that week, ranging from an assessment in Ireland for funding the war with Spain, to a bill for settling the price of wine.

<sup>43</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 88 – 22 June – 29 June 1657’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), pp.14-15

<sup>44</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 101 – 21 September – 30 September 1657’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.16

<sup>45</sup> For the use of ‘Highness’ as a title elsewhere in Early Modern Europe see Roland Mousnier, *The Institutions of France Under the Absolute Monarchy, 1598-1789*, Volume 2: *The Origins of State and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Olaf van Nimwegen, *The Dutch Army and the Military Revolutions, 1588-1688* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010)

distributing information regarding the continent and England's enemies, consistently referred to the King of France, England's principle ally during the Interregnum, as 'His Majesty'.<sup>46</sup> In an edition of *Publick Intelligencer* dated in early February 1657, the 'very acceptable' news that Sindercombe's attempted assassination of Oliver Cromwell had been thwarted had been reported to the French Court, prompting 'their Majesties ... congratulate him' for the Lord Protector's survival.<sup>47</sup> After the battle of Dunkirk it was reported that 'his Majesty, desirous to give due Testimonies of reall Friendship and good correspondence with England, put the Town into the possession of my Lord Lockhart, on the behalf of His Highness the Protector,' conveying recognition of the French King's authority and Louis XIV's recognition of the Protector as a sovereign ruler.<sup>48</sup> Likewise, neutral sovereigns such as the kings of Denmark and Sweden were frequently reported on as 'Majesties', while King Philip IV of Spain was occasionally, if somewhat dismissively, referenced as his 'Catholick Majesty'. This demonstrates a symbiotic relationship between honours of Highness and Majesty on public display, furthering the concept that Oliver, as Protector, was the equivalent of a King abroad. This would change under his son Richard's rule, however, with the honour of Highness only appearing in transcriptions that directly addressed the Protector. Likewise, as the Army moved to oust the Protector, reference to Richard as such would wain in the newsbooks, with only one foreign reference to Richard as the sovereign in a communique from the King of Denmark, whom 'gave thanks to the Lord Protector' when Richard sent ambassadors to settle the Dano-Swedish war in May 1659.<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, all reference to the position of Protector is abandoned upon Richard's agreement to resign from the title, with his father simply referred to in his former position as 'the late Lord General'.<sup>50</sup> The term 'Highness' can therefore be

---

<sup>46</sup> Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p.205

<sup>47</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 69 – 2 February – 9 February 1657', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), pp.14

<sup>48</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 421 – 17 June – 24 June 1658', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.2

<sup>49</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 175 – 2 May – 9 May 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.14

<sup>50</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 178 – 23 May – 30 May 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.8

understood as a mark of respect for the Protector, and Oliver in particular, with reports of the use of the title abroad enhancing the concept that the Protector was sovereign. Likewise, when the Protector was reasoned to be a poor leader, as the Army deemed Richard, the honour of 'Highness' was withdrawn, replaced by the term 'his Excellency' when General George Monck assumed control of the Army, and the State, in December 1659.<sup>51</sup>

Evidence that divine authority was a major element for the newsbooks when conveying sovereign rule, for it served as conformation that God acknowledged the ruler's ability to lead their people spiritually, as Hobbesian theory dictates.<sup>52</sup> In reporting Cromwell's rejection of the crown, Nedham inferred that God did not consent to the Protector taking the throne, remarking that 'to undertake one of the greatest burthens ... without the support of the Almighty, he must necessarily sink under the weight of it, to the damage of these Nations.'<sup>53</sup> In that same edition Nedham reported Cromwell's acceptance of the amended Humble Petition and Advice, and the belief that it was simply 'an Introduction to the carrying on of the Government of these nations,' to which God had already consented to by granting Cromwell victory in the English Civil Wars.<sup>54</sup> It was a return to the notion that Parliament's soldiers were acting as 'His [God's] servants' when Cromwell led them to victory during the Civil War, a remark that Nedham himself had made when reporting on the battle of Marston Moor thirteen years earlier.<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, the newsbooks of Nedham would be the principal means of conveying days of public Thanksgiving under the Cromwellian Protectorate, which marked a range of events from 'the deliverance of his Highness' from the Sindercombe Plot, to the taking of Dunkirk.<sup>56</sup> In proclaiming God's support of Cromwell, and printing the reminders to the

---

<sup>51</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 1: 19 December – 26 December 1659', *Parliamentary Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.7

<sup>52</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.199

<sup>53</sup> Hall, 'Number 363', *Mercurius Politicus*, p.14

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.14-15

<sup>55</sup> Marchamont Nedham (ed.), 'Number 42 – 1<sup>st</sup> July – 8<sup>th</sup> July 1644', *Mercurius Britannicus* (London: 1644), p.4.

<sup>56</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 350 – 19 February – 26 February 1657', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.7

population that they should publically thank God in the same context, Nedham is publically reinforcing the Protector's sovereignty by declaring that victory served God's interests.<sup>57</sup>

Likewise, the Restoration government took great pains to state that there was divine influence in the return of Charles II and kingship, for Charles truly believed he was God's representative to the nation.<sup>58</sup> Foremost among the reports of Charles' divine inspiration was the performance of the Royal Touch, the success of which would be reported frequently by his propagandists throughout the early years of the Restoration.<sup>59</sup> Publicus advertised Charles II's availability at the Banqueting House, claiming that only the first 200 people 'to be presented to him' would receive the cure for the 'Evil', with which 'The Kingdome having for a long time, by reason of his Majesties absence, been troubled.'<sup>60</sup> By the end of July, Publicus claimed that 'near 1,700 persons' had been Touched since Charles II landed in Dover, with 1,000 more from London alone waiting to receive the cure, which 'his Majesty is graciously pleased to dispatch to all.'<sup>61</sup> Eight months later Publicus reported that there 'certain persons ... have the Forhead to come twice of thrice' to be touched, meaning certificates from Church Wardens would need to be presented from the next 'Healing' onwards.<sup>62</sup> The origins of the Touch came from the miracles of Edward the Confessor, and hence if a king could perform an equivalent miracle, such as the Touch, then it would be evidence of God supporting them, a point Andrew Lacey has made in reference to Parliamentary legislation banning people visiting Charles I when he was held captive.<sup>63</sup> Focusing so heavily on the Touch was a means of tying the

---

<sup>57</sup> For the debate regarding Nedham's personal thoughts on the Protectorate and Commonwealth see Benjamin Woodford, *Perceptions of a Monarchy Without a King: Reactions to Oliver Cromwell's Power* (McGill-Queen's Press, 2013); Blair Worden, 'Milton and Marchamont Nedham'. In David Armitage, Armand Himy, Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Milton and Republicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

<sup>58</sup> Sharpe, 'Private Conscience', *Historical Journal*, p.654

<sup>59</sup> For the use of the Touch by other seventeenth century kings see Marc Bloch, *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France* (London: Routledge, 2015)

<sup>60</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 27 – 28 June – 5 July 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.14

<sup>61</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 30 – 19 July – 26 July 1660', *Mercurius Publicus*, (London: 1660), pp. 1-2

<sup>62</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 7 – 14 February – 21 February 1661', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.1

<sup>63</sup> Lacey, *Charles the Martyr*, p.33

Restoration monarchy back to years before the Interregnum, enhancing Charles II's right to rule as sovereign as he was publically performing the miracle that his predecessors had performed for centuries. Further, it restored a practice that the Army and Parliament had deemed 'superstitious', which, as Robert Zaller has claimed, was part of Charles I's reasons for rejecting peace in 1647 for it would 'betray his crown.'<sup>64</sup> Aiding this was the fact that recent memory of the Touch had not disappeared during the Interregnum, for Nedham's newsbooks reported that the King of France 'touched a great number of people that were sick of the Evil' in early 1657.<sup>65</sup> Though it was only a section from the daily business of the French Court, its inclusion demonstrates that there was still popular belief in the practice, for there is no criticism of the practice, although it must be noted that Nedham would be unwilling to attack England's principal ally. The Touch was renowned as a symbol of divine authority, and by heavily publishing its use by Charles II, Restoration propagandists were demonstrating that Charles was a sovereign ruler.

An important element in comparing the representation of sovereignty between Protectors and Monarchs in the final years of the Interregnum is to analyse how reactions to their respective investitures were reported, for there is both variation and overlap in the methods used by Protectorate and post-Restoration newsbook editors. For Charles II, news centred on his 'Proclamation' as King of England, which was reported in the newsbooks as a means to inspire conformity to the new regime, as reports of celebration were twinned with the official context that a Proclamation was typically read. The report of Charles' proclamation in Oxon was among the first to be printed, reporting the 'very solemn, magnificent, splendid, and joyful order' in which they news was celebrated.<sup>66</sup> As a former Royalist stronghold during the

---

<sup>64</sup> Robert Zaller, 'Breaking the Vessels: The Desacralization of Monarchy in Early Modern England' *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Autumn 1998), p.768

<sup>65</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 65 – 5 January – 12 January 1657', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.5

<sup>66</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 20 – 10 May – 17 May 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.1

English Civil War, and the home of the Royalist press during the conflict, relaying news that the population of Oxford ‘have ever born his Majesties Father, our late King of most glorious memory,’ comes as little surprise, but does reinforce the notion that Charles II had popular support for his return from the propagandist’s perspective.<sup>67</sup> The rest of the edition featured reports from Pontefract and Warwick, while the following week’s issue of *Publicus* included no fewer than twelve reports of Proclamations from across the country, including Liverpool, Scotland, Cambridge and Sherborne.<sup>68</sup> A similar approach had been adopted by the Protectorate propagandists after Oliver Cromwell’s acceptance of the Humble Petition and Advice, which was reported as ‘A Proclamation by His Highness and the Parliament’ on the front page of *Mercurius Politicus* for the week 25 June to 2 July.<sup>69</sup> Further reactions to the Proclamations made regarding Cromwell’s investiture as Lord Protector were slowly trickled across following issues, which similarly reported the ‘solemnity’ of the events. The report of ‘The Publick proclaiming of his Highness the Lord Protector’ from Kings Lynn, Norfolk was printed in an issue of *Politicus* for the week 23 July to 30 July, yet the report itself is undated, simply stated as ‘by the last.’<sup>70</sup> A week later and *Politicus* reported on an ‘acclamation as I have not heard before’ in Albrough, Suffolk, which was staged on the 27 July, before the final major report of celebrations from Rippon, Yorkshire which was printed in early September.<sup>71</sup> In highlighting the ‘solemnity’ of these events, and celebrations surrounding them, both Royalist and Protectorate propagandists attempted to show that the population supported the regime, a public display of consent to the sovereign’s rule, regardless of whether it was a Protector or King.

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2

<sup>68</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), ‘Number 21 – 17 May – 24 May 1660’, *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), pp.1-4, 9-11, 13

<sup>69</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 369 – 25 June – 2 July 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.1-2

<sup>70</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 373 – 23 July – 30 July 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.1-2

<sup>71</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 374 – 30 July – 6 August 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.1-2; John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 380 – 3 September – 10 September 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), p.8

Under Richard Cromwell, however, the reports of the various Proclamations made to announce him as Lord Protector were entwined with the death of his father, giving a far more formal tone. The first such report came of the Proclamation in Exeter, which stated that there were ‘multitudes’ following the officials as they went around conducting the Proclamations, before claiming that ‘I never remember anything done with so great solemnitie’, only to temper that statement by mentioning the ‘invaluable losse ... in the death of the incomparable late Lord Protector.’<sup>72</sup> A similar sentiment from Dunkirk is reported later in the issue, which stated that there was ‘a greate deale of Joy ... yet not without a deep sense of the great loss’, while the report from Herefordshire ‘urged the people to the obedience of the now Lord Protector, citing many places of Scripture to induce them thereunto,’ after the conclusion of the official celebrations.<sup>73</sup> Reaction from Scotland was also contained within the same issue, including the declaration by the Council of Scotland ordering, ‘with consent of tongue and heart’, that the Sheriffs to proclaim Richard’s ascension, only for a second report to be printed in early November to announce that the city had ‘unanimously resolved to adhere unto him and it against Charles Stuart.’<sup>74</sup> The fact that there needed to be a clarification of Scotland and Edinburgh’s position regarding the acceptance of Richard’s accession, with claims that the people were ‘generally well satisfied’ repeated throughout, undermines the notion that people had genuinely given consent for Richard to rule as Protector upon his ascension, hence Nedham’s needed to print reminders.<sup>75</sup>

Furthermore, while reports of the Proclamations of Charles II and Oliver Cromwell were to last for a couple of months at the most, news of Richard’s succession was consistently

---

<sup>72</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 433 – 9 September – 16 September 1658’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.1-3

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.5-6, 9-11

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.14-16; John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 441 – 4 November – 11 November 1658’ *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.1-2

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.1-2

reported through to March 1659, and most often took the form of a ‘humble Address’ with a petition attached. At first glance these address look like a carefully crafted campaign to demonstrate support for the new Lord Protector, with these Addresses and petitions gaining ‘thousands of signatures’ in a document that frequently declared ‘satisfaction’ with Richard’s succession. However, these Addresses had a more formal tone and, unlike the reports of the Proclamations, relayed little news of celebrations to the rise of Richard Cromwell, instead choosing to highlight the popularity of his father. The first such address, printed in issue 146 of *Publick Intelligencer*, came from the County of Buckingham to request that Richard ‘make the Example of your deceased Father to be your Pattern’; namely for the continuation of ‘pious Magistracie and Ministry’, ‘Rights and Liberties’ and ‘the suppressing of Sin,’ so that the population ‘will be ready to testifie our Affections to your Highness, our obedience to your Government.’<sup>76</sup> This was not a gesture of immediate consent to Richard’s rule, rather a promise to support Richard as Lord Protector if he ruled to their expectations; namely that he rule as his father had. A similar sentiment is shown in the Humble Address from Leicester printed two weeks later, which hoped that Richard will ‘indeavour to the just freedom and liberty of these Nations ... according to the Humble Petition and Advice.’<sup>77</sup> The Coventry petition printed in mid-November remarked that it was ‘sad stroke of Divine Providence, that took away ... your Highness most gloriously renowned Father’, while the address of Durham a week later talked of Richard’s father Oliver as one who entwined characteristics of several former Kings, from Henry I to Edward VI.<sup>78</sup> Focusing so heavily on Richard’s father was a means of confirming that the title of Protector was a sovereign position, for Nedham was outlining the widespread support for Oliver Cromwell in that role in every Address he printed.

---

<sup>76</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 146 – 4 October – 11 October 1658’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.5

<sup>77</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 438 – 14 October – 21 October 1658’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.1-2.; John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 445 – 2 December – 9 December 1658’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.11-13

<sup>78</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 442 – 11 November – 18 November 1658’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1658), p.3



In order to appease people to Richard, Nedham used Addresses that spoke of divine providence to legitimise his rule, appealing a more royalist sense of sovereignty to make up for the fact that Richard was a relative unknown. Prior to becoming Protector, the only major report regarding Richard Cromwell had been the launch of *The Richard*, a sister ship to the English fleet's flagship the *Naseby* that had been named 'in honor of the most illustrious Lord, the L. Richard Cromwell' in May 1658.<sup>79</sup> The Dorchester address printed in early December claims that they 'will by Gods assistance adhere to you', while the Leicester address stressed that it was their 'duty' to aid the new Protector after they had 'eye the providential hand of God in calling forth your Highness to success in the Government of these Nations.'<sup>80</sup> The Address from Pontefract printed in early November gave thanks to 'Almighty God' for 'not leaving us as sheep without a shepheard', from Oxford it was stated that Richard was 'the person designated by God and Man to reign over us', while it was with 'thankful hear[t]s we receive the wonderful outgoings of God in our age' that Nottingham Addressed Richard.<sup>81</sup> Even the Army, who would later engineer the removal of Richard, were shown to be supporting the 'Providence in bringing your Highness to succeed him' with a hope that Richard 'carry that good old Cause and Interest of God' in an Address dated the 18 September that was otherwise dominated by reverence of his father.<sup>82</sup> Furthermore, the reception to Richard's speech to his only Parliament on the 27 January, of which only a 'seasoning' could be printed in the immediate newsbooks, was also positive as he reflected these sentiments, although a lack of support for the new Parliament, and hence Richard, soon arose amongst the Army.<sup>83</sup> By stating

---

<sup>79</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 127 – 24 May – 31 May 1658', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1658), p.5

<sup>80</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 444 – 25 November – 2 December 1658', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1658), pp.9-10; Hall (ed.), 'Number 438', *Mercurius Politicus*, p.2.

<sup>81</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 150: 1 November – 8 November 1658', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1658), pp.10-12; John Hall (ed.), 'Number 547: 23 December – 30 December 1658', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1658), pp.10-12

<sup>82</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 434: 16 September – 23 September 1658', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1658), pp.12-13

<sup>83</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 552: 27 January – 3 February 1659', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1658), pp.6-7; Patrick Little and David L. Smith (eds.), *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp.158-60

that Richard was divinely backed in his succession, that the death of his father was something that God had intended, Nedham attempted to introduce the Nation to their new Protector as God's servant. Further, it conforms to Hobbesian theory regarding 'Common-wealth by Acquisition', for Richard had agreed to serve as Oliver's successor after their reported meeting on the latter's deathbed.<sup>84</sup> Richard was being billed as a future sovereign by this method, so there can be little surprise when he fell eight months later as he failed to achieve the divine expectations that had been placed upon him throughout his short reign.

As the Army proved to be the main feature of the Protectorate's downfall, and much of the chaos of 1659, a key element of Charles II's propaganda campaign in the newsbooks would be a need to show that he was in complete control, and had the respect of, the English troops. Reports of demobilisation were a common sight in the newsbooks printed after the Restoration, the first such communique coming on the 8 November 1660, where the garrisons and regiments of South Wales and Hereford were paid off.<sup>85</sup> That issue of *Publicus* additionally reported that the troops 'most cheerfully laid down their Arms, with loud shouts and large expressions of their loyalty and obedience to his Majesty,' highlighting their acceptance of Charles II as their sovereign, and his right to declare both war and peace.<sup>86</sup> A near identical report follows in an edition of *Publicus* two weeks later, while further reports continued to note the 'joy' and 'loyalty' that the disbanded troops displayed across the following months. An edition of *Publicus* in mid-March 1661 took these reports even further, stressing that the regiments of Ireland 'would willingly spend their Lives and Fortunes in his service' should Charles require them.<sup>87</sup> These reports explained that the soldiers had been paid off, but in claiming that the soldiers were satisfied, loyal subjects of the crown, the propagandists managed to counter the

---

<sup>84</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, pp.121, 139

<sup>85</sup> Giles Dury 'Number 45: 1 November – 8 November 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), pp.2-3

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.2-3; Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.126

<sup>87</sup> Giles Dury 'Number 11 – 14 March – 21 March 1661', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.13

memory of Oliver Cromwell, who was famed as a general, and had enjoyed the same right of declaring war and peace as Protector.<sup>88</sup> For those regiments that remained, the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance was made compulsory for new soldiers and officers, with public swearing of the oath reported in several issues, and the oath itself printed in full in both *Kingdomes Intelligencer* and *Publicus* in January 1661.<sup>89</sup> Furthermore, Charles was increasingly reported to be being referred to as ‘Dread Sovereign’ by the army, with letters and addresses printed in full appearing to that effect in *Publicus* as early as the 4 April 1661.<sup>90</sup> This was an older form of Dread, meaning awe or reverence, a form of recognition used to refer to other Kings and Queens of England, and was used as a means to confirm that Charles II had the support of the army like his predecessors. By demonstrating that Charles had the loyalty and respect of the remaining troops, that he had the loyalty of now ex-soldiers that no longer posed a threat to the rest of population without their arms, the Restoration propagandists effectively demonstrated that Charles had the ability to defend the nation, a key part of being a Hobbesian sovereign.

The newsbooks of Oliver Cromwell and Charles II from 1657 onwards were an effective method for establishing that both Cromwell and Charles were legally sovereigns, for it was shown that they could meet the terms of a Hobbesian ruler. Under Oliver, sovereignty was established by various means, from outlining that Charles Stuart was an incapable alternative, demonstrating that Oliver’s position of Protector was divinely supported through his history, to reporting that his acceptance of the Humble Petition and Advice was a decision met with widespread celebration across the country to inspire further conformity. Under Charles II, newsbooks were used in a similar vein, adding the use of memory of former Kings, as well as restoring Charles I to a position of sovereignty to reinforce Charles II’s legitimacy,

---

<sup>88</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.126

<sup>89</sup> Giles Dury ‘Number 3 – 14 January – 21 January 1661’, *Kingdomes Intelligencer* (London: 1660), p.16

<sup>90</sup> Giles Dury ‘Number 13 – 28 March – 3 April 1661’, *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.12

a return to the old ways of governing the country. The exception to this rule would be the propaganda campaign under Richard Cromwell as Protector, who lacked his father's ability to inspire, nor Charles II's long standing claim to rule. Without those foundations, the understanding of Richard as Protector and sovereign would quickly lose its early support, for it was a role so mixed with the perception of his father that no amount of acclaim could ensure wider conformity.

## Chapter II: Advertising Sovereignty

In the week ending 22 June 1657, *Publick Intelligencer* carried a variety of ‘advertisements for books newly printed’, which ranged from *The Life of the Renowned Nicolaus Claudius Fabricius*, to *The History of Magick*.<sup>1</sup> However, among the works advertised was a piece by ‘Britains Remembrancer’ entitled *A Sudden Flash*, which sought to publically outline why Oliver Cromwell had rejected the crown just a month earlier to be re-invested as Protector.<sup>2</sup> This was part of a growing use of newsbooks by the state to manipulate public thinking to support the Protectorate regime, a process started, as Jason Peacey has stated, by the Commonwealth and Protectorate propagandist Marchamont Nedham.<sup>3</sup> This trend was carried over into the Restoration period by Sir Edward Nichols, Secretary of State from 1660 until 1662, a period which saw a vast increase in the number of politically focused works advertised, as compared with the final eighteen months of Oliver Cromwell’s Protectorate.

As such, this chapter will focus on the politically fixated works highlighted by state advertising as a means of comparing how Protectors and Kings were praised, vilified, and even justified as sovereign rulers, using the newsbooks as the gateway that their author’s intended in the mid-seventeenth century. To do so, this analysis will take Thomas Hobbes’ definition of a sovereign ruler, whom must act as a source of justice, act as God’s prophet, and provide stability and security, to examine how other writers attempted to demonstrate or deny sovereignty to Charles II and Oliver Cromwell.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, this analysis will focus on

---

<sup>1</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 87 – 15 June – 22 June 1657’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.13

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p.13

<sup>3</sup> Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p.225

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*. In Richard Tuck (ed.), *Hobbes: Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp.68, 121, 299; Robert Zaller, ‘Breaking the Vessels: The Desacralization of Monarchy in Early Modern England’, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Autumn 1998), p.773

themes highlighted by the individual pieces, with tyranny, religious affinity, justice and the use of the natural world as a metaphor used to view how late Interregnum and early Restoration writers were debating sovereignty. The selection of works will be based on the timing of their advertisement rather than their original publication date, as they were highlighted to gather public support for a particular faction or political concept of sovereignty, and provide a reliable date for when interactions between theories were taking place publically.<sup>5</sup>

The first piece of work to be advertised amid the offer of the crown to Cromwell in early 1657 appeared in *Publick Intelligencer*, on page thirteen of the seventy-third edition, dated for the week 2-9 March. The work was by a Rector named George Lawson, entitled *An Examination of the Political Part of Mr. Hobbs his Leviathan*, printed in London by a Mr. R. White. In it, Lawson offered a discourse into what powers a sovereign, regardless of being a 'Prince' or King, truly has over the 'Civil Sovereignty' of the population and Parliament.<sup>6</sup> Lawson stated that 'There cannot be any Sovereign but one, in one and the same Commonwealth: and to set up Supremacy against Sovereignty; Canons against Laws; Ghostly authority against Civil, must needs be a cause of division, confusion, dissolution.'<sup>7</sup> Here, Lawson is attempting to demonstrate that a sovereign, of any definition, cannot have sole power, and therefore must work with a Parliament to have the true authority, or the right, to rule, a direct counter to the ideal Hobbesian sovereign.<sup>8</sup> This is a pattern that appeared throughout Lawson's piece, with constant reminders that 'the Kings of England never made or repealed a Law, nor levied a subsidie alone themselves, without a Parliament.'<sup>9</sup> The timing

---

<sup>5</sup> Jason Peacey has highlighted the potential value in analysing the adverts printed within the newsbooks of Marchamont Nedham before. See Jason Peacey, 'Cromwellian England: A Propaganda State?' *History*, Vol. 91, No. 2, (April 2006), p.191

<sup>6</sup> George Lawson, *An Examination of the Political Part of Mr. Hobbs his Leviathan* (London: R. White, 1657), p.99, 138

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p.138

<sup>8</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.121

<sup>9</sup> Lawson, *An Examination of Leviathan*, p.100

of the advert for Lawson's work is therefore important to note, for it came in the midst of the Humble Petition and Advice debate over whether Oliver Cromwell should be crowned as King. Lawson's work served as reminder to its readership that, regardless of title, a ruler must operate with the people's consent, 'Otherwise we may fear a military Government, or an absolute Monarch, or a Tyrannie, or an Anarchy.'<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, while it is neutral on the legality of Kings, Lawson bemoans the fact that a sovereign ruler can be affected by ill advice through both Parliament and 'Privy-Counsel' for 'both these may be ill constituted, abused and turned into factions, there is no doubt, we have had too woful experience of this.'<sup>11</sup> For Lawson, sovereignty was a question of balance between a single authority, ideally a King, and a constructive Parliament.

Concern over the style of rule, and what truly constituted a sovereign, also surfaced at the start of the next regime, that of Richard Cromwell in September 1658. In mid-November 1658 issue 152 of *Publick Intelligencer* began advertising a John Milton edited version of Sir Walter Raleigh's *The Cabinet Council*, printed by the state's newsbook printer Thomas Newcombe.<sup>12</sup> Although the work was originally written in the Elizabethan period, Milton's edition appeared in early 1658 as a method of questioning Oliver Cromwell's right to rule as a single authority, as has been discussed by Kevin Sharpe.<sup>13</sup> This is enhanced by the fact that historians such as Mark Nicholls and Penry Williams have come to the conclusion that *The Cabinet Council* was not by Raleigh at all, as can be evidenced by the lack of a copy of the manuscript printed before Milton's edition.<sup>14</sup> Nicholls and Williams suggest instead that Raleigh's name was used by Milton to enhance the work's appeal to scholars and the wider

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p.90

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p.90

<sup>12</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 152 – 15 November – 22 November 1658', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1658), p.12; Walter Raleigh, *The Cabinet Council* (London: Thomas Newcombe for John Milton, 1658)

<sup>13</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Authority and Representing Rule in Early Modern England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp.183-4

<sup>14</sup> Mark Nicholls, Penry Williams, 'Raleigh, Sir Walter (1554–1618)', *ODNB*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

population.<sup>15</sup> However, the work was not advertised until the early weeks of Richard Cromwell's rule, suggesting the editors of *Publick Intelligencer* and *Mercurius Publicus* wanted to promote a debate on the state once again, although Newcombe's hand as printer of both cannot be ignored as he would have benefited from the sales of a work he was advertising. The tome itself provides interesting reflections on what a 'Commonwealth' was defined as, including a Hobbesian-esque opening statement that 'All Common-wealths are either Monarchies, Aristocracies, Democracies.'<sup>16</sup> The role of Protector was not stated outright, although Milton's definitions of 'Soveraigntie' reflect those of Hobbes, with Milton highlighting the sovereign's 'Power to bestow all Honors and cheif Offices at his pleasure', a power that the newsbooks had consistently reported as knighthoods were awarded by Cromwell.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, while 'Artistocracies' and 'Demoncracies' received little attention, the concept of Monarchies were constantly queried by Milton's piece, with the words 'Tyranny' and 'Sedition' only appearing alongside the concept of a single ruler.<sup>18</sup> Criticism of the recent history of Oliver Cromwell and attempts at censorship can also be seen, as Milton stated that 'Tyrants do also endeavor to suppress the knowledge of Letters and civil life, to the end all good arts should be exiled, and Barbarism introduced.'<sup>19</sup> Milton was implying that censorship was a practice limited to single rulers, and hence inferring that the Protectorate was tyrannical for conducting its own censorship campaign led by Secretary of State John Thurloe.<sup>20</sup>

Unlike the previous starts to the final Protectorate regimes, the start of Charles II's reign in May 1660 was not heralded by a piece solely attempting to redefine sovereignty.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.121; Raleigh, *The Cabinet Council*, p.1

<sup>17</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.68; Raleigh, *The Cabinet Council*, p.3; John Canne (ed.), 'Number 121 – 8 February – 15 February 1658', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1658), p.15

<sup>18</sup> Raleigh, *The Cabinet Council*, pp.4, 9, 81-7, 197-8

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p.85

<sup>20</sup> Peacey, 'Cromwellian England', *History*, p.178



Instead, issue 615 of *Mercurius Politicus*, for the week 5-12 April 1660, advertised a series of sermons by John Allington, entitled *A Continuation of the Grand Conspiracy*, which had been preached earlier in the year.<sup>21</sup> The major subject of the sermon was Oliver Cromwell, Allington stating that Cromwell was not only an ‘Impudent Usurper’, but had courted ‘the Devil ... that he might seem to prove himself the Protector, and Prince of this world, (for King he could never reach to)’.<sup>22</sup> Allington went further in his attack of Cromwell as an agent of the ‘Devil’, reminding his readers that ‘as Gods anointed truly said, my help, my Crown, my Kingdom is of the Lord’, echoing statements made in Charles I’s *Eikon Basilike*, and enhancing his argument that Cromwell wanted to be King.<sup>23</sup> Additional criticism of the Cromwellian rule came through attacks on the Army, with Allington further stating ‘what ever any thing is made of, by the same principles it must be kept up, that which is got by the sword, must be kept by the sword, and that which is got by the Divil, must be kept by the Divil.’<sup>24</sup> In attacking Cromwell’s reputation as a General, by equating his rise to Protector by the sword and Army to consorting with ‘the Divil’, Allington was further undermining the perception of the Protectorship as a sovereign position. The timing of the advert for this piece is crucial, for it appeared just a few weeks before the Army remnants, led by a principal author of the Instrument of Government John Lambert, capitulated as the last major group actively resisting Monck’s gradual shift towards the restoration of monarchy. The language used by Allington against the remains of Cromwell’s Army mirrored that used by Lambert’s militant rebels, as demonstrated in the *Calendar of State Papers for April 1660*. In them, an intelligence report reveals Lambert’s men believed ‘The Lord is angry that ... we employ carnal, selfish men in His work, especially that treacherous wretch, the Lord General, but we

---

<sup>21</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 615 – 5 April – 12 April 1660’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1660), p.9

<sup>22</sup> John Allington, *A Continuation of the Grand Conspiracy* (London: 1660), p.5

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p.6

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p.27

hope he will be removed out of the way.’<sup>25</sup> Their aim was to remove George Monck, who was proclaimed Lord General before the final Rump government dissolved itself, and prevent either Monck, or Charles Stuart, from taking the throne. Allington’s sermons therefore worked hand in hand with the Council of State’s attempts to keep the majority of the population on the side of the Restoration before a full Parliament had been elected to make the Restoration a reality. The circulation of Allington’s work was particularly important, for it was advertised in the London newsbooks, a city left vulnerable by Monck’s destruction of the gates upon the request of the Council.<sup>26</sup> In stating that God was the backer of kings, and the ‘Divil’ a supporter of ‘the Protector’, Allington undercut the Army remnant’s campaign, and reinforced the concept that a king was the only valid sovereign according to God.

Memory was an important element in the polemic pieces advertised during the Interregnum and Restoration, and could serve the purpose of both attacking and defending the sovereignty of a specific person or position. George Wither’s *A Suddain Flash*, advertised in issue 87 of *Publick Intelligencer* as being by ‘Britains Remembrancer’ is one such example, using the memory of the Civil Wars to explain why Oliver Cromwell rejected the crown in 1657.<sup>27</sup> According to Wither, Cromwell’s achievements in defeating Charles I and Charles II merited the title of king at the very least, for ‘Thou hast subdued Kingdomes, and great Kings; | Whereby, their Crowns, their Scepters & all things | Belonging to such Conquerors, are thine, | As truly, as the Clothes I wear, are mine.’<sup>28</sup> Yet, Wither states that the title of Protector is something more, a legitimatising position that makes Cromwell superior to all other Rulers: ‘For, in his condescending to be King, | He could have been, at best, no greater thing | Than other Earthly Princes: But, hereby | He may ascend unto

---

<sup>25</sup> Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), ‘Volume 220: April 1660,’ CSPD: Interregnum, 1659-60 (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1886), p.407

<sup>26</sup> Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London: Penguin Books, 1997), p.219

<sup>27</sup> Canne, ‘Number 87’, *Publick Intelligencer*, p.13

<sup>28</sup> George Wither, *A Suddain Flash* (London: 1657), p.5

a *Sovereignty*,<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, Wither makes repeated statements that the Protectorship was ‘by God, conferred upon him’, while also implying that it was the former kings, rather than Cromwell that had ‘usurped’ control of England, so ‘GOD, hath provided to restore | All, that our Kings usurped heretofore’.<sup>30</sup> This reinforces the underlying message from the newsbooks printed by the State, which constantly advertised days of Thanksgiving for England’s military triumphs under Cromwellian rule. An example of this can be seen in the reporting of the Battle of Santa Cruz, Tenerife, fought on the 20 April 1657 but officially reported to the Council of State on the 27 May, whereby the Council ordered the printing of the report, as well as a day of Thanksgiving, which both appeared in that week’s editions of *Intelligencer* and *Politicus*.<sup>31</sup> This is a modification of the Hobbesian template of a sovereign, which dictates that the sovereign served as God’s prophet.<sup>32</sup> Both Wither and the State were making it clear to the public that God was on the side of Cromwell, and so the rule of a Protector was as a sovereign.

For the Restoration writers, however, memory was used to restore Charles I to his throne and to enhance Charles II’s authority. In the context of the Restoration, memory was used to refer back to rule of Charles I, highlighting the pious aspects of the former king. Alongside Allington’s *Continuation of the Grand Conspiracy*, issue 615 of *Politicus* advertised *The Faithful yet imperfect Character Of a Glorious King, King Charles the First*, written by ‘A Person of Quality’ and sold at the exact same book seller, Richard Royston.<sup>33</sup> It is important to note that Royston had a long association with works promoting Charles I, noted as the first bookseller to sell the *Eikon Basilike* in 1649.<sup>34</sup> As for the *Faithful yet*

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.5, 13-5, 37, 44, 47

<sup>31</sup> Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), ‘Volume 155: May 1657,’ *CSPD: Interregnum, 1656-7* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1886), p.387; John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 364 – 28 May – 4 June 1657’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1657), pp.11-3, 16

<sup>32</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.299

<sup>33</sup> Hall, ‘Number 615’, *Mercurius Politicus*, p.9

<sup>34</sup> H. R. Tedder and rev. William Proctor Williams (ed.), ‘Royston, Richard (1601–1686)’. From H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds.), *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

imperfect Character, the author claims that Charles I was ‘the highest Monarch upon earth’, but was powerless to prevent the civil war without infringing on his rights or style of rule.<sup>35</sup> Indeed, when outlining Charles I’s traits and ‘Vertues’, the author states that Charles I ‘let his affections to, and an high opinion of mens Persons ... to weigh down his own judgement’ prior to the Civil War, effectively allowing ‘those that carried on their own Designs, under some specious pretence of service to him’ to bring England to war.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, to counter the claims of Wither that Cromwell’s rejection of the Crown in 1657 was to obtain a more legitimate sovereignty, the author of Faithful yet imperfect Character stated that Charles I ‘seemed to ware rather an Immortal then Temporal Crown’ during his reign, a crown later confirmed by his death.<sup>37</sup> The Faithful yet imperfect Character was attempting to undermine any retrospective thought that either Cromwellian or Parliamentary rule were Godly periods, rather that the man those regimes killed was God’s chosen ruler. Further, it restored Charles I to a Hobbesian definition of a sovereign, one who attempted to guide his people as God’s prophet.<sup>38</sup> Later works also advertised in royalist newsbooks would play to this concept, such as Thomas Forde’s panegyric *Virtus Redivivia*, advertised in *Parliamentary Intelligencer* 43, which stated ‘He who had worn a Crown of Gold, must now admit a crown of thornes, that might fit him for the Crown of Glory.’<sup>39</sup>

An important element for a sovereign in seventeenth century England, according to Hobbes, was to be perceived as being a just ruler, one who ruled within the bounds of the law.<sup>40</sup> For Royalists writing during and after the Restoration this was a simple matter, for the concept that the monarch was the centre for justice was one bound in Common Law since the

---

<sup>35</sup> A Person of Quality, *The Faithful, yet Imperfect, Character Of a Glorious King, King Charles I: His Country’s & Religions Martyr* (London, 1660), pp.68-9

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.35-6

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4

<sup>38</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.299

<sup>39</sup> Thomas Forde, *Virtus Rediviva* (London, 1660), p.24

<sup>40</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, pp.212-3

Saxon period.<sup>41</sup> John Gauden's commentary *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter House*, advertised during the first week of July 1660 in Parliamentary Intelligencer, stated that in killing Charles I Parliament 'obstructed the Fountain of Justice, altered the Channell, broken the Cistern, turned the clear and wholesome waters of our Laws into blood'.<sup>42</sup> The Faithful yet imperfect Character likewise commented that 'when Justice was most corrupted in the streams, it was ever pure in him the Spring.', when defending Charles I, an important reminder at the time of advertising given that the Council of Safety were still negotiating the Restoration settlement with Charles' son.<sup>43</sup> Allington's piece made a near identical statement when commenting on Charles I's defeat; 'as if God had delivered whatever the sword had forced; whereas indeed, the streams of Gods justice, they had ever run in a regular channel'.<sup>44</sup>

Of Charles II, Walter Charleton's *A Character of his Most Sacred Majesty, Charles the Second*, advertised and printed a year and a half into Charles II's reign, remarks 'He is a KING, in whom Clemency and Justice, Piety and Fortitude, Modesty and Magnanimity, (Virtues that seldom co-habit in one breast) are with so perfect an Union married together.'<sup>45</sup> Charleton's piece was particularly timely, for it was advertised in Publicus 46 for the week 7-14 November 1661, a period when the government were campaigning against a rise in non-conformist agitation, while still dealing with the legacy of the Cromwellian rule: 'There are many mongrel justices that were for Oliver, who proceed coldly and neglect duty.'<sup>46</sup> William Langley summarises that 'They [kings] are Gods by deputation, in that they judge not for men, but for the Lord, 2 Chron. 19.6.', a statement made in his piece *The Death of Charles*

---

<sup>41</sup> J. H. Baker, 'Criminal Courts and Procedure at Common Law 1550 – 1800', in Cockburn, J. S. (ed.), *Crime in England 1550 – 1800* (London: Methuen, 1977), p.25

<sup>42</sup> John Gauden, *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter House* (London: 1660), p.7

<sup>43</sup> *A Person of Quality, Faithful yet Imperfect Character*, p.39

<sup>44</sup> Allington, *Grand Conspiracy*, p.9

<sup>45</sup> Walter Charleton, *A Character of His Most Sacred Majesty, Charles the Second, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland. Defender of the Faith, &c.* (London: 1661), p.21

<sup>46</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 46 – 7 November – 14 November 1661', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.13; Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), 'Charles II - Volume 44: November 1661', *CSPD: Charles II, 1661-2* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1861), p.155

the First Lamented.<sup>47</sup> By advertising works such as these, the Restoration newsbooks were reinforcing Charles II's right to rule by demonstrating that legal justice would be guaranteed under the restored monarchy, for it was a return to the natural method of legal justice and peace keeping, akin to the sovereign template in *Leviathan*.<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, a piece by John Hall advertised in May 1657 as Cromwell debated taking the English throne, commented that 'Nay and respect to the continual administration of Justice also, unto which (doubtless) our Laws had an especial regard, when not onely the publick peace is called the Kings Peace, but the Laws too are called his Laws, being acted in his name, as well as enforced by his authority;'.<sup>49</sup> Advertising Hall's work was a final attempt by the newsbook editors to persuade Cromwell to take the crown, for it focused on the sense of stability and peace that monarchy had long been associated with.

Likewise, works advertised during the Cromwellian period attempted to demonstrate the same concepts, albeit to consolidate the rule of the Protector as a single sovereign ruler. Wither takes a direct approach to the issue, replacing the fountain analogy for one of foundations: 'By our Protector, who, must be the Stone | First laid, to build their new fram'd work upon?'.<sup>50</sup> Samuel Purchas used another analogy entirely in his study *A Theatre of Politicall Flying-Insects*, advertised twice in October 1657 and again in June 1658, periods of relative stability after Cromwell's second inauguration.<sup>51</sup> Purchas comments that 'The Laws whereby this Commonwealth is ordered, are natural, not written in letters but engraven in their manners;' when writing about the structure of a bee-hive, a piece deliberately designed to test sovereign theory against the natural world.<sup>52</sup> Although Cromwell was inaugurated

---

<sup>47</sup> William Langley, *The Death of Charles the First Lamented, with the Restauration of Charles the Second Congratulated* (London: 1660), p.58

<sup>48</sup> Hobbes, 'Leviathan', pp.91-2, 191

<sup>49</sup> John Hall, *The True Cavalier Examined by his Principles and found not guilty of Schism or Seditious* (London: 1656)

<sup>50</sup> Wither, *A Suddain Flash*, p.16

<sup>51</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 106 – 26 October – 2 November 1657', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), p.12; John Canne (ed.), 'Number 128 – 31 May – 7 June 1658', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1658), p.12

<sup>52</sup> Samuel Purchas, *A Theatre of Politicall Flying-Insects* (London: 1657), p.33

against two written constitutions, Purchas states that it is within the Protector's rights to rule as other single sovereigns had previously, remarking that 'the Commander of the Bees' should 'imitate the King of Bees, who so deports and carries himself, that hee is beloved, provided for, and protected by all the Bees;'.<sup>53</sup> Marchamont Nedham's self-advertised piece, *The Great Accuser Cast Down*, which appeared in *Publick Intelligencer* 110 to attack preacher John Goodwin, attempts to defend the Protectorate's authority over law by claiming that Goodwin 'is as bold as Leviathan, and having a Brow of Brass, it is he that counts the present Authority and Laws but as straw and rotten wood before him.'<sup>54</sup> In this, Nedham is implying that Cromwell's rule is legal, for Goodwin is simply ignoring law to state his own arguments, despite evidence otherwise: 'he vomits up against the present Authority, because they have given Rules and Directions by a Law to prove men whether they be sound in the Faith, before they be sent to preach the Faith'.<sup>55</sup>

Tyranny was also a key topic for writers attempting to define sovereignty on behalf of their rulers, for it was used as a tool by the newsbooks to both attack the regime's predecessors, and defend their current ruler. John Milton, for example, used his Walter Raleigh attributed piece, *The Cabinet Councill*, to suggest that Charles I was a tyrant due to the fact that '[against the] causes of Civil War some remedies may be used, because it preceedeth of Faction, Sedition or Tyranny.'<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, Milton claimed that sedition and tyranny derived themselves from 'certain Captains, Cavaliers, or Ringleaders of the people' who fought for Charles I, yet the former king did nothing to prevent them from doing so.<sup>57</sup> This, combined with Milton's consistent association of monarchs with tyrants, demonstrated a personal pursuit of a return to a Republican style of rule upon the accession of Richard to

---

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4

<sup>54</sup> Marchamont Nedham, *The Great Accuser Cast Down, or, A Publick Trial of Mr. John Goodwin* (London: 1657), p.55

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p.55. 'Faith' in this context meaning to support the sovereign, rather than religious belief.

<sup>56</sup> Raleigh, *The Cabinet Councill*, p.81

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p.83

his father's title. Other works produced in the final years of the Interregnum took a more theoretical position, attempting to define tyranny to alienate it from the title of Protector, and more significantly king. Publick Intelligencer issue 73, printed in the first week of March 1657 as Oliver Cromwell debated taking the crown, carried an advert for Lawson's Examination of Hobbs Leviathan, which stated that 'Tyrannie doth not signifie Monarchy, nor Oligarchy an Aristocracy.'<sup>58</sup> Although this was a quote directly from Leviathan, Lawson does not share Hobbes' belief that the label of tyrant is only another name for a monarch issued by the 'discontented'.<sup>59</sup> Instead, to defend the concept of retaining a single ruler by maintaining a Parliament and 'Privy Counsel' as part of the 'Constitution of England', Lawson stated that 'we may fear a military Government, or an absolute Monarch, or a Tyrannie, or an Anarchy.'<sup>60</sup> For Lawson, and the editors of Publick Intelligencer, declaring that a monarchy and a tyrant were different worked in their favour regardless of Cromwell's ultimate decision, for it effectively separated the titles of king and tyrant, while also absolving the rule of a single person regardless of title. Purchas' treatise on the Theatre of Politicall Flying-Insects, which appeared after Cromwell's second inauguration, also referenced the issue of tyranny, claiming that 'under the Commander of the Bees, who useth not his sting, that is, exerciseth tyranny against none, and orders nothing but that which is profitable for the Commonwealth;' was a better means of rule than a tyrant leading 'men who ... never perform any thing notable, and praiseworthy;'.<sup>61</sup> By using the term 'Commander' rather than 'Queen', Purchas sought to appease the concept of Protector as a sovereign title, thereby insulating the position with Oliver Cromwell in the role from the image of a tyrant.

For the Restoration newsbooks, advertising works that referenced tyranny as a separate form of rule also served as a method of debating sovereign theory, primarily by

---

<sup>58</sup> Lawson, Examination of Hobbs Leviathan, p.36

<sup>59</sup> Hobbes, Leviathan, pp.129-30

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p.90

<sup>61</sup> Purchas, Theatre of Insects, p.18



denouncing the Regicide as having been conducted by tyrants. *Cromwell's Slaughter House*, Gauden's piece advertised in early July 1660 was a prime example of this, boldly stating that the Regicide 'at one blow to cut off the head of three Kingdomes, and with him all Monarchy; to make way for your Loleocracy, a Military Tyranny, or Schismatical *Anarchy*.'<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, during the week in which the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion came into effect, the newsbook *Mercurius Publicus* advertised Fabian Philipps' *Veritas Inconcus*, which included numerous definitions relating to Civil War and Rebellion.<sup>63</sup> According to Philipps, treason was defined as 'the intending, advising, or declaring of a War is Treason of compassing the Kings death; that an endeavour to subvert the fundamental Laws and Government of England, and introduce a Tyrannical Government against Law'.<sup>64</sup> This was a modified version of the Hobbesian definition, but one that fitted perfectly with the actions of the Regicides according to the author.<sup>65</sup> Roger L'Estrange continued this association in 1662, when his *Memento* began to be advertised in an edition of *Mercurius Publicus*, one of the newsbooks L'Estrange oversaw.<sup>66</sup> In the *Memento*, L'Estrange implied that the Regicide allowed Cromwell to be 'successfully Employ'd in the subjecting of Scotland, and Ireland to their Power, and Model, and to complete their Tyranny over the Kings Best Subjects, and their Usurpations over his *Royal Dominions*.'<sup>67</sup>

Furthermore, Restoration writers employed the rhetoric of tyranny as a method of attacking the legacy of Cromwell's rule, largely through its association with usurpation.

William Prynne's *Signal Loyalty and Devotion to Gods True Saints*, noted that 'That it is not

---

<sup>62</sup> Gauden, *Cromwell's Slaughter House*, p.15

<sup>63</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 35 – 23 August – 30 August 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.13; Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), 'Charles II - volume 11: August 21-31, 1660', *CSPD: Charles II, 1660-1* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1861), p.205

<sup>64</sup> Fabian Philipps, *Veritas Inconcus* (London: 1660), p.232

<sup>65</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Hobbes, p.212

<sup>66</sup> Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p.325

<sup>67</sup> Roger L'Estrange, *A Memento, Directed to all those that Truly Reverence the Memory of King Charles the Martyr* (London, 1662), p.25

only unnatural, unchristian, and inhuman, but antichristian, tyrannical, treasonable ... for any usurped Powers or Innovators whatsoever, ... to enforce Subjects against their Loyalty,' to both Church and state.<sup>68</sup> Although Prynne, a prominent Royalist Member of Parliament, only had his work advertised in the State backed Kingdoms Intelligencer in mid-April 1661, its sentiments can be seen in other works produced after the Restoration. Gauden's *Cromwell's Slaughter House*, among the first books to be advertised after the restoration, would boldly state that the Protectorate and Republican regimes 'by Treachery and Tyranny usurped upon all just power, and exalted your selves (such despicable worms) above all that is called God?'<sup>69</sup> Moving on from the Regicide, Gauden *also claimed that* 'we so far disdain, your Hypocrisie, Treachery and Tyranny, that we had rather be under the Tyranny of our rightfull King (of whose justice and clemency we nothing doubt) then owe our Liberty, as you call it'.<sup>70</sup> Another work by Gauden, *Stratoste Aiteutikon* advertised in *Mercurius Publicus* for the week 8-15 May 1662 but claimed to have been written in February 1649, complained of censorship 'in those Tyrannous times' that prevented the piece being printed.<sup>71</sup> This is strikingly similar to John Milton's complaints about the censorship campaign conducted under the Protectorate regime in *The Cabinet Councill*, which had been advertised after the ascension of Richard Cromwell in 1658 and contained barely concealed criticisms of Oliver's rule. If censorship was something that only a tyrant would contemplate, then Cromwell, according to both Gauden and Milton, must be considered a tyrant, rather than a lawful, popularly supported sovereign.

---

<sup>68</sup> William Prynne, *The First and Second Part of the Signal Loyalty and Devotion to Gods True Saints and pious Christians towards their Kings* (London: 1660)

<sup>69</sup> Gauden, *Cromwell's Slaughter House*, p.5

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p.89

<sup>71</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 19 – 8 May – 15 May 1662', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1662), p.12; John Gauden, *Stratoste Aiteutikon* (London, 1661), p.i: Gauden's *Stratoste Aiteutikon* was essentially a tract focusing on the Regicide, taken from *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter House* and printed verbatim.

Away from censorship, L'Estrange commented in his Memento that it was a natural progression for Cromwell's rule to develop into a tyranny, for 'What they got by Rebellion, was to be mainteyn'd by Tyranny; and Necessity was sure at Last to do the work of Conscience.'<sup>72</sup> This was hardly a unique discourse by L'Estrange, for John Dauncey's History of His Sacred Majesty Charles the II, advertised as early as May 1660, labelled Oliver Cromwell as a 'Noble Tyrant', while 'his Tyrannicall Government' enslaved those 'being by the Protector known as persons not very well affected' to his rule.<sup>73</sup> William Younger's historiographical piece, A Brief View of the Late Troubles and Confusions in England, claimed that the final years of the English Republic had seen 'all mouths are open in an instant, against the late Protector Oliver, reproaching him as the worst of Tyrants and Usurpers'.<sup>74</sup> Younger's piece was advertised in mid-July 1660 in Parliamentary Intelligencer issue 29, as the Government sorted through business relating to damage inflicted upon the Church and Royalist supporters during the Interregnum, meaning Younger's work could be used as a means to demonstrate why the Government were focusing on such issues.<sup>75</sup> Another history, The Compleat History of Independencie by Clement Walker, first advertised in mid-November 1660 in Mercurius Publicus, attacked the Humble Petition and Advice for allowing Cromwell 'To name his successor, that so he might entail his yoke of tyrannical Usurpation and slavish oppression on the Kigdom'.<sup>76</sup> Attacking the Protectorate regime of Oliver Cromwell for being tyrannical was a means of reinforcing Charles II's rule, for it eroded any thinking that Cromwell, or the Republics that he protected, were sovereign creations.

---

<sup>72</sup> L'Estrange, A Memento, p.80

<sup>73</sup> John Dauncey, The History of His Sacred Majesty Charles the II. King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, defender of the Faith, &c (London: 1660), pp.149, 169

<sup>74</sup> William Younger, A Brief View of the Late Troubles and Confusions in England (London: 1660), p.101

<sup>75</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 19 – 9 July – 16 July 1660, Parliamentary Intelligencer (London: 1660), p.9

<sup>76</sup> Clement Walker, 'The Fourth and Last Part', p.29, in Clement Walker, The Compleat History of Independencie (London: 1661)

To enhance Charles II's ability to rule the kingdom, the newsbooks produced after the Restoration would advertise works that highlighted his dedication to Protestantism, which would fulfil the Hobbesian definition of the sovereign as God's prophet.<sup>77</sup> During the Interregnum, one of the Protectorate regime's most efficient propaganda campaigns had been to question whether Charles II was truly a Protestant, particularly when reporting the composition of his armies and court when in exile.<sup>78</sup> In the week in which the Council of State 'ordered in their public prayers to pray for the King, by the name of "Our sovereign lord, Charles,' Mercurius Publicus ran an advert for the Thomas Newcomb printed *Certain Letters evidencing the Kings Stedfastness in the Protestant Religion*.<sup>79</sup> An anonymously translated set of letters between members of Charles' exiled court, the Protestant organisations in Paris, and agents in England, *Evidencing the Kings Stedfastness* was designed to simply counter 'evil rumors concerning the Religion of this Prince'.<sup>80</sup> Furthermore, as if to counter the claims of the 'Popish chaplains' that Publick Intelligencer claimed had populated Charles Stuart's armies, the author stated that despite having to 'reside sometimes in places where the Exercise of our Religion is not permitted, yet he hath always had his Chaplains near to him', implying that these were Protestant ministers.<sup>81</sup> Edward Reynolds' *Divine Efficacy without Humane Power*, advertised in late July 1660 in Mercurius Publicus issue 31, outlined that it was God who arranged for Charles II to be restored, reminding the population to 'blesse the Lord for his Majesties firmness in, and zealous care of the Protestant Religion, and withstanding all temptations which would have drawn him from it.'<sup>82</sup> Likewise, Dauncey claimed that Charles II had been imbued 'with the Principles of the

---

<sup>77</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.299

<sup>78</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 66 – 12 January – 19 January 1657, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1657), pp.5-6

<sup>79</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 19 – 3 May – 10 May 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), p.11; Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), 'Volume 221: May 1660,' *CSPD: Interregnum, 1659-60* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1886), p.434

<sup>80</sup> Anon., *Certain Letters Evidencing the Kings Stedfastness in the Protestant Religion* (London: Thomas Newcombe, 1660), p.20

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p.20; Canne, 'Number 66', *Publick Intelligencer*, p.6

<sup>82</sup> Edward Reynolds, *Divine Efficacy without Humane Power* (London: 1660), p.41

Religion of the Church of England,' a trait inherited 'from his most religious Father of blessed Memory'.<sup>83</sup> From this, Dauncey implied that Charles II will be lawful sovereign, for 'tis Love not Fear makes him Religious; he Fears God only because he Loves him.'<sup>84</sup>

Edward Terry claimed there would be peace with Charles II's Restoration, as 'the Purity and Power of Religion shall shine amongst us, we cannot be less than an *happy people*:' in his Character of His most Sacred Majesty, a piece advertised either side of the Restoration.<sup>85</sup>

Restoration propagandists were demonstrating that Charles II was restored to the throne with God's ascent, which was granted because of Charles II's devotion to Protestantism.

To further defend Charles II's right to rule through religion, the newsbooks also advertised works that defended the faith of his father, Charles I. The Cult of King Charles the Martyr had already built a foundation for later works to be based upon, with Eikon Basilike having made it clear that Charles I died a Protestant king, as Andrew Lacey has surmised.<sup>86</sup> Ames Short's God Save the King would rhetorically ask 'How much the Protestant Religion, the King's Royal Family, the three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland have suffer'd' since the 'murder' of Charles I.<sup>87</sup> Short's printed sermon, advertised in mid-July 1660 amid the Restoration government's first debates on the Church settlement, also claimed that Charles II's beliefs were 'derived from his Grandfather James, the first of Great Brittain, the Solomon of his Age; and from his late Majesty, his no lesse wise and prudent Father.'<sup>88</sup> Furthermore, Forde would claim in *Virtus Rediviva* that Charles I ensured his children's 'education in the true Protestant Religion, which he alwayes professed, and learnedly defended,' reinforcing the concept that Charles II took his father's lessons of piety

---

<sup>83</sup> Dauncey, *History of His Sacred Majesty Charles the II*, p.156

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p.224; Additionally, Alexander Brome's A Congratulatory Poem outlined a request that 'true Religion flourish and increase, | And we love virtue, as the ground of peace;' in a panegyric advertised in the 30<sup>th</sup> edition of *Mercurius Publicus* as the first reports of Proclamations were reported in the newsbooks.

<sup>85</sup> Edward Terry, *A Character of His most Sacred Majesty King Charles IId.* (London: 1660), pp.36-7

<sup>86</sup> Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), p.83

<sup>87</sup> Ames Short, *God Save the King: A Sermon Preach'd at Lyme Regis May 18. 1660.* (London: 1660), pp.xii-xiii

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, p.46

to heart.<sup>89</sup> Philipps' *Vertias Inconcussa* claimed that Charles I 'had already granted enough to preserve the Lavvs, Lives, Religion and Liberty of the people, and was so willing almost at any rate to purchase a peace for himself and his people;' a statement used to simultaneously denounce the regicide and the Commonwealth that replaced him.<sup>90</sup> The self-proclaimed 'Lover of Loyalty' reminded the population that the Regicide saw 'a Protestant King, not treasonably conspired against, but murdered,' in a tract advertised in the second week of May 1660 as the Council of State passed a charge of high treason against Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw, Henry Ireton and Thomas Pride for the murder of Charles I.<sup>91</sup> Furthermore, on the anniversary of Charles II's return to London, Thomas Washbourne would remark that the restored king was 'still the Defender of the faith once delivered to the Saints, therein following the great example of the best of Kings, his Royal Father, who to his death maintained the Religion of the Church of England, and died a Martyr for the same.'<sup>92</sup> Consistently reminding the population that Charles II's father was a Protestant king who was the victim of murder, whose beliefs were passed to his son and heir ensured that Charles I was retroactively restored to being a sovereign ruler. Charles I had been God's chosen ruler according to the Restoration propagandists, and it was because of his example, combined with Charles II's own demonstrations of his dedication to the Protestant faith, that God had provoked the Restoration.

Furthermore, post-Restoration writers advertising the sovereignty of Charles II would use the Bible to explain why England's new monarch had sovereign authority, expanding upon portrayals of Charles II's faith. The main argument for Restoration propagandists was to equate either Charles II, or his father, to King David of Israel, which the Bible outlined was

---

<sup>89</sup> Forde, *Virtus Rediviva*, p.6

<sup>90</sup> Philipps, *Veritas Inconcussa*, p.207

<sup>91</sup> G. S., *Lover of Loyalty, The Dignity of Kingship Asserted* (London: 1660), p.35; Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 20: 10 May – 17 May 1660', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1660), pp.13, 15

<sup>92</sup> Thomas Washbourne, *The Repairer of the Breach* (London: 1661), p.20

the first sovereign monarch accepted by God. Washbourne had his sermon, *The Repairer of the Breach* advertised in the first week of November 1661, a period when the government was dealing with minor business, some six months after it was originally preached.<sup>93</sup> Washbourne's sermon was originally preached on the anniversary of Charles II's birth and return to London, and remarked that 'upon this very day whereon he came into the world, he came into his Royal City, being just thirty years old, as David was when he began to reign.'<sup>94</sup> Anthony Sadler's *Mercy in a Miracle* followed a similar template, reflecting that 'The Lord make his Majesty truly Happy; his People truly Loyal; and all truly thankful; for this Regal Restauration', akin to the 'the Preservation, and Restauration of King David.'<sup>95</sup> James Barker's *The Royal Robe*, advertised in February 1661 as *Mercurius Publicus* warned that people cured of the King's Evil were falsely claiming to suffer from the disease in order to receive the Royal Touch a second time, claimed that 'our cause is much like that of Davids, to dwell amongst those that are enemies to peace.'<sup>96</sup> Although this statement was made in reference to the Royalist cause during the Civil War, the fact that the work was advertised just a few weeks after a failed uprising by the Fifth Monarchists suggests that the newsbook editors thought it necessary to remind the population who their sovereign was, and who he represented.<sup>97</sup>

Away from the Bible, the use of the natural world as a metaphor was another prominent technique deployed by writers during the late Interregnum and Restoration periods, with works advertised to promote either monarchy or the protectorate regimes. Purchas' *Theatre of Politicall Flying Insects*, advertised first in November 1657, stated that

---

<sup>93</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 45: 31 October – 7 November 1661', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1661), p.9; Green, 'Volume 44', CSPD, pp.132-42

<sup>94</sup> Washbourne, *Repairer of the Breach*, p.23

<sup>95</sup> Anthony Sadler, *Mercy in a Miracle shewing, the deliverance and the duty, of the King, and the People* (London: 1660), pp.i, 2

<sup>96</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 7 – 14 February – 21 February 1661', *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1661), pp.2, 9; James Barker, *The Royal Robe: Or, A Treatise of Meeknesse* (London: 1661), p.173

<sup>97</sup> Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London: Cardinal, 1969), p.150

bee hives were ‘Common-wealths’ equivalent to a Kingdome ‘whereby the duties of the King towards the people, and of the people towards the King, and of the Citizens among themselves are most clearly taught.’<sup>98</sup> However, to blunt what would otherwise have been an allegory promoting kings, Purchas stated that the members of the Commonwealth pay ‘reverence to their Commander by whose counsel their Commonwealth is governed’.<sup>99</sup> In replacing kings with ‘Commanders’ was to reference Oliver Cromwell in his position as a General. Furthermore, the acknowledgement that the Commander was a ‘counsel’ for the Commonwealth appeased the image that the Protector should rule as the central figure of a wider political landscape, which, according to the Humble Petition and Advice, meant a Parliament. Barker would also use the bee analogy in his Royal Robe, however his discourse identified the ‘Master Bee, whom all the rest do follow as their King,’ rather than a Commander.<sup>100</sup> The Royal Robe also adopted the theory of a ‘Common-wealth’ among the bee population, although Barker suggested that this was a society designed to support their ‘Master Bee’ as a King.<sup>101</sup> Regardless of specific arguments, however, both Purchas and Barker were promoting the concept of the single ruler as a sovereign, reflecting the Hobbesian definition of single sovereigns tolerating a set of advisers, for in the natural world it was a simple response for society to form a Commonwealth to support them.<sup>102</sup>

To conclude, advertising in the newsbooks was a key aspect of establishing sovereignty by both the Restoration and Protectorate regimes, for it allowed various concepts of sovereign authority to be tested, debated and publicised to influence the wider population. Demonstrating that God supported either Oliver Cromwell or Charles II to rule was a key element for establishing their sovereign authority, achieved by explicitly stating their

---

<sup>98</sup> Purchas, *Theatre of Insects*, pp.3-4

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17

<sup>100</sup> Barker, *Royal Robe*, p.177

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, p.177

<sup>102</sup> Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.121



dedication to Protestantism. Royalist works in particular were keen to connect Charles II to the biblical figure David, while others worked to portray his father Charles I as a Christian martyr. The classification of a tyrant was also a key element, as pro-monarchical writers attempted to separate the label from monarchy, either to generate support for Cromwell to take the throne, or to establish greater support for the rule of Charles II. This was part of the rise of a faction more sympathetic to monarchy during the Cromwellian rule, with Nedham and Thurloe promoting works that equated monarch and Protector, or subtly promoted the former through natural metaphor. Likewise, attempts to associate the term tyrant and monarch, led by Milton but in line with the Hobbesian definition, were used to persuade the population that monarchy was not a tolerable form of rule, particularly at the start of Richard Cromwell's rule, while others such as George Wither attempted to legitimise the Protectorate by denouncing the crown entirely. Yet, the final months of Oliver Cromwell's rule would demonstrate to the population that he was the sovereign as Lord Protector, a position that was increasingly made akin to that of monarch by works advertised in the regime's newsbooks. This would provide a stable platform for Royalist writers to build upon in 1660, and was duly used to reinforce the rule of Charles II as monarch .

### Chapter III: The Disappearing Sovereign?

This final chapter will analyse how sovereignty was understood in the twelve months between the fall of Richard Cromwell on the 25 May 1659 and the return of Charles II in May 1660. The latter half of 1659 and early 1660 were among the most remarkable months in English history as no fewer than four distinct governments, using different models of rulership, attempted to establish and define their authority within the territory of England. Central to this analysis will be an examination into how propagandists and writers in 1659 attempted to define a Commonwealth, for it was a term that had been ambiguously applied in England since the writing of Thomas More's *Utopia*.<sup>1</sup> As all official declarations and documents referenced the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland in 1659, understanding how each government portrayed the Commonwealth is important to establishing how sovereign power was defined in spite of the changes in government.

Additionally, this chapter will examine how Charles Stuart, future king of England, was viewed in the tumultuous twelve months of 1659, and whether the greater concept of monarchy could fit within any concept of Commonwealth. This section will question whether the 'King of Scots' was perceived as a genuine threat to the English Commonwealth in 1659, or if he was ever publically acknowledged as a viable sovereign before his return in May 1660. Furthermore, this chapter will analyse how English sovereignty was portrayed in the wider concept of foreign policy, both in terms of those plotting against the English Commonwealth, and those whom the various governments viewed as potential allies. Moreover, this chapter will analyse the memories of the Cromwellian rule in 1659 and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jonathan Scott, 'What Were Commonwealth Principles?', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 47, No.3 (Sep. 2004) p.591

actions of the English Army officers, particularly the work of General George Monck in re-establishing the monarchy in spite of a widely printed fear of another Civil War.<sup>2</sup>

The debate over what exactly a Commonwealth was in 1659 was part of the much wider issue of sovereignty, for the concept of a Commonwealth as a sovereign power was being applied for the first time. Jonathan Scott has concluded that republican writers in the 1650s came to view the Commonwealth as an integral part of the concept of a Republic that went ‘beyond the mere word ‘Commonwealth’,’ which Scott states was simply the ‘English rendering of the Latin *res publica*’.<sup>3</sup> Thomas Hobbes, when writing *Leviathan* in 1651, stated that the concept of a Commonwealth was an artificial form of rule, with sovereign power only attained when men ‘submit some Man, or assembly of men, voluntarily’.<sup>4</sup> Hobbes identified this form of ‘Commonwealth’ as ‘Commonwealth by Institution’, although his opposition to this form of government is made clear as he highlights the inherent flaw in the concept: a body formed by Covenant cannot reject those they have made sovereign without undermining their own authority to make a sovereign.<sup>5</sup> Royalist writer James Howell would use this concept as a central argument in his *Philanglus*, printed in April 1660, highlighting how often the governments of the 1650s had been dismantled by their associated parties.<sup>6</sup> William Prynne used a similar concept in his preface to Thomas Campanella, stating that ‘by scattering the seed of Schism and division in the natural sciences’ in England would allow Spain to establish a ‘Universal Monarchy’ across the World.<sup>7</sup> In this instance, ‘natural sciences’ refers to understanding how England was governed, with the Commonwealth a

---

<sup>2</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 201 – 31 October – 7 November 1659’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.16

<sup>3</sup> Scott, ‘Commonwealth Principles’, *Historical Journal*, pp.591, 595

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, in Richard Tuck (ed.), *Hobbes: Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), p.121

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.121-2

<sup>6</sup> James Howell, *Philanglus: Som Sober Inspections made into the Cariage and Consults of the Late-Long Parlement* (London: 1660), p.181

<sup>7</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *Thomas Campanella, an Italian Friar and second Machiavel, his Advice to the King of Spain for attaining the Universal Monarchy of the World*, trans. William Prynne, (London: 1660), p.ii

result of ‘Schism and division’ to eliminate the ancient and ‘natural’ monarchy.<sup>8</sup> Steven Pincus has analysed the impact of translations of Campanella’s work on the foreign policy of the Cromwellian Protectorate in the 1650s, with particular focus on the start of the Anglo-Dutch War in 1653, rather than its impact in 1660.<sup>9</sup> Other pro-Royalist writers would use God’s Sovereignty over humanity as a means to demonstrate that monarchy was ‘natural’, with R.W. stating that ‘The Object of earthly Government, being the advancement of GODS Image in Mankind, for the establishing of the Throne of Reason and Law, in, and amongst men, according to the Rules prescribed by GOD and Nature:’.<sup>10</sup> God was the single ruler and sovereign of the Earth, ergo the rule of a monarch was the only method of fulfilling the ‘Object’ of government, something a Commonwealth could never achieve. For Royalists, a Commonwealth could never have its own sovereign power for, as Hobbes had established, the populace had sworn themselves to the protection of a monarch both physically and spiritually.

Other definitions, highlighting the sovereignty and authority of a Commonwealth government, were frequently proposed by Republican writers in 1659 and 1660 in something of a resurgence of Republican theory after the death of Oliver Cromwell. Joad Raymond has investigated this revival, remarking on the Republican Rota Club meetings led by James Harrington to discuss the Political landscape after Oliver’s death, as well as the general despair for the Republic’s future upon General Monck’s march south.<sup>11</sup> In these works and discussions, there was a universal acceptance that a Commonwealth meant a Republican state

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p.ii

<sup>9</sup> Steven Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650-1668* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp.185-6; Peter Schröder’s *Trust in Early Modern International Political Thought, 1598–1713* provides an analysis on Campanella’s impact on a wider European scale.

<sup>10</sup> R. W., *The Originall of the Dominion of Princes founded upon Gods Sovereignty over the whole Earth* (London: 1659), p.10

<sup>11</sup> Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p.251

and vice versa, surmised by Raymond as a return to the 'Good Old Cause'.<sup>12</sup> Interestingly, the majority of works advertised after the fall of Richard Cromwell that referenced Commonwealth government appeared prior to, or during, the Army Rule, although most of the works were hesitant to explicitly reference the Good Old Cause that had overthrown Richard's Protectorate.<sup>13</sup> The advertised pieces did, however, conform to the Cause's core belief that the monarchy, and more generally the rule of a single person, had to be resisted to allow England to develop spiritually.<sup>14</sup> The most provocative of these works would be William Sprigg's *A Modest Plea for an Equal Common-Wealth against Monarchy*, which claimed that 'the true nature of Monarchy, which is no other then the more gentle or civil expression of Tyranny,' through constant corruption.<sup>15</sup> In contrast a Commonwealth was a means of defence against monarchical tyranny according to Sprigg, who proclaims: 'to settle a Free-state upon such just and righteous foundations as cannot be moved, that may be a strong Rampire of defence not only to our Civil Liberties ... but also of security to our Spiritual Liberties.'<sup>16</sup> *Diapoliteia*, authored by the Fifth Monarchist minister John Rogers, uses similar arguments, stating that one of 'the evils of Monarchy' is 'intrenchment upon the peoples liberties, with the Retrivement and Retrenchment of the Monarches Lusts (in things Civil and Religious, we may add.)'<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, Rogers stated that 'what ever was the Cause, that was the effect (and an inevitable EFFECT of the Wars) I am sure;' Ergo, the need for a Commonwealth was a natural reaction to the rise, and as Rogers believed the abuse, of monarchical power which had started the Civil War.<sup>18</sup> Milton was unsurprisingly

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.251-2

<sup>13</sup> A. H. Woolrych, 'The Good Old Cause and the Fall of the Protectorate', *The Cambridge Historical Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 2, (1957), p.159

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.133-4

<sup>15</sup> William Sprigg, *A Modest Plea for an Equal Common-wealth against Monarchy* (London: 1659), p.9

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18

<sup>17</sup> John Rogers, *Diapoliteia: A Christian Concertation with Mr. Prin, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Harrington, for the true cause of the Commonwealth* (London: 1659), p.120; For more on the life of John Rogers see Bernard Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism*

<sup>18</sup> Rogers, *Diapoliteia.*, p.45

involved in this call for Commonwealths against monarchies, although his *Readie and Easie way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* would only appear after Monck had ousted the Army generals from government. For Milton, the Commonwealth was a means of breaking 'royal bondage', allowing people to maintain their freedom 'in the civil rights and advancements of every person according to his merit'.<sup>19</sup> Christopher Hill has remarked upon Milton's mentality throughout the Interregnum, highlighting his increasing desire for a Republican state, as well as becoming a template for religious groups such as the Ranters, although Kevin Sharpe has noted that *The Readie and Easie way* was a last attempt to achieve said Commonwealth.<sup>20</sup> For Republican writers, the Commonwealth derived its sovereignty from its people, who consented to the Commonwealth government in return for the ability to choose whom would govern them.

To summarise, writers in the year between the fall of Richard Cromwell and the return of Charles II were crafting two overarching definitions for a Commonwealth. For those who supported Charles and monarchy, the Commonwealth was little better than the Protectorate, a usurping creation that could not have any sovereign power for it lacked a direct connection to God's supreme authority. For Republicans, however, a Commonwealth was a symbol of civil liberty, which was in turn invested into the Commonwealth's government to produce a sovereign state. With this understanding of what a Commonwealth was considered to be, it is possible to dissect the propaganda and polemic that went into defending and attacking it, as well as the alternative in the form of Charles II and the return of monarchy.

---

<sup>19</sup> John Milton, *The Readie and Easie way to Establish a Free Commonwealth*. In John Alvis (ed.), *Areopagitica: And other Political Writings of John Milton* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund Inc., 1999), pp.416, 441

<sup>20</sup> Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (London: Penguin Books, 1991), p.395; Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Authority & Representing Rule in Early Modern England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp.179, 184

The most intense periods of propaganda and polemic to arise in support of a Commonwealth government came in May 1659 and September/October 1659, points when the Army attempted to dictate who should hold sovereign authority. The earlier of the two campaigns in May 1659 was, as Ruth Mayers and Joad Raymond have surmised, dominated by the emergence of a number of pro-Army newsbooks that proclaimed for the ‘Good Old Cause’, principally Richard Collings’ Weekly Intelligencer, and D. Border’s series: The Faithfull Scout; The Loyall Scout; and The Weekly Post.<sup>21</sup> The purpose of these newsbooks was to break the stranglehold of the two parliament-backed newsbooks, the Publick Intelligencer and Mercurius Politicus, shortly before the removal of Marchamont Nedham as the editor of the parliamentary editions on the 13 May.<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, while the Parliamentary newsbooks would only mention the Good Old Cause when transcribing events as they were reported by the government, both Collings and Border would author personal statements that declared their support for the Cause. The first of Border’s newsbooks, The Faithfull Scout, called for the removal of Richard’s Protectorate parliament in April a ‘progress into the National Interest, for the establishing of it a Common-wealth’, a significant coup for the Army Officers.<sup>23</sup> For Border, the removal of the Protectorate Parliament was aided ‘by the Lords good hand’, absolving the Army’s pursuit of ‘that Good Old Cause,’ for it was a step towards the ‘restoring of the people to their just Rights and Priviledges.’<sup>24</sup> Likewise, the very first edition of the Weekly Intelligencer opened with a statement regarding the Council of Officers, who ‘were assiduous & elaborate for their advancement of the publique peace ... many addressed were made unto him, and many proposals presented for

---

<sup>21</sup> Ruth Elisabeth Mayers, 1659: The Crisis of the Commonwealth (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004), p.185; Raymond, Politicians and Pamphleteers, pp.251, 253

<sup>22</sup> Joad Raymond, ‘Nedham [Needham], Marchamont (bap. 1620, d.1678)’. From H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds.), ODNB (Oxford: OUP, 2004)

<sup>23</sup> D. Border (ed.), ‘Number 1 – Friday April 22 to Friday April the 29, 1659’, The Faithfull Scout (London: 1659), p.2

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p.2

the common safety of the good old Cause & the assertors of it;'.<sup>25</sup> Both Border and Collings were supplying their readers with the concept that the Good Old Cause was creating a sovereign Commonwealth government by dismantling Richard's authority: Border by outlining divine support; Collings by highlighting public consent.

Subsequent events, and the statements within rival newsbooks, also suggest that the Commonwealth that Collings and Border had championed via the Good Old Cause had genuine support, confirming their arguments of divine support and consent in the designs. Henry Reece has studied on the Army leadership's reaction to the return of the Cause in 1659, stating that the 'unchecked military presence', which increased throughout 1659, 'was the single most important reason for the political nation's acceptance of an unconditional restoration of the monarchy in 1660', rather than their involvement in the ousting of Richard in May 1659.<sup>26</sup> Whereas the two Parliamentary newsbooks, under the editorship of John Canne from the 13 May, would also highlight the Cause as the Army officers moved against Richard, the reports produced were restricted to simple transcriptions of the government's actions.<sup>27</sup> The most intriguing of these reports was the inclusion of an Invitation to praise God so 'That there may be a wise, and and thorow understanding of the Good Old Cause,' on the 18 May, a date originally reserved by order of Richard Cromwell for a day of thanksgiving.<sup>28</sup> Two weeks later and *Politicus* carried a Petition from the 'divers Assertors of the Good Old Cause, Inhabitants of the County of Bucks', which included various propositions for the 'Cause of this Commonwealth'.<sup>29</sup> The two newsbooks had also carried the 'humble Representation and Petition of the General Council of the Officers of the Armies' addressed

---

<sup>25</sup> Richard Collings (ed.), 'Number 1 – From Tuesday May 3 to Tuesday May 10', *Weekly Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.1

<sup>26</sup> Henry Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England: 1649-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp.11, 173-189

<sup>27</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 176 – 9 May – 16 May 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), pp.10-3

<sup>28</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 171 – 4 April – 11 April 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), pp.10-3; Canne, 'Number 176', *Publick Intelligencer*, pp.10-3.

<sup>29</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 569 – 26 May – 2 June 1659', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1659), pp.6-8



to Richard in mid-April, which declared that the Good Old Cause would be ‘for the strengthening of Your Highness and Parliament;’<sup>30</sup> Yet, reports of the Cause would soon fade in the newsbooks, *Publick Intelligencer* and *Politicus* only printing two references to the Cause between June 1659 and January 1660, (both of which appear in June), while Collings’ *Weekly Intelligencer* would not mention the Cause at all from its fifth edition through to its last in December.<sup>31</sup> Even the Royalist uprising by George Booth in August 1659, which was reported to have spread across the country from its origin in Cheshire, failed to rally renewed calls for the Cause in the public sphere for it was universally stated that God had prevented the Cavaliers from succeeding.<sup>32</sup> The conspicuous absence of the Cause from the newsbooks after Richard had been dealt with suggests that the Cause’s definition of a Commonwealth, one which had to reject monarchy or single rule in favour of a ‘Free State’ ruled by Parliament, had been achieved.

It is therefore interesting to analyse what pro-Commonwealth authors were writing in the middle of the Rump’s second attempt at rule from May until October 1659, for although the Cause had disappeared, political debate had not. In the second week of September 1659 *Politicus* advertised *A Modest Plea for an Equal Common-wealth against Monarchy*, authored by William Sprigg, a political theorist based at Cambridge University.<sup>33</sup> Christopher Hill has noted Sprigg’s dislike of primogeniture as well as his attacks on the nobility with *A Modest Plea*, but did not develop upon those themes in his studies of the discontented groups in England.<sup>34</sup> For Sprigg, this tract was not a call to remove the Rump, nor was it printed to ‘fawn upon your Honours in the midst of your Triumphs, being most part of it committed to

---

<sup>30</sup> Canne, ‘Number 171’, *Publick Intelligencer*, p.13

<sup>31</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 182 – 20 June – 27 June 1659’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.6

<sup>32</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 190 – 15 August – 22 August 1659’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.6

<sup>33</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 586 – 8 September – 15 September 1659’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1659), pp.12

<sup>34</sup> Hill, *World Turned Upside Down*, pp.147, 346

the Press before the breaking forth of the late Rebellion', led by the Royalist George Booth.<sup>35</sup> Instead it was to serve as a reminder to the Rump that they were 'Pilots that sit at the Stern ... to endeavour the Common-wealth may be so equally ballanc'd as it may neither have propensity to a second relapse into Monarchy, as of late, or Oligarchy, which is worse, nor yet into Anarchy, the worst of all three.'<sup>36</sup> Further, they were 'to settle a Free-state upon such just and righteous foundations as cannot be moved, that may be a strong Rampire of defence not only to our Civil Liberties ... but also of security to our Spiritual Liberties.'<sup>37</sup> In this, Sprigg moves away from the rhetoric of the Cause, for it is his belief that a 'Free-state' should place far more restrictions on religious toleration, beyond the established hatred of Catholicism.

Furthermore, *A Modest Plea* recounted that the religious principles of the Commonwealth had been established by the Army Officers as part of their 'duty to teach and preach to their several Regiments and Companies in which they reaped the fruit of Gods glorious presence', in effect a means of inspiring the troops to victory during the Civil War.<sup>38</sup> However, the project of a 'Free State' would be delayed amid the rise of Quakers and Anabaptists across the country, as well as the established groups of Presbyterians and Independents which had created factions within the both the Army and Rump.<sup>39</sup> Only tight control of these religious factions 'that clash so much against another, and make such tumults in the world' would, according to *A Modest Plea*, allow a Commonwealth to truly emerge.<sup>40</sup> Their removal would promote unification against monarchy, for it had been reported in the newsbooks that these groups had been courted into supporting a return of Monarchy.<sup>41</sup> Sprigg

---

<sup>35</sup> Sprigg, *A Modest Plea*, p.ii

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.32-3

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p.81

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p.81

<sup>41</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 580 – 21 July – 28 July 1659', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1659), p.10

was otherwise convinced that it would be nigh-impossible for a monarch to be established ‘since the Crown-Lands and Church-Lands of this Nation are sold,’ while to reinstate monarchical rule was ‘the seed of a perpetual civil war,’ being as it was ‘diametrically opposite to, and inconsistent with the true liberty and happiness of any people.’<sup>42</sup> Further, a truly ‘Godly’ monarch was an impossibility, for Sprigg declares that ‘Kings are Gods scourges and given in wrath’ according to scripture, having used the example of Nimrod during his discourse.<sup>43</sup> For Sprigg, the Commonwealth was already a sovereign state under the Rump, built on a foundation of the Good Old Cause’s concepts but requiring some spiritual refinement to ensure that it would persevere against future threats.

However, the Army’s rebellion and subsequent establishment of a Committee of Safety packed with its Officers dispels the concept that the Officers wanted to promote a Commonwealth formed by the Cause, though the exact agenda upon which Lambert and his Officers removed the Rump on 13 October 1659 is unclear. The principal reasons for the fall-out between the Rump were a concoction of political theories and material concerns, the most public and prevalent of which would be money. After the fall of Richard, the newsbooks of the Parliament and Army had been littered with reports that the former Royal Palaces of Hampton Court, Somerset House, and even the goods in Whitehall, would be sold to pay off the debt owed to the Army regiments.<sup>44</sup> The sales of Somerset House and Hampton Court were likely to have been more particularly sought, the former for being a residence of the Papist ‘little Queen’ Henrietta-Maria, while the latter had been home to Oliver Cromwell in his years as Protector.<sup>45</sup> The sale of those properties would have removed two key symbols of

---

<sup>42</sup> Sprigg, *A Modest Plea*, pp.9, 14

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8

<sup>44</sup> Canne, ‘Number 182’, *Publick Intelligencer*, pp.12-3

<sup>45</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 207 – 12 December – 19 December 1659’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.15; Erin Griffey, *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court* (Yale University Press: 2015), pp.189-91

monarchical rule, akin in principle to the sale of Royal goods that had been in practice since 1649: removing a royal symbol effectively equated to the material reduction of royalist influence.<sup>46</sup> However, none of the former Palaces would be sold before Lambert and Fairfax ousted Parliament in October, in spite of an eleventh hour Order by the Council of State and the House to pay ‘the Arrears due ... out of the Moyerie of such monies as shall be raised by the sale or other disposition of the Estates of Delinquents sequestered and to be sequestered upon the late Insurrection.’<sup>47</sup> Without a steady stream of funding, the Army Officers opted to remove the Rump to obtain the funds required to pay their troops, although there would be no dramatic changes to the Army’s funding after the expulsion of the Rump. Henry Reece and Tim Harris suggest that the situation after the Army’s power grab was worse than it had been at any point before, Reece focusing on the near constant occupation of various counties such as Kent and Cheshire, while Harris identified a rumoured plot by the soldiers in London to raid the goldsmiths.<sup>48</sup> Reece has further stated that the period of the Army rule was one of confusion within the Army itself, with individual regiments roaming the country, while the north of England was subject to ‘wartime conditions’ as General Monck questioned Lambert’s intentions from Scotland.<sup>49</sup> In the midst of this self-inflicted chaos, there is little evidence that the Committee of Safety established by the Army could have formed a sovereign government, for its own principle supporters, the soldiers, were acting on an individual rather than national basis.

There would be some major attempts by pro-Army writers to explain why the Army Officers had acted in October 1659. The principal argument outlined by the Army’s most

---

<sup>46</sup> See Kevin Sharpe *Image Wars* for a more detailed analysis of Commonwealth sales of Royal goods and properties in the early 1650s, particularly pages 427 to 434.

<sup>47</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 197 – 3 October – 10 October 1659’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.5

<sup>48</sup> Reece, *Army in Cromwellian England*, p.177; Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p.42

<sup>49</sup> Reece, *Army in Cromwellian England*, pp.178-9

reliable propagandists and polemics, which proved to be the old Parliamentary newsbooks *Politicus* and *Publick Intelligencer*, would be that the new government was opposed to monarchy and would create a 'Civil Government' to rule over England.<sup>50</sup> This was a claim to appease those whom viewed that the Commonwealth was to be governed by a parliament, and hence the Army would be diligent in creating one. However, *Intelligencer* would take its new found allegiance further in December 1659, advertising an anonymously authored pamphlet titled *The Armies Vindication of this last CHANGE*, which explained why the Army Officers were justified in removing the Rump.<sup>51</sup> The author of *Vindication* proclaimed that the Army, not Parliament, had become the sovereign power of England during the Civil Wars, for it was largely 'raised out of the ordinary and common bulk of the people, which are the greatnesse and strength of the Nation,' at the request of the God.<sup>52</sup> God's interests were further analysed in *Vindication*, with the claim that 'A Military power is us truly an Ordinance of God, as any other, and superior to it ... all Governments are called powers, and in Scripture, called, the Sword.'<sup>53</sup>

Moreover, the author of *Vindication* claimed that 'the Parliament had no legall Constitution or Right to Government by any law of this Nation,' for that was an authority it had lost via the execution of the King, meaning the Army's actions could not be viewed as treasonable nor a usurpation.<sup>54</sup> *Vindication* supplemented this claim by highlighting that 'the Government being broken and shattered, and that remaining part of the Parliament was very lame and defective:' a justification of their effort to remove the Rump which was not only ineffective, but lacked authority in the first place.<sup>55</sup> In terms of monarchy, the author stated

---

<sup>50</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 592 – 20 October – 27 October 1659', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1659), p.12

<sup>51</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 206 – 5 December – 12 December 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.6

<sup>52</sup> Anon., *The Armies Vindication of the last CHANGE* (London: 1659), pp.4-5

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.4, 14

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16

that the Army had ‘rescued themselves and the honest party of this Nation from Tyrany;’ in defeating Charles I, whom had ‘perished by his own sword, by sheathing it in the bowels of his own body politick.’<sup>56</sup> Monarchy, as far as Vindication was concerned, was a moot topic upon the death of Charles I. The combination of these factors by the anonymous author of Vindication was a clear demonstration that the Army’s creation, the Committee of Safety, was a sovereign entity to rule the country, for it represented God, had the consent of the people, and had removed a government deemed unsuitable to rule.

However, Vindication would stand alone as the polemical defender of the Army in terms of advertised works, as other writers, and political thinkers, questioned their motives and actions. On the surface, the pro-Army writer Border, now editing *The Loyall Scout*, appeared to conform to the Committee of Safety’s rejection of monarchy, producing a series of editions throughout October that opened with a discourse on the actions of several former Kings. The most striking of Border’s passages appeared in issue 27 of *The Loyall Scout*, which used the example of the resistance against ‘King Henry the Third ... a great Oppressor of His Subjects’ as a means to justify the Army Officers actions.<sup>57</sup> For Border, the resistance to Henry III was an example of ‘the Duty of all English men, to endeavour their Countries preservation, considering that each individual Members Life and Fortune is safest when ventures for the publick Interest’.<sup>58</sup> However, Border’s passage proves to be a discourse against the Army’s actions, for he questions whether ‘*England’s* Freedom be purchased at no cheaper rate, than by pulling up the Foundation of the peoples just Rights and priviledges?’<sup>59</sup> In removing the Rump, the Army had, according to Border, removed the sovereign power of the country: the Parliament. Unlike Vindication, this was the language of the Good Old

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., pp.2, 6

<sup>57</sup> D. Border, ‘Number 11: From Friday, Octob. 28 to Friday, Novem. the 4<sup>th</sup>, 1659’, *The Loyall Scout*, (London: 1659), p.1

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p.2

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p.2

Cause, a need to be governed by a Parliament to resist a seemingly oppressive regime, twisted to subtly attack the Army Officers.

Furthermore, Monck's counter campaign against the Army Officers questioned their intentions for the Commonwealth, and ultimately ended their control of the country via the Committee of Safety. The biggest fear of the Committee of Safety, and the London Council, was 'the nature of General Monck's proceedings in Scotland' which 'might ensue another civil war', prompting the two bodies to meet in mid-November 1659, as reported by Publick Intelligencer.<sup>60</sup> This stance came either side of a state backed suppression campaign of Monck's motives and actions, for the state-backed publications Politicus and Publick Intelligencer revealed that Monck had sent a letter to the Committee, dated 13 October, but did not print its contents.<sup>61</sup> However, the suspected letter from Monck was printed in Weekly Intelligencer for the same week, which revealed that Monck 'thought it My Duty to suspend the Execution of Your Desires,' on account of the opinion of his troops.<sup>62</sup> Monck reinforced his stance in favour of Parliament with subsequent letters and reports from the Scottish Parliament, which were printed in various newsbooks and, as Joad Raymond has highlighted, pamphlets to enhance his political pressure upon the Committee.<sup>63</sup> The state newsbooks would soon calm the thoughts of a potential civil war down with reports that Monck was keen to negotiate with the Army Officers in England, with both sending representatives to Newcastle in November.<sup>64</sup> However, as negotiations with stalled in Newcastle, a militant newsbook Occurrences from Forraign Parts reported that the Convention of the Scottish Parliament, called by Monck to discuss the situation in England, had given consent for

---

<sup>60</sup> Canne, 'Number 201', Publick Intelligencer, p.16

<sup>61</sup> Hall, 'Number 592', Mercurius Politicus, p.16

<sup>62</sup> Richard Collings (ed.), 'Number 25 – From Tuesday October 18 to Tuesday October 25', Weekly Intelligencer (London: 1659), p.1

<sup>63</sup> Raymond, Pamphlets and Pamphleteering, p.218

<sup>64</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 202 – 7 November – 14 November 1659', Publick Intelligencer (London: 1659), p.7

Monck to 'secure the peace of that Nation', while Loyall Scout proclaimed that Monck was actively preparing his Army for war a week later.<sup>65</sup> Although these reports suggest that London's fear of a civil war were true, there would be no fighting when the Newcastle talks fell apart in December, with the Council of Army Officers consenting to the restoration of the Long Parliament on the 26 of the month. Peacey, meanwhile, has outlined that Nedham, acting as editor of Publick Intelligencer and Politicus, had reversed his position to supporting the Scottish General, although his change of heart amid reported defections from the Committee's troops, would not secure him a place in Monck's new temporary government.<sup>66</sup> Instead, Monck arranged for a new newsbook named Parliamentary Intelligencer, first sold on the 26 December 1659 for editor Henry Muddiman, to enter print, which proclaimed on its opening page that the English Army had been unwilling to fight Monck due to their belief in Parliamentary authority.<sup>67</sup> That same edition would also include a statement against the Committee of Safety, labelling reports that they had called back the Parliament as false for it was their intention to call a 'Military Parliament'.<sup>68</sup> The population had deemed that sovereign power laid within the bounds of a representative Parliament, and it was up to Monck in the early months of 1660 to decide how a stable government could be established.

Having wrestled for control, Monck's agenda became the focus of attention for writers in the Commonwealth, as the General gradually moved to supporting a restoration of the monarchy. The Loyall Scout was among the first publications to print a report on an Oath of Renunciation, which was to be sworn by members of the House, reformed Council of State

---

<sup>65</sup> John Macock (pub.), 'Number 42. Novemb. 22 to Novemb. 29', Occurrences from Forraign Parts (London: 1659), p.7; D. Border, 'Number 31: Friday, Novemb. 25 to Friday, Decemb. the 5<sup>th</sup>, 1659', The Loyall Scout (London: 1659), p.1

<sup>66</sup> Peacey, Politicians and Pamphleteers, p.286

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., p.189; Giles Dury (ed.), 'Number 1: Decemb. 19 to Decemb. 26, 1659', Parliamentary Intelligencer (London: 1659), p.1

<sup>68</sup> Dury, 'Number 1', Parliamentary Intelligencer, p.3



and the Army to reject the line of Charles Stuart, and consequently reject monarchy.<sup>69</sup> Yet the Calendar of State Papers made no mention of this Oath until February 1660, revealing a concern that Monck had yet to acknowledge such an oath himself.<sup>70</sup> Furthermore, while the newsbooks would print that the Oath existed, and revealed its content in the form of an Engagement, there would be no reports that any members of Parliament, Council of State or statesmen swearing to it before it was ‘repealed’ on the 13 March 1660.<sup>71</sup> Monck, meanwhile, had engineered the return of the secluded members, persuaded them to dissolve themselves, and would go on to accept the Declaration of Breda, and oversee the election of the Convention Parliament that would negotiate Charles II’s return. Throughout this period, Monck and the Council of Safety used the notion of a Free Parliament for the Commonwealth to maintain the support of the most vocal, and volatile, advocates of the Cause within the Army, although the subsequent election of the Convention Parliament resulted in a strong Royalist majority.<sup>72</sup> Monck’s subtle control of the major newsbooks saw letters sent to and from Monck printed, used to communicate his hopes that the people ‘shall continue faithfull in this Good Cause, that the Nations may be stablished in a free-Common-wealth,’.<sup>73</sup> In February a letter to the Speaker of the House was released reinforcing the concept that ‘Monarchy, cannot possibly be admitted for the future in these Nations ... because it’s exclusive to all the former Interests both Civil and Spiritual,’ that England ‘must needs be Republique.’<sup>74</sup> Paul Hammond has analysed the Republican writings of Milton in the context of a ‘free’ Republic, highlighting Milton’s concerns with how the population would use their

---

<sup>69</sup> D. Border, ‘Number 36: Friday, Decemb. 30 to Friday, January the 5<sup>th</sup>, 1659’, *The Loyall Scout* (London: 1660), p.1

<sup>70</sup> Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), ‘Volume 219: February 1660’, *CSPD: Interregnum, 1659-60* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1886), p.347

<sup>71</sup> John Canne (ed.), ‘Number 216 – 13 February – 20 February 1660’, *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1660), pp.4-5; John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 611 – 8 March – 15 March 1660’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1660), p.13

<sup>72</sup> Paul Hammond, *Milton and the People* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p.190

<sup>73</sup> Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, p.218; Giles Dury (ed.), ‘Number 4: January 9 to January 16, 1660’, *Parliamentary Intelligencer* (London: 1660), p.12

<sup>74</sup> John Hall (ed.), ‘Number 605 – 26 January – 2 February 1660’, *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1660), p.3

‘freedom’ correctly, although it would be a concern that stretched well into the Restoration.<sup>75</sup> A review of the State Papers implies that Monck had been approached by members of the exiled Royalist court in early January, albeit without any major success, but by the end of March Monck was issuing positions in the Army ‘by virtue of the power delegated to me by King Charles II.’<sup>76</sup> The key to this change would be Monck’s use and reaction to calls for the restoration of the secluded members of Parliament, publishing letters and declarations from other counties such as Norfolk and Devon that proposed ‘remedies’ for the high taxation, ‘interruptions of Government’ and lack of representation over the previous year.<sup>77</sup> Their influence, combined with Monck’s constant purging of his forces, use of printed media, and promotion to Commander in Chief of all English forces, gave Monck enough influence to secure the secluded members return as a means of securing a ‘Free Parliament’, which promptly agreed to dissolve itself and prepare fresh Parliamentary elections from the 23 February onwards.<sup>78</sup> The campaign for a Free Parliament had therefore been allowed to develop into a campaign for monarchy in the public sphere under Monck’s guidance, which in April 1660 would be described by the Convention Parliament as freeing them from ‘Bondage and Slavery’ since 1649.<sup>79</sup>

In late 1659 and 1660, pro-Royalist writers advanced a powerful argument regarding the hypocrisy of forming a new Commonwealth government, only for several principal creators to rebel against it a few months later. Howell’s *Philanglus*, printed in 1660 and advertised in the sixteenth edition of the now pro-Royalist newsbook *Parliamentary*

---

<sup>75</sup> Hammond, *Milton and the People*, p.189

<sup>76</sup> Green (ed.), ‘Volume 219’, CSPD, p.334; Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), ‘Volume 220: March 1660’, CSPD: *Interregnum, 1659-60* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1886), p.402; For more information on the structure of the exiled Stuart court see Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile 1640-1660* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

<sup>77</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), ‘Number 6: January 23 to January 30, 1660’, *Parliamentary Intelligencer* (London: 1660), pp.7-10

<sup>78</sup> Giles Dury (ed.), ‘Number 10: February 20 to February 27, 1660’, *Parliamentary Intelligencer* (London: 1660), p.11; Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, p.218

<sup>79</sup> Oliver Williams (ed.), ‘Number 84: 20 April to 27 April’, *An Exact Account* (London: 1660), p.8

Intelligencer, reminded his readers that the original concept of Parliament, which Howell implies is synonymous with 'Commonwealth', was the creation of King Henry I.<sup>80</sup> Specifically, Howell's discourse states that the Long Parliament, which by 1649 had been reduced to the Rump, had lost its authority the moment Charles I lost his head, for 'the Original Writ from whence they deriv'd their power was void by the Kings death.'<sup>81</sup> A body elected, by royal authority, to advise the sovereign, cannot have kept its own power once the authority with which they were invested had been removed. Without that legally recognised consent from the population, the Rump could not transition England from a Kingdom to a Commonwealth or Republic with legal authority. Intriguingly, this theory also undermines the Convention Parliament that voted to reinstate the monarchy in May 1660, which was being elected as *Philanglus* was being advertised. However, the Calendar of State Papers reveal that the Parliament, which included the secluded members who had been banned from sitting since Pride's Purge in 1649 for refusing to agree to the trial of Charles I, had been debating the return of the monarchy as early as February 1660.<sup>82</sup> By April, the king's return was all but a formality, with the two pro-Royalist newsbooks *Mercurius Publicus* and *Parliamentary Intelligencer* officially replacing the Parliamentary editions *Mercurius Politicus* and *Publick Intelligencer* as the state's main news source from the 26 March 1660.<sup>83</sup>

Running parallel to the debates of sovereign authority domestically were remarks on foreign policy relations, in asserting that the government had international recognition as a means of aiding its attempts to portray sovereign authority. Kevin Sharpe has highlighted the Commonwealth's efforts to obtain recognition from the United Provinces prior to the start of Oliver Cromwell's rule, with state visits of envoys orchestrated by Charles I's former master

---

<sup>80</sup> Howell, *Philanglus*, pp.14, 61

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p.181

<sup>82</sup> Green (ed.), 'Volume 219', CSPD, p.375

<sup>83</sup> Henry Muddiman (ed.), 'Number 14 – 26 March – 2 April 1660', *Parliamentary Intelligencer* (London: 1660), p.1

of ceremonies Sir Oliver Fleming.<sup>84</sup> This, according to Sharpe, caused a royalist appearance to the ceremonies which promoted the image of Cromwell, before he became Protector, as being greater than the Commonwealth he served.<sup>85</sup> This issue of a single figure being recognised as the symbol of the Commonwealth would persist throughout the 1650s, particularly when England entered the realm of international diplomacy. Helmer Helmers has analysed the public reaction to Oliver's rule within the United Provinces and Europe, which would denounce the Protectorate as being nothing short of a tyranny, both immediately after the regicide, and the Anglo-Dutch War.<sup>86</sup> When taking part in the negotiations to end the newly reignited Dano-Swedish war in May 1659, *Publick Intelligencer* printed that the King of Denmark 'gave thanks to the Lord Protector and to the General [Montague] for their affection'.<sup>87</sup> This piece of international recognition was intriguingly printed in the same edition that revealed that the Army had forced Richard's Parliament out of office, and placed alongside the conclusion of the Army's Declaration advocating the return of the Rump members whom had sat between 1649 and 1653.<sup>88</sup> Subsequent editions of the newsbooks provided no news of English involvement in the Dano-Swedish negotiations, as the subsequent Rump and Army governments focused on the internal power struggles instead, suggesting that international recognition was not a priority for the various governments in 1659.

However, when it came to reporting to news of Royalist involvement in international politics, the newsbooks were not to be silenced. A continuing theme of the Protectorate and

---

<sup>84</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (London: Yale University Press, 2010), p.446

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.446, 448

<sup>86</sup> Helmer J. Helmers, *The Royalist Republic: Literature, Politics, and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp.58, 129; Joad Raymond has also highlighted the influence of the Netherlands in the polemical debate of sovereignty after the Restoration, highlighting a ban on the import of books by L'Estrange. See Raymond, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p.326

<sup>87</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 175 - 2 May - 9 May 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.14

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15

Commonwealth's anti-monarchical propaganda was that Charles Stuart would use a foreign power to aid his return to England. Throughout the summer of 1659 *The Weekly Post* would report that James, the 'Titular Duke of York' was fighting with an edict for the Spanish Army, while *The Faithful Scout* claimed that James and Henry, the youngest Stuart brother, were to lead a group of English and Scottish regiments within the Spanish Army.<sup>89</sup> In July, this changed to James and Charles leading disbanded, and therefore unofficial, Spanish regiments, before in December the Duke was said to be commanding a Spanish force to attack Dunkirk.<sup>90</sup> Characterising Charles and his brother as warmongers and disturbers of the peace was a means to undermine the case of monarchy in spite of the upheaval being caused in England by the Army and their involvement in politics. Furthermore, the newsbooks were quick to establish that Charles was involving himself in the negotiations between France and Spain, the *Loyall Scout* reporting that Charles had issued a declaration to the two nation's armies that outlined his intentions to invade England during one of the meetings.<sup>91</sup> The *Loyall Scout* went further by stating that Charles was to negotiate with Spain in the knowledge that tolerance of Papists would be required for their support, a particularly volatile statement given the reports that the Papists had declared for Charles during the Booth uprising.<sup>92</sup> The state backed newsbooks were more subtle, *Publick Intelligencer* reporting in October that Charles had failed to gain any support from the concluded treaty, while *Politicus* inferred that it was common knowledge among Cavaliers that there was Spanish backing for Charles at the end of November.<sup>93</sup> *Politicus* would later imply that the 'King of Scots' would return

---

<sup>89</sup> D. Border, 'Number 6: From 7 June to the 14 June 1659', *The Weekly Post* (London: 1659), p.1; D. Border, 'Number 6: From Friday, May. 27 to Friday, June. the 3, 1659', *The Faithful Scout* (London: 1659), p.6

<sup>90</sup> D. Border, 'Number 13: From Friday, July. 22 to Friday, July. the 29<sup>th</sup>, 1659', *The Loyall Scout* (London: 1659), p.8; John Canne (ed.), 'Number 208 – 19 December – 26 December 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.14

<sup>91</sup> D. Border, 'Number 22: From Friday, Sept. 23 to Friday, Sept. the 30<sup>th</sup>, 1659', *The Loyall Scout* (London: 1659), p.8

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3; John Canne (ed.), 'Number 187 – 25 July – 1 August 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.11

<sup>93</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 197 – 3 October – 10 October 1659', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.11; John Hall (ed.), 'Number 596 – 24 November – 1 December 1659', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1659), p.2

Dunkirk to Spain in return for their assistance, although with a small caveat that this was more a Spanish hope than a promise, timed as the Restoration of the monarchy became a certainty in April 1660.<sup>94</sup> By undermining Charles's agenda abroad, the Commonwealth's propagandists were undercutting the perception of Charles in England, associating him with England's major enemy from the 1650s in the form of Spain.

To counter the Republican focus on Charles' actions on the Continent, the pro-monarchist writer and politician William Prynne added a preface to Thomas Campanella in 1660. Advertised in both the Commonwealth supporting *Publick Intelligencer* and the Royalist *Exact Accompt* in the final week of February, Campanella was claimed to be a translation of a piece by Tommaso Campanella, an 'Italian Frier, and second Machiavel', as an agenda for Philip II to become a 'Universal monarch'.<sup>95</sup> According to Prynne, whom also penned a preface for the edition, the creation of the Commonwealth was a Spanish plot which had been proposed before the death of Queen Elizabeth in 1603.<sup>96</sup> The concept, according to Campanella, would be to 'privately' support King James of Scotland to the throne, with an agreement to 'restore there again the Catholick Religion; for the love whereof, His Mother, Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots refused not to spend her dearest blood,'.<sup>97</sup> However, upon James' accession, the Spanish king was to withdraw his support, leaving James to 'labour with the English Peers, and the chieftest of the Parliament, and egge them on to endeavour to reduce England into the Form of a Republick:' to cast himself into the image of a tyrant.<sup>98</sup> As this was going on, Campanella proposed that a template for a 'Common-Wealth' should be circulated, promoting 'Mutual Love should be maintained amongst all

---

<sup>94</sup> John Hall (ed.), 'Number 614 – 29 March – 5 April 1659', *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1659), p.2

<sup>95</sup> John Canne (ed.), 'Number 217 – 20 February – 27 February 1660', *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1659), p.13; Oliver Williams (ed.), 'Number 69: 24 February – 2 March 1660', *An Exact Accompt* (London: 1660), p.6

<sup>96</sup> Campanella, *Campanella*, pp.i-ii

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p.159

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.159-60

Fellow-Citizens, for the benefit of the Publick; as we see it is among the Venetians.’<sup>99</sup> The result of this agenda would be a Civil War, allowing Spain to sweep in to tame the country alongside the restored Catholic church.

Despite their failure to achieve a corruption of James I, Prynne maintains that ‘they have now made (either ignorantly or affectedly) such an unhappy dismal progress, by subverting our ancient Kingly Government to metamorphose us into a Commonwealth,’ implying that Spain could achieve its goals at any time.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, Prynne surmised that these plots explained the ‘wars with the Scots and *Hollanders*’ and the action of ‘the late Agitators and general Council of Officers in the Army, and their Anti-Parliamentary Conventicles, ever since the year 1647.’<sup>101</sup> The only solution to this was therefore the ‘happy restitution of our Hereditary King, Peers, and English Parliaments to their ancient Rights and Priviledges’, an opinion which was, outside of this near-apocalyptic context, voiced in Monck’s restored Parliament.<sup>102</sup> In this, Prynne advocated the return of monarchy by undercutting the perception of the Commonwealth to make it an artificial and foreign creation to undermine the natural, English form of sovereign rule. It also went further, using one of the Commonwealth writers’ favoured methods of associating Catholicism and monarchy against it, suggesting that the only defence against a Catholic ‘Tyrant’ would be a ‘speedy cordial Christian union between our lawful KING long exiled Head and members;’.<sup>103</sup>

To conclude, the battle to publically define whom had sovereign authority in 1659 would serve as the major catalyst for the sweeping changes in government throughout the year of 1659 and 1660, as writers for Parliament, Army and Monarchy used various arguments to explain why their leader’s authority was sovereign. For the Army soldiers and

---

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., p.93

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., p.ii

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., p.ii

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., p.iv; Green, ‘Volume 219’, CSPD, p.375

<sup>103</sup> Campanella, Campanella, pp.i-ii

Republican writers, the ambiguous definition of the Commonwealth became entwined with the Good Old Cause's desire for an anti-monarchical regime that ruled with a Parliament. The Cause's Commonwealth ideal would come to fore at various points, used to oust Richard Cromwell and provide the foundation of General Monck's resistance to the English Army's regime between October and December 1659. Furthermore, Charles Stuart's claims to the throne were undercut by constant association with foreign powers and intentions to invade, attempts made to undermine any belief that monarchy would provide stability. The Army Officers somewhat abandoned the Cause's Parliamentary concept to enforce their rule in October, their more extreme supporters advertising that it was they, not Parliament, that had inherited sovereign power upon Charles I's execution, only to face resistance from Monck and the population of London who clung to the concept of Parliament's authority. Royalist writers, meanwhile, would focus on the constant dissent within the bounds of the Commonwealth's governments to demonstrate its inability to secure stability, or maintain the public peace. Yet, the Cause's definition would only be overcome when a majority of those who held power according to the Cause's Commonwealth design moved against it, with Royalist writers allowing pro-monarchical literature to slowly re-establish the balance of power between Parliament and King.



## Conclusions

This thesis aimed to examine how the definition of sovereign authority was manipulated in the final years of the Interregnum and early years of the Restoration, to both defend the ruling regime as well as attack its opposition. The Hobbesian template for a sovereign, established in 1651 in *Leviathan*, provided the foundation for all works of the period, which proclaimed that sovereignty could only be established by a single ruler.<sup>1</sup> Under the regimes of Oliver Cromwell and Charles II, the concept of a single ruler was promoted to enhance public perception of their roles as Protector and king respectively, with various elements of Hobbes' theory used to demonstrate the ruler's sovereign authority. The most frequently used elements of Hobbes' theory were God's acceptance, the ability for a sovereign to guide their population spiritually as God's prophet, ability to provide political stability, and ensure the public peace.<sup>2</sup> It was only after the ousting of Richard Cromwell in May 1659 that Hobbes' concept of a single ruler was directly challenged in print although, as this thesis has shown, widespread support for a Republican Commonwealth had been eroded by the spring of 1660.

The first chapter of this thesis was limited to the state supported newsbooks printed during the regimes of Oliver Cromwell and Charles II. The newsbooks of Marchamont Nedham, *Publick Intelligencer* and *Mercurius Politicus*, established that Oliver was deemed to be the sovereign ruler of England after his acceptance of the Humble Petition and Advice by highlighting his role as Protector and 'His Highness'. God's influence on Cromwell's actions, from his military victories to the rejection of the crown, were highlighted within the

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*. In Richard Tuck (ed.), *Hobbes: Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp.121, 126, 136, 139, 199, 299

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, pp.121, 126, 136, 139, 199, 299

newsbooks, a pattern followed by the newsbooks of Charles II's early rule which emphasised his use of the Royal Touch as evidence of God's support. Further similarities can be seen in the fact that the newsbooks were used to attack each regime's rivals, the Cromwellian newsbooks by demonstrating that Charles Stuart was a poor prospect as a sovereign through his constant fights against Englishmen, while his moral standards, and hence ability to lead England spiritually, were constantly questioned. To counter, the Restoration newsbooks reinstated Charles II's father as being the legal sovereign that he had been in 1649, and hence attacked the entire Commonwealth by consistently reporting on the trials of the regicides. The result of these campaigns would be that Oliver Cromwell died, and was remembered into his son's reign, as England's sovereign, while Charles II's regime was successfully able to close its official newsbooks in 1663 without fear of major polemical uproar.

The second chapter of this thesis used books advertised within the newsbooks of the Cromwellian and Restoration regimes as a means of investigating how sovereignty, and terms regarding it, were debated and publicised to the population.<sup>3</sup> To complement the newsbooks, advertised works supporting either Oliver Cromwell or Charles II during their reigns would frequently highlight their divine backing. Charles II was equated to the biblical King David in numerous works to enhance his image as the fountain of justice and being God's anointed to rule as sovereign, while Oliver's Protectorate was proclaimed as having been 'conferred upon him' by God.<sup>4</sup> Elsewhere, Nedham would defend the Protectorate against claims of injustice by royalist preachers such as John Goodwin, later countered by John Gauden's advertised piece *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter House* which denounced the regicide as the destruction of the entire state.<sup>5</sup> Tyranny was another key theme shared between the regimes, with pro-

---

<sup>3</sup> See Jason Peacey, 'Cromwellian England: A Propaganda State?' *History*, Vol. 91, No. 2, (April 2006), p.191 – Peacey proposed an analysis of advertised material as a means to investigate how polemical ideas were spread by Nedham's newsbooks.

<sup>4</sup> George Wither, *A Suddain Flash* (London: 1657), p.5

<sup>5</sup> John Gauden, *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter House*, (London: 1660), p.7

monarchical writers attempting to separate monarchy from the spectre of tyranny to apply the charge of tyrant to Cromwell, while others such as John Milton tied the two terms together to warn against the rule of kings and single sovereigns. Milton was particularly vocal, labelling both Charles I and Oliver Cromwell as tyrants, the former through the actions of his troops during the Civil War, while the latter was outed for his use of censorship, destabilising the perception that either had held sovereign authority during their rule through a lack of justice.<sup>6</sup> Finally, there appeared to be an increasing trend in the final months of Oliver's rule to advertise works that subtly promoted monarchy through the use of natural metaphor, with the structure of the bee hive used to demonstrate the roles of 'Commanders', 'Kings' and 'Queens'.<sup>7</sup>

The third and final chapter of this thesis combined the previously separate studies of newsbooks and advertised works to analyse sovereignty in the context of 1659, a period in which sovereign theory was tested against a relatively new form of rule: the Republican Commonwealth. The Good Old Cause was championed within the Army to oust the ineffective Richard Cromwell from the Protectorate in May 1659, promoted via the newsbooks of Richard Collings and D. Border as well as the writings of John Rogers and William Sprigg. The Cause called for the complete removal of monarchy, and more generally single rule, and the establishment of a 'Free State' or Commonwealth ruled by Parliament, although its sentiments were overshadowed by the Army Officer's rebellion against the Rump in October 1659. The Army Rule saw General Lambert's supporters claim that it was the Army that should rule, the author of *The Armies Vindication* proclaiming that God had backed the 'common bulk of people' within the Army against the monarchy during the English Civil War, while Parliament was left 'lame and defective'.<sup>8</sup> General Monck's counter

---

<sup>6</sup> Walter Raleigh, *The Cabinet Council*, (London: 1658), p.85

<sup>7</sup> Samuel Purchas, *A Theatre of Politicall Flying-Insects* (London: 1657)

<sup>8</sup> Anon., *The Armies Vindication of the last CHANGE* (London: 1659), pp.4-5, 14

campaign used the Cause as a tool to gain support in December 1659 and restore the Rump, although his ambiguity beyond that point allowed more pro-monarchical politicians and writers to emerge in the spring of 1660. The Commonwealth was quickly redefined by Royalist writers as an unstable, artificial and insecure mess, while the restoration of Charles Stuart and monarchy were shown to be a means of healing a troubled nation.

Ultimately, this thesis has demonstrated that the seventeenth century notion of sovereignty was fluid, but could only be bent so far in state propaganda and political writings. As Kevin Sharpe and Robert Zaller have shown, Oliver Cromwell's actions as Lord Protector are enough demonstrate that he held sovereign power according to the Hobbesian template.<sup>9</sup> This study has expanded upon this concept to demonstrate that the writers of the Cromwellian regime, led by the newsbooks of Nedham, actively sought to promote the Protector's sovereign authority, eluding to Hobbes' theories. Naturally, the Hobbesian template was better suited to describe Charles II's early reign, during which the state actively sought to use the major characteristics of Hobbes' Leviathan to restore Charles, his father and more generally monarchy to a position of sovereign authority. Attempts to portray Richard Cromwell as the sovereign faltered as he lacked the political support of his father, while the arguments put forward by supporters of the Republic and Commonwealth were distorted by the events of 1659. Without a clear concept of what the Commonwealth could represent in the spring of 1660, the return of monarchy was all but a certainty, although Charles II's regime would still need to actively demonstrate his position as sovereign to prevent another Republican experiment.

---

<sup>9</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660*, (London: Yale University Press, 2010), p.446; Robert Zaller, 'Breaking the Vessels: The Desacralization of Monarchy in Early Modern England', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Autumn 1998), p.773

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

All accessed via Early English Books Online, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>, unless otherwise stated.

Anon., *Certain Letters Evidencing the Kings Stedfastness in the Protestant Religion* (London: Thomas Newcombe, 1660)

Anon., *The Armies Vindication of the last CHANGE* (London: 1659)

A Person of Quality, *The Faithful, yet Imperfect, Character Of a Glorious King, King Charles I: His Country's & Religions Martyr* (London, 1660)

Allington, John, *A Continuation of the Grand Conspiracy* (London: 1660)

Barker, James, *The Royal Robe: Or, A Treatise of Meeknesse* (London: 1661)

Baxter, Richard, *A Holy Commonwealth, or, Political Aphorisms* (London: 1659)

Brome, Alexander, *A Congratulatory Poem*, (London: 1660)

Campanella, Tommaso, *Thomas Campanella, an Italian Friar and second Machiavel, his Advice to the King of Spain for attaining the Universal Monarchy of the World*. Translated by William Prynne, (London: 1660)

Charleton, Walter, *A Character of His Most Sacred Majesty, Charles the Second, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland. Defender of the Faith, &c.* (London: 1661)

Dauncey, John, *The History of His Sacred Majesty Charles the II. King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, defender of the Faith, &c.* (London: 1660)

Forde, Thomas, *Virtus Rediviva* (London, 1660)

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson (ed.), *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906)

Gauden, John, *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter House* (London: 1660)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Stratoste Aiteutikon* (London, 1661)

Green, Mary Anne Everett (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1886)

Hall, John, *The True Cavalier Examined by his Principles and found not guilty of Schism or Sedition* (London: 1656)

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*. In Tuck, Richard (ed.), *Hobbes: Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016)

Howell, James, *Philanglus: Som Sober Inspections made into the Cariage and Consults of the Late-Long Parlement* (London: 1660)

Langley, William, *The Death of Charles the First Lamented, with the Restauration of Charles the Second Congratulated* (London: 1660)

Lawson, George, *An Examination of the Political Part of Mr. Hobbs his Leviathan* (London: R. White, 1657)

L'Estrange, Roger, *A Memento, Directed to all those that Truly Reverence the Memory of King Charles the Martyr* (London, 1662)

Mayers, Ruth Elisabeth, *1659: The Crisis of the Commonwealth* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004)

Milton, John, *The Readie and Easie way to Establish a Free Commonwealth*. In Alvis, John (ed.), *Areopagitica: And other Political Writings of John Milton* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund Inc., 1999), pp. 414-445

Nedham, Marchamont, *The Great Accuser Cast Down, or, A Publick Trial of Mr. John Goodwin* (London: 1657)

Philipps, Fabian, *Veritas Inconcussa* (London: 1660)

Prynne, William, *The First and Second Part of the Signal Loyalty and Devotion to Gods True Saints and pious Christians towards their Kings* (London: 1660)

Purchas, Samuel, *A Theatre of Politicall Flying-Insects* (London: 1657)

Raleigh, Walter, *The Cabinet Council* (London: Thomas Newcombe for John Milton, 1658)

Reynolds, Edward, *Divine Efficacy without Humane Power* (London: 1660)

Rogers, John, *Diapoliteia: A Christian Concertation with Mr. Prin, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Harrington, for the true cause of the Commonwealth* (London: 1659)

S., G., Lover of Loyalty, The Dignity of Kingship Asserted (London: 1660)

Sadler, Anthony, Mercy in a Miracle shewing, the deliverance and the duty, of the King, and the People (London: 1660)

Short, Ames, *God Save the King: A Sermon Preach'd at Lyme Regis May 18. 1660.* (London: 1660)

Sprigg, William, A Modest Plea for an Equal Common-wealth against Monarchy (London: 1659)

Terry, Edward, A Character of His most Sacred Majesty King Charles IId. (London: 1660)

W., R., The Originall of the Dominion of Princes founded upon Gods Sovereignty over the whole Earth (London: 1659)

Walker, Clement, The Compleat History of Independencie (London: 1661)

Washbourne, Thomas, The Repairer of the Breach (London: 1661)

Wither, George, A Suddain Flash (London: 1657)

Younger, William, A Brief View of the Late Troubles and Confusions in England (London: 1660)

## Newsbooks

All accessed via Early English Books Online, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>, unless otherwise stated.

Border, D. (ed.), *The Faithful Scout* (London: 1659)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Loyall Scout* (London: 1659-1660)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Weekly Post* (London: 1659)

Canne, John (ed.), *Publick Intelligencer* (London: 1655-1660)

Collings, Richard (ed.), *The Weekly Intelligencer* (London: 1659-1660)

Dury, Giles (ed.), *Mercurius Publicus* (London: 1659-1663)

Hall, John (ed.), *Mercurius Politicus* (London: 1650-1660)

Macock, John (pub.), *Occurrences from Forraign Parts*, (London: 1659-1660)

Muddiman, Henry (ed.), *Parliamentary Intelligencer* (London: 1659-1663)

Nedham, Marchamont (ed.), *Mercurius Britanicus* (London: 1643-1646)

Williams, Oliver (ed.), *An Exact Accompt* (London: 1659-1660)



## Secondary Sources

Baker, J. H., 'Criminal Courts and Procedure at Common Law 1550 – 1800', in Cockburn, J. S. (ed.), *Crime in England 1550 – 1800* (London: Methuen, 1977), pp. 15-48

Bloch, Marc, *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France* (London: Routledge, 2015)

Capp, Bernard, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (London: Faber & Faber, 2008)

Davies, Godfrey, 'Charles II in 1660', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (May 1956), pp. 245-275

Eustace, Timothy (ed.), *Statesmen and Politicians of the Stuart Age* (Hong Kong: MacMillan, 1985)

Gaunt, Peter, 'The Single Person's Confidants and Dependants? Oliver Cromwell and His Protectoral Councillors', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (Sept. 1989), pp. 537-560

Griffey, Erin, *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court* (Yale University Press: 2015)

Hammond, Paul, *Milton and the People* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Harris, Tim, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Helmets, Helmer J., *The Royalist Republic: Literature, Politics, and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016)

Hill, Christopher, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London: Cardinal, 1969)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London: Penguin Books, 1991)

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

Kishlansky, Mark, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603 – 1714* (London: Penguin Books, 1997)

Lacey, Andrew, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003)

Little, Patrick and Smith, David L. (eds.), *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Love, Harold, 'L'Estrange, Sir Roger (1616–1704): Author and press censor'. From Matthew, H. C. G. and Brian Harrison (eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Marshall, Alan, 'Sindercombe, Miles (d. 1657)'. From Matthew, H. C. G. and Brian Harrison (eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Mousnier, Roland *The Institutions of France Under the Absolute Monarchy, 1598-1789, Volume 2: The Origins of State and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984)

Reece, Henry, *The Army in Cromwellian England: 1649-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

Patterson, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984)

Peacey, Jason, 'Cromwellian England: A Propaganda State?' *History*, Vol. 91, No. 2 (April 2006), pp. 176-199

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Nibbling at Leviathan: Politics and Theory in England in the 1650s', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (1998), pp. 241-257

\_\_\_\_\_ *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)

Pincus, Steven, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650-1668* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Rahe, Paul A., *Against Throne and Altar: Machiavelli and Political Theory Under the English Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Raymond, Joad, 'Nedham [Needham], Marchamont (bap. 1620, d.1678)'. From Matthew, H. C. G. and Brian Harrison (eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

\_\_\_\_\_. Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Schröder, Peter, Trust in Early Modern International Political Thought, 1598–1713, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017)

Scott, Jonathan, ‘What Were Commonwealth Principles?’, The Historical Journal, Vol. 47, No.3 (Sep. 2004), pp. 591-613

Sharpe, Kevin, Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England 1603-1660 (Yale: Yale University Press, 2010)

\_\_\_\_\_. ‘Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I’, The Historical Journal, Vol. 40, No. 3 (Sept., 1997), pp. 643-665

\_\_\_\_\_. Reading Authority and Representing Rule in Early Modern England (London: Bloomsbury, 2013)

\_\_\_\_\_. Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth Century Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Smith, Geoffrey, The Cavaliers in Exile 1640-1660 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Smith, Nigel, Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660 (London: Yale University Press, 1994)

Sutherland, James, The Restoration Newspaper and its Development (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)

Tanner, J. R., English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century 1603-1689 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971)

Tedder, H. R. and rev. William Proctor Williams (eds.), ‘Royston, Richard (1601–1686)’. From Matthew, H. C. G. and Brian Harrison (eds.), Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Underdown, David, Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987)

van Nimwegen, Olaf, The Dutch Army and the Military Revolutions, 1588-1688 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010)

Venning, Timothy, 'Thurloe, John (bap. 1616, d. 1668)'. From Matthew, H. C. G. and Brian Harrison (eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Williams, J. B., 'The Newsbooks and Letters of News of the Restoration' *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 23, No. 90 (April 1908), pp. 252-276

Williams, Mark, *The King's Irishmen: The Irish in the Exiled Court of Charles II, 1649-1660* (London: Boydell & Brewer Ltd, 2014)

Worden, Blair, 'Milton and Marchamont Nedham'. In Armitage, David, Armand Himy and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Milton and Republicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 156-180

Woodford, Benjamin, 'From Tyrant to Unfit Monarch: Marchamont Nedham's Representation of Charles Stuart and Royalists during the Interregnum', *History*, Vol. 100, No. 339 (January 2015), pp. 1-20

\_\_\_\_\_. *Perceptions of a Monarchy Without a King: Reactions to Oliver Cromwell's Power* (McGill-Queen's Press, 2013)

Woolrych, A. H., 'The Good Old Cause and the Fall of the Protectorate', *The Cambridge Historical Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 2, (1957), pp. 133-161

Zaller, Robert, 'Breaking the Vessels: The Desacralization of Monarchy in Early Modern England', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Autumn 1998), pp. 757-778