

Visions for Merrie England:

A Survey Examination of Royalist Views and Beliefs during the English Civil War

1619-1671

Daniel Ocon

Introduction

“Melancholic men observed many ill presages about that time” wrote Edward Hyde, the Earl of Clarendon. “A general sadness covered the whole town, and the King himself appeared more melancholic than he used to be.”¹ Such was Clarendon’s despondent description of the raising of the Royal Standard by King Charles I. The simple action of raising the standard on a wooden pole outside of Nottingham on August 22, 1642, would mark the beginning of the English Civil Wars between the supporters of King Charles, the Royalists, and the supporters of Parliament, the Parliamentarians. Clarendon, by admittance, “was much affected” but immediately gave his pledge of allegiance to the King saying, “I will willingly join with you the best I can.”² Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and Chancellor of England, would stand by King Charles and the Royalist camp throughout the English Civil Wars and, after their subsequent defeat, follow the Royal Family and their supporters in exile.

Edward Hyde was not alone in his support of the Royalist faction. The Earl of Clarendon is one of many personalities who was caught up in the chaos of the English Civil Wars. The raising of the standard at Nottingham brought little jubilation throughout Caroline England yet, many officers, members of Parliament (MPs), and aristocrats would nonetheless answer the call

¹ Sir Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion: A New Selection* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 141.

² Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion: A New Selection*, 141-2.

to arms and fight on behalf of their King. Like Clarendon, these supporters of the monarchy and the divine right of kings, Royalists, would experience firsthand the English Civil Wars and their physical and political effect on England. The Royalists would face many uncertainties and misfortunes in the turmoil of the civil wars: the wars themselves, the execution of King Charles in 1649, and the Parliamentary supremacy in England for almost a decade. Despite this, many Royalists never faltered in their loyalty to their King, and would take to the printing press and the courts of Europe to argue for the restoration of the Monarchy.

What were their beliefs and ideals that kept them in the Royalist camp despite the outward defeat? What were the common denominators in said beliefs? The answer is as variable and wide ranging as there were people who supported the King. However, through analysis of their own writings, between 1619 and 1671, it becomes clear that those actors who came to advocate their support for the Crown did so by connecting their support for the king for support of various, hierarchical elements of society such as religion, nationhood, and culture. These actors emphasized one structure or another yet, they often reached similar conclusions. The ability of those who defended the King to do so out of a wide variety of individual beliefs and ideologies represents a fascinating insight into the beginnings of contemporary political culture. Thus, the existence of this overarching, united front of different peoples and ideas consolidated into Royalism, represents the one of the earliest, conservative ideological movements.

King Greater than Country? National Identity and Royalism

Woe to the multitude of many people, which make a noise like the noise of the seas; and to the rushing of nations, that make a rushing like the rushing of mighty waters!

Isaiah 17:12

The meaning and the role of the nation in governance and civil life was a subject that dominated the mind of Sir Francis Kynaston long before the first shots of the English Civil War. Born in 1587, Sir Francis Kynaston was an early humanist scholar, poet, and Member of Parliament. Gaining a knighthood from King James I between 1618-9, Sir Kynaston would later become the MP for Shropshire in 1621.³ The earliest mention of him within *The Journal of the House of Commons*, the official House of Commons records, comes on the first of May 1621. According to the record, “Sir Francis Kinnaston commendeth the great Honour of these Princes, and - the great Lewdness of Floyde. Moveth, Floyde his Study maybe presently searched, and his Papers viewed.”⁴ He had defended what he saw as an attack on the monarchy from a fellow member of the house, Floyd, and demanded his libraries be searched for treasonous material. His ties to the Stuart monarchy would only grow as he would become an esquire for Charles I and receive patronage from the Royals for his ‘*Museaum Minervae*,’ a planned academy of learning.

Sir Francis Kynaston’s zealous defense of the monarchy would tie into his ideas about nation, his defense of which was placed against what he called ‘parliamentarian patriotism.’ In the years following the death of Queen Elizabeth and the rise of the Stuart Dynasty, MPs had begun to be divided between men who thought that the sovereign’s role should be tamed, or worse, rejected, and those who still had a certain level of faith in parliament where the King played a leading role.⁵ These ‘constitutional’ parliamentarians like Mr. Edward Alford, Mr.

³ Cesare Cuttica, “Sir Francis Kynaston: The Importance of the ‘Nation’ for a 17th-Century English Royalist,” *History of European Ideas*, vol. 32, no. 2 (Jan. 2006): 136.

⁴His Majesty’s Stationary Office “House of Commons Journal Volume 1: 01 May 1621.” *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 1, 1547-1629*. London, vol. 1, 29 Apr. 1802, pp. 598–600.

⁵ Cuttica, “The Importance of the Nation,” 137-8.

William Corryton, and Sir Roger North were a small but growing number of the members of parliament who rejected the absolute authority of the King.⁶

For Sir Francis Kynaston, the growth of this sect was an outrage. He bitterly chastised the growing ‘constitutional’ sect in Parliament reminding their faction’s members that, “their Election is commaunded by the kings Writ of Summons,” and their duty as parliamentarians was “the kings Prerogative and gracious favours, whose will and sole Power is the Ortus and Interitus [Latin: Rise and Fall or, poetically, Sunrise or Sunset] of Parliament.”⁷ Kynaston observed that these ‘parliamentarian patriots’ believed their source of power was from their perceived public support. In his view, this outlook was incorrect because they could only be elected by the public with permission from the King, and the King had the authority to appoint and dismiss the MPs as he pleased. Kynaston believed that the King could not go against the national will for he was the “Pater Patriae,” the Father of the Nation, and thus, as the father and symbol of the nation, he had the complete authority to act in the nation’s name.⁸ Such opinion becomes clear when he admonished his opponents in May of 1621,

[L]et no man ... be arrogant as to think, that he hath a greater care of the Commonwealth then the King hath. Let no man that resists the King out of an opinion that he stands for the Country, deceive himself.⁹

For Kynaston, the King was the nation. To attack the King, under the pretext of faith or commitment to the country, was to attack the nation and broke the necessary harmony that ought to thrive within it.

⁶ Cuttica, “The Importance of the Nation,” 138.

⁷ Cuttica, “The Importance of the Nation,” 138.

⁸ Cuttica, “The Importance of the Nation,” 140.

⁹ Cuttica, “The Importance of the Nation,” 143.

This intersection between King and Nation was a motif that did not begin and end with Sir Francis Kynaston, as exemplified by his contemporary Sir Robert Filmer. Born in 1588, Sir Robert Filmer would share many similarities with Kynaston. Like Kynaston, Filmer would be knighted by King James I on January 24, 1619. Filmer was also a learned scholar, being able to speak and write in Greek and Latin.¹⁰ Filmer, however, would never be a member of parliament. Instead, he would spend the time before, during, and after the civil wars engaging in intellectual activism and writing treatises on philosophy and ethics.¹¹

As can be weaned, Filmer was not a zealous-in-action royalist nor an ideological reactionary. According to Cesare Cuttica's Biography, *Sir Robert Filmer, and the Patriotic Monarch*, "Despite being identified as an extreme apologist for the kingly prerogative by the parliamentarians in Kent, ... from the first he took only slight action in support of Charles I, and that from a distance."¹² Additionally, one of his first well-known works, 1641's *In Praise of the Vertuous Wife*, was a dialectical work of philosophy between a misogynistic unnamed pamphleteer and himself where he argued for the exaltation of female virtues and characteristics.¹³ His forward-thinking views on a few of the social questions of the day, Cuttica argues, informed his support for a more absolutist form of government,

[H]e emphasized the necessity that those who were in a position of responsibility always fulfil their duties even under the harshest circumstances. To leave the household or abandon the kingdom (and, consequently, the sovereign) in case of danger or conflict represented the most despicable decision that a housewife, or an assembly, could take.¹⁴

¹⁰ Cesare Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653) and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth Century Political Thought*, Ed. Peter Lake (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), 20-23.

¹¹ Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653)*, 20-23.

¹² Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653)*, 146.

¹³ Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653)*, 104.

¹⁴ Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653)*, 36.

Such an explanation of Sir Robert Filmer's political and social beliefs would be best represented in his magnum opus on political Royalism, *Patriarcha, or the Divine Powers of Kings*. Filmer began writing the work in 1632 but, troubles in licensing and the outbreak of violence prevented his work from being published until 1680, over 30 years after his death.¹⁵ What was eventually published, however, was the culmination and synthesis of his interests in ethics, politics, and philosophy. Filmer believed that Kings have the power of the Patriarch, as political and familial head over the nation.¹⁶ According to him, this came from two sources simultaneously across history. The first source was the King's rights to rule descended from, and heir to, the roles of Abraham and the biblical patriarchs. The second comes from the role of the King as peacekeeper and "Father of the Nation." On the former, Filmer states that,

The three Sons of Noah had the whole World divided amongst them by their Father; for of them was the whole World over-spread, according to the Benediction given to him and his Sons, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the Earth. Most of the Civilest Nations of the Earth labour to fetch their Original from some One of the Sons or Nephews of Noah, which were scatterd abroad after the Confusion of Babel: In this Dispersion we must certainly find the Establishment of Regal Power throughout the Kingdoms of the World.¹⁷

In this section, Filmer denies the prevailing anti-royalist notion of the period that because there is only one God yet different nations of peoples, these nations should be at liberty to choose their respective governments thus democratizing the power that God gave to Abraham. He argues against this in a fine, specific manner. Whilst Filmer does agree that power should be split amongst the nations of the world but, the democratization of power which the Parliamentarians are seemingly arguing for would simply lead to no power at all. He says,

¹⁵ Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653)*, 143.

¹⁶ Sir Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha, or, the Natural Power of Kings* (London: Printed and Are to Be Sold by Walter Davis ..., 1680), 3-4.

¹⁷ Filmer, *Patriarcha*, 5.

Thus to avoid the having but of one King of the whole world, we shall run into a liberty of having as many Kings as there be men in the world, which upon the matter, is to have no King at all, but to leave all men to their naturall liberty, which is the mischief the Pleadors for naturall liberty do pretend they would most avoid.¹⁸

This leads to Filmer's second argument, that Kings act like patriarchs in Roman law, sole keepers of property and head of the family unit. Under this line of reasoning, the Roman familial unit is expanded exponentially to cover the entirety of English society. As such, the King also holds sway over the people in a similar vein as an adoptive father, shepherding the peoples as he sees fit. His rule is only restricted by "the present lawes and customes of the realm."¹⁹ Thus, it is completely unnatural for a people to elect their king since an elected monarch cannot be the heir to divine patriarchy, nor legitimacy to rule over property/lands that are not his.²⁰ Just as it is impossible for somebody to "elect" their father. In a sense, an elected King is neither heir to, nor representative of, the nation. Thus, in the eyes of Filmer and Kynaston, the King is the guardsman of the nation and cannot be removed lest the nation collapse. Both motifs, of the centrality of the monarchy and the chaos that will/might ensue if he were to be removed are prevalent not only in their writings but also in the wider arguments made by the Royalists for the King.

The Patriarchal Father: Royalism and Religion

The state of MONARCHIE is the supremest thing upon earth: For Kings are not onely GODs Lieutenants upon earth, and sit upon GODs throne, but euen by GOD himselfe they are called Gods

King James VI and I in a Speech to the Lords and Commons, 1609

¹⁸ Filmer, *Patriarcha*, 7.

¹⁹ Filmer, *Patriarcha*, 13.

²⁰ Filmer, *Patriarcha*, 11.

The massive religious change in England that had started with Henrician Reformation in 1534, continued with all haste during Caroline era of English history.²¹ The Anglican Church, founded by Henry and supported by his successors would soon find itself under siege by more radical Protestant faiths such as Puritanism, Quakerism, and Presbyterianism.²² English Royalism, which nominally held that the King was the head of the Anglican Church, quickly began to attack and defend the monarchy based on Anglican principles. One expression of the religious ties to the monarchy comes from the only comedy written by a poet, Francis Quarles. Quarles, born in 1592, had come from a family that had long served the monarchy, as his great-grandfather was Auditor to King Henry VII.²³ Upon the commencement of hostilities in 1641, Francis took the Royalist side, printing many pamphlets in support of King Charles.²⁴ Before the first shots, however, Quarles had written an epic play, *The Virgin Widow*, for the Barrington noble family in 1640. The plot, which revolves around a series of Shakespearean intrigues and political maneuvers set in a fantasy world, is a thinly veiled polemic against the parliamentary cause growing around him. In the play, Katreena, a daughter of a physician and love interest of the King Evaldus, spells out the relationship between king and church as thus:

Being thus ordain'd by heavenly powers to wear
The facred Crowne of unexpected Care;
And well advising, what great danger waits
Upon the Scepters of ungovern'd States:
Conscious of too much weaknesse to command
So great a Kingdome with a single hand:

²¹ Bernard Capp, "Healing the Nation: Royalist Visionaries, Cromwell, and the Restoration of Charles II." *The Seventeenth Century*, vol. 34, no. 4 (November 2018), 493.

²² Capp, "Healing the Nation", 493.

²³ Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism: 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), 44.

²⁴ Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism*, 44.

W'are pleas'd to choose a Consort, in whose care
The Realme hath prosper'd, and to whom we dare
Commit our selfe and it.²⁵

Here, the fictional character of Katreena represents the pure Anglican Church fighting against the intrigues of Quack and the Queen Augusta, two Characters representative of the divergent Protestant faiths vying for supremacy. Yet, this polemical attack on divergent faiths in defense of King was based on a conventional tie of the monarchy to Anglicanism. Others would take a far more direct and unorthodox approach.

“Dear friends, it was no dream nor fancy; for I was awake, and had my perfect memory,” wrote John Sanders of Harborne in recollection of one of his experiences.²⁶ Sanders was a nonconformist religious fanatic, as those around him could attest. His wife and in-laws came to see him as mentally deranged and “came to be [his] bitterest enemy.”²⁷ They went as far as to almost beat him to death and throw him in jail with false charges before separating themselves from him permanently.²⁸ What particularly elicited such cruel treatment was the nature of John’s visions. In Tudor and Caroline England, visions of the fantastical could be accepted as inspired by God, although uncertainty often reigned as to whether this was a legitimate divine ordination or a sign of madness.²⁹ In his own words, John Sanders was a “Herald or Ambassadour from the great Kingly power and Parliament of Heaven” to reveal “how that the Church and State must be rebuildd and reformed in this Land.³⁰” His visions called for “our true born King Charles Stuart the second being restored, and Oliver Cromwell by the grace of God being united unto him, the

²⁵ Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism*, 47.

²⁶ Capp, “Healing the Nation”, 495.

²⁷ Capp, “Healing the Nation”, 497.

²⁸ Capp, “Healing the Nation”, 497-498.

²⁹ Capp, “Healing the Nation”, 493.

³⁰ Capp, “Healing the Nation”, 494.

civil magistracy will be a wall to the orthodox church ministry,” for a mixed Royalist-Parliamentarian realm.³¹ The question of the church played a vital role in Sanders’ Vision as, according to Bernard Capp’s *Healing the Nation*,

[Sanders believed] the civil war had begun with the pretence of rousing Protestants against Papists, but that some had then sought to impose a false Presbyterian church. In response, an angry God had allowed Protestants to destroy each other, while Catholics remained as strong as ever.³²

Sanders believed that a restoration of the monarchy would bring about a reconciliation from within the Protestant faiths in England. The faiths then united, presumably under a reformed Anglicanism, would then lead to the collapse of the Roman Catholic Church “by love and a spiritual war.³³” The arguments made by Saunders, and other Protestants, in favor of monarchy based on religious grounds were wildly variant, and quite eccentric in Sanders’ case, but all of them were built upon the idea that God had a mandate for the monarchy that surpassed individual freedoms or ‘democracy.’

The Pragmatic Sanction: The Commons and Royalism

The people's liberties strengthen the king's prerogative, and the king's prerogative is to defend the people's liberties

King Charles I to Parliament, 1628.

Despite an outward appearance to be separate from the common people and their needs, Royalists did monitor themselves to ensure that the movement had some legitimacy and some popular support. Early examples of this could be earlier in this essay, as was the case with Sir

³¹ Capp, “Healing the Nation”, 594-5.

³² Capp, “Healing the Nation”, 497.

³³ Capp, “Healing the Nation”, 498.

Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha*. The book, which was most certainly finished by the time of the beginning of the Civil War in 1641, was not published until 1680. The Royal authorities had forbidden its publishing due to the fear it argued for too radical a program. Thus, the crown did not give license for its publication until long after Filmer's death.³⁴ The Royalists would come to directly appeal to, and cultivate, popular support for the monarchy. Their popular arguments, rather than the philosophical or religious arguments, dealt directly with the daily problems of the commons and show that Royalism had to appeal to the masses.

“Base Miscreants ... could ye not invent / Some other Plague in your damn'd
PARLIAMENT, / To vex good-fellows, but you must put down / Strong-Ale, the chief upholder
of the Crown.”³⁵ This poem, *A Curse Against Parliament Ale*, was written anonymously in 1649
and mocks the parliamentary excises and regulations on alcohol consumption during the
Protectorate. The Protectorate, established between 1653-9 after the defeat of the Royalists
during the English Civil War, had attempted to appease the dissenters from the Anglican Church
(Puritans, Independents, Presbyterians, Etc.) by enacting laws that would regulate morality of the
English.³⁶ Some examples of the laws placed on alcohol included: Prohibiting taverns from
opening on Sundays, the banning of French wines, and the levy of heavy taxation on strong
alcohol.³⁷ Such laws caused massive discontent towards the Protectorate regime. The Royalists
quickly took advantage and began spreading works that targeted popular discontent. One such
ballad shows how beermakers felt that the new regime worked to their disadvantage,

³⁴ Cuttica, “The Importance of the Nation,” 143.

³⁵ Caroline Boswell, “Popular Grievances and Royalist Propaganda in Interregnum England.” *The Seventeenth Century*, vol. 27, no. 3, (August, 2012), 319.

³⁶ Boswell, “Popular Grievances and Royalist,” 315-6.

³⁷ Boswell, “Popular Grievances and Royalist,” 317.

“The Brewer he must be paid,
the Hostis she will not score,
Yet drinke is smaller made,
then't was in times before.³⁸”

The Royalists, therefore, positioned themselves as the champions of the old order, that would do away with the morality policing of the Protectorate. *A Curse* was written by a Royalist and his rhetorical appeal that strong ale was backed by the crown would have been appealing to the brew makers who needed business, the tavern-goers who wanted a drink, and the urban poor for whom strong ale was a vital part of their caloric intake.³⁹

The Royalists, however, did not rely solely on their attacks on social regulation to gain popular support but also attacked the way in which Cromwell and his heirs ruled England. England, as well as the other realms of Great Britain and Ireland, was ruled by Oliver Cromwell, leader of the parliamentary faction, as a Lord Protector: a title which carried with it all the powers of a de facto king.⁴⁰ Cromwell envisioned himself as a watchman, acting only as he saw fit. However, he “had never gained the willing consent of the nation,” and his rule relied primarily on support from the military.⁴¹ This dependence on the military and the reliance on soldiers to do the Protectorate's bidding had a severe impact on public perception of the Commonwealth.⁴²

In 1650, the author John Crouch described an incident involving some soldiers and the citizenry, which best represents the kind of popular argument made by the Royalists. In the newspaper, *The Man in the Moon*, Crouch related how a few ‘rebel’ soldiers had seized some

³⁸ Boswell, “Popular Grievances and Royalist,” 319.

³⁹ Boswell, “Popular Grievances and Royalist,” 319-20.

⁴⁰ Maurice Percy Ashley, *The English Civil War* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), 175.

⁴¹ James Rees Jones, *Country and Court: England, 1658-1714* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), 113.

⁴² Jones, *Country and Court: England*, 114.

actors illegally performing a stage-play on St. James Street in London, stripped them naked, and humiliatingly marched them across the city of London to Westminster.⁴³ Along the way, an actor threw a bucket of grain into the face of a cavalry officer, which he responded in anger and brandished his weapon. He was prevented from striking down the man only by a teenager, a “butcher's boy”, who seized his weapon and told him to enjoy the free grain which was on his face.⁴⁴ Crouch finished the article with praise for the teenager and rallied for continued public support for disobedience, even of a violent nature,

“If this Souldier scape ... there will questionlesse come forth an Act for a Thanksgiving for this wonderful! Victory over the poore Players, and the Souldiers deliverance, and a double Excise upon all Beefe and Mutton for the future; that Butchers hereafter may learne to keep their Apprentices, and not suffer them to beat Souldiers as they passe upon their occasions.⁴⁵”

By appealing to the motif of the righteous, resistant commoner and portraying itself as the alternative against Parliamentary tyranny and their regime of taxes, Royalism developed a rapport between the commons and the Royals that helped it gain popularity and support.

Conclusion

“In this wonderful manner, and with this miraculous expedition, did God put an end in one month ... a rebellion that had raged near twenty years, and been carried on with all the horrid circumstances of parricide, murder, and devastation, that fire and the sword, in the hands of the wickedest men in the world, could be ministers of, almost to the desolation of two kingdoms, and the exceeding defacing and deforming the third. Yet did the merciful hand of God in one month bind up all these wounds, and even made the scars as undiscernible as in respect of their deepness was possible.”⁴⁶

⁴³ Boswell, “Popular Grievances and Royalist,” 313.

⁴⁴ Boswell, “Popular Grievances and Royalist,” 313.

⁴⁵ Boswell, “Popular Grievances and Royalist,” 313.

⁴⁶ Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion*, 424.

So concludes Edward Hyde the Earl of Clarendon's account of the Civil War in England, upon the restoration of the monarchy in 1660. Despite Hyde's idealistic and rosy picture, Royalism's ideological development would not end with the Restoration. Nor would the questions revolving around the duties and role of England's monarchy terminate upon the cessation of hostilities. At the time of one of its greatest tribulations, however, the supporters of King Charles and his heirs created a vast field of arguments for the support and restoration of the king. The arguments from the supporters of the crown from different institutions would combine from the different social elements such as religion, the nation, and public interest, to create the ideology of Royalism.

The philosophy made by the Royalists, and their evocations of social structures, would be rearranged and reargued as the crown repeatedly found itself under duress throughout the 17th century. In the 1690's, ardent Royalists would defend the right of the Catholic James II to ascend to the English throne, invoking Filmer's arguments and observations on the state of nature and the role of the King. The ability of these appeals attract followers is a revealing insight into philosophy of the people who argued for them and the dynamism of their cause. However, no political situation is certain nor ideological conviction stable. Despite Royalist best efforts, the power of the monarchy waned, and the power of parliamentary democracy grew. Yet his 'Tory' faction would change as well. Despite eschewing the absolutism of Filmer or the heterodoxy of John Sanders, the 'Tories' and later Conservatives would make similar appeals to policy based on the social pillars earlier Royalists pinned theirs. As such, the Royalists of the 17th century represent the beginning of a long and variable line of political thought that would eventually be known as Conservatism.

Historiography

The history and the recording of the Royalist beliefs during the English Civil Wars occurred at the same time of the Civil Wars themselves. When the Civil Wars began, King Charles and the Royalists promoted authors and works i.e., the *History of the Rebellion*, which sought to drum up support for the Royalist cause. It was during the period of the late 17th century that both Parliamentary and Royalist histories proliferated, with support from political backers, with their own beliefs and versions of events.⁴⁷ However, the downfall of the House of Stuart in 1714 and the final supremacy of Parliament over Royal authority, gave the Royalists and their interpretation of history a near deathblow.⁴⁸

What occurred over the next century, with the increasing democratization of power, was the preeminence of the Whiggish view of history. This version of history, popularized amongst the liberal elites of the Anglophone world of the 18th and 19th centuries, believed that the world was on an ever-progressing march towards liberalism and freedom with each generation.⁴⁹ The Royalists, in their view, were an aberration and merely a steppingstone towards progress. The Whiggish view of historiography would largely remain unchanged until the outbreak of the First World War and the rise of socialist thought in Europe. What emerged from the ashes of Whiggish history was Marxist history, embodied by historian Christopher Hill, held that the English Civil War was a large class war between the aristocratic Royalists and the bourgeois Parliamentarians.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Peter Lake. "From Revisionist to Royalist History; or, Was Charles I the First Whig Historian," *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 78, no. 4, (2015): 661.

⁴⁸ Lake "From Revisionist," 665

⁴⁹ Lake "From Revisionist," 657-8.

⁵⁰ Lake "From Revisionist," 658.

The Marxist view, like the Whiggish view before it, was soon replaced by a new form of historiography in the 1960-70's: Revisionist historiography.⁵¹ Revisionist Historiography, led by men like Conrad Russel and Glen Burgess, is a complicated interpretation of history that seeks to reject the outright ideologization of Whiggish and Marxist theory, which see the victory of the Parliamentarians as inevitable or just another symptom of class conflict. Instead, revisionist historians seek to understand the beliefs and structure of the time as the people would have understood it and how the structures existed. For instance, in Whiggish history, the fact that many of the parliamentarian leaders were themselves aristocrats was often overlooked. It was only with Conrad Russel's *Origins of the English Civil War* that such fact began to play an important part in the historical narrative.⁵² It is with the advent of revisionist history, that a new look can be granted at the ideological development of the English Civil Wars, and where this work rests as an addition upon.

⁵¹ Lake "From Revisionist," 657

⁵² Lake "From Revisionist," 657

Bibliography

- Ashley, Maurice Percy. *The English Civil War*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
- Boswell, Caroline. "Popular Grievances and Royalist Propaganda in Interregnum England." *The Seventeenth Century*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2012, pp. 313–334., doi:10.7227/tsc.27.3.4.
- Capp, Bernard. "Healing the Nation: Royalist Visionaries, Cromwell, and the Restoration of Charles II." *The Seventeenth Century*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2018, pp. 493–512., doi:10.1080/0268117x.2018.1462246.
- Clarendon, Sir Edward Hyde. *The History of the Rebellion: A New Selection*. Edited by Paul Seaward. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Cuttica, Cesare. "Sir Francis Kynaston: The Importance of the 'Nation' for a 17th-Century English Royalist." *History of European Ideas*, vol. 32, no. 2, 13 Jan. 2006, pp. 139–161., doi:10.1016/j.histeuroideas.2006.02.002.
- Cuttica, Cesare. *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653) and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth-Century Political Thought*. Edited by Peter Lake. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016.
- Filmer, Sir Robert. *Patriarcha, or, the Natural Power of Kings*. London: Printed and Are to Be Sold by Walter Davis ..., 1680.
- His Majesty's Stationary Office "House of Commons Journal Volume 1: 01 May 1621." *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 1, 1547-1629*. London, vol. 1, 29 Apr. 1802, pp. 598–600.
- Jones, James Rees. *Country and Court: England, 1658-1714*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Lake, Peter. "From Revisionist to Royalist History; or, Was Charles I the First Whig Historian." *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 78, no. 4, 2015, pp. 657–81, <https://doi.org/10.1353/hlq.2015.0037>.
- Wilcher, Robert. *The Writing of Royalism: 1628-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001.