Introduction

Desiring to deepen his understanding of the present world by turning to the past, between 1644 and 1652 the Cambridge student William Bright filled a small book with notes and commonplaces gleaned from political, historical, and religious writings. In 1648 he recorded political and military observations drawn from an anonymous pamphlet by 'D. P. Gent', listing five 'chiefe Causes of *th*e mutations of Monarchies': 'Wants of Issue', 'Ambition', 'Lust', 'Effeminacy', and 'Taxes'. The original pamphlet, entitled *Severall politique and militarie observations* (1648), had listed six causes of the mutations of monarchy, with the first being the 'crying sinnes of a Nation'.[1] Bright, however, only copied into his notebook those causes which could be illustrated by historical and contemporary rather than by divine example. Beside each of the causes, he included a short list of such exempla, including Julius Caesar and Richard III for 'Ambition'; Sextus Tarquin and Appius Claudius for 'Lust'; and Sardanapalus of Assyria for 'Effeminacy'.[2] Bright's notes illustrate well the entanglement of political, gendered, and historical thinking in seventeenth-century England. Statesmen in Stuart England widely held that the rise and fall of historic kingdoms, republics, and empires formed patterns from which the student of contemporary politics might learn, and this record testified that the 'lustful' or 'effeminate' ruler who committed sins of the bedroom or household might topple an empire just as surely as might unjust taxation or crises in hereditary succession. Indeed, both Bright's notes and the pamphlet from which they were drawn argued that the effeminacy or lust of a ruler could well be the very cause of unjust taxation or hereditary crisis.

[1] D. P., *Severall politique and militarie observations: upon the civill, and militarie governments; the birth, increase, and decay of monarchies, the carriage of princes, magistrates, commanders, and favourites*. London, 1648, 59. The Thomason copy includes the annotation, 'May 3d'.
[2] Cambridge University Library GBR/0012/MS Add.6160. p. 4.

Bright's practice of copying historical notes was commonplace in seventeenth-century England, a society saturated with imagery and ideas drawn from the ancient and near past.[3] Schoolrooms, churches, libraries, playhouses, the court, and the palace, manuscripts and printed works were all sites of historical thinking in England. The subject of History, and the historically informed study of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages and texts, held pride of place in humanist grammar school and university curricula.[4] The political and legal structure of England was understood to have been founded upon conceptions of the ancient constitution and the common law, as well as constitutional structures, customs, and laws derived from the Roman legal tradition.[5] And the political imagination and culture of England, tied as it was to continental humanism, drew very heavily upon historical exempla.[6]

[3] In their study of history, readers frequently 'were encouraged to "harvest" and excerpt what they judged note-worthy'. See Freyja Cox Jensen, *Reading the Roman Republic in Early Modern England* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 38; Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), esp. 135–75; Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 137, 145–46. Harold Love has further argued that personal miscellanies, into which compilers entered texts of varying lengths from printed works or from short manuscripts, or 'separates', were often 'personal' in so far as the particular configuration of material depended upon the tastes and interests of the compiler and would not be repeated exactly, but that there was usually a strong family resemblance between manuscripts arising from particular institutions or sub-regions. Material copied into miscellanies would have ideological and timely reasons for their selection. See Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993).

[4] Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities', in N. Tyacke, ed. *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: Seventeenth Century Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 211–357, esp. 257–60; Jensen, *Reading the Roman Republic*, 25–37; Daniel Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and the 'Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990).

[5] J. G. A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957 and 1987); Andrew Lewis, '"What Marcellus Says Is against You": Roman Law and Common law', in *The Roman Law Tradition*, ed. A. D. E. Lewis and D. J. Ibbetson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 199–208; R. H. Helmholz, 'The Roman Law of Guardianship in England, 1300–1600', *Tulane Law Review* 52.2 (1978): 223–57; D. J. Seipp, 'Roman Legal Categories in the Early Common Law', in *Legal Records and Historical Reality*, ed. T. G. Watkin (London and Ronceverte: Hambledon, 1989), 9–36.

[6] R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, c. 1590–1630', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1994), 21–43; Paulina Kewes, ed., *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Press, 2006); David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, '"Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy', *Past and Present* 129 (Nov. 1990): 30–78.

Within this intellectual milieu, the history of Rome held an especially significant place, as scholars such as Paulina Kewes and Malcolm Smuts have shown. Kings repeatedly represented themselves as Roman in print, portraits, performances, and public processions. By 1640, at least fifty-seven Roman history plays had been produced in England, of which forty survive, and printed English translations of classical accounts of Rome flourished, including by Livy, Sallust, Suetonius, Caesar, Tacitus, Lucan, Plutarch, Polybius, Seneca, Horace, and Cicero.[7] Alongside descriptions of scripture and of England's own past, interpretations of the history and historical exempla of Rome became a primary way that English subjects complimented, counselled, and criticised their monarchs – hailing or condemning King James, for example, as a new Augustus, a Julius Caesar, or a Nero.[8]

Attention to the history of history has borne great fruit in historical scholarship on seventeenth-century England, enriching our understanding of the political culture and of the intellectual origins of English republican thought. This book intends to deepen still further our understanding of the extent and character of historical thought in seventeenth-century England, and its significance in English political thinking, by attending to vibrant discourses of tyranny within early Stuart historical thought and the ways by which these conceptions of tyranny eroded support first for the Stuart monarchs and thereafter for Oliver Cromwell. Through closely analysing a series of Roman historical exempla and their public appropriation, the following chapters provide a detailed portrait of the multivalent images of tyranny which classical history afforded to English statesmen in this period. As Bright's notebook demonstrates, historical diagnoses of tyranny could lead the English student to analyse and to condemn a monarch's public and private performances – his political, moral, and familial activities. Simultaneously, this book seeks to remedy an unfortunate lacuna in the scholarship on history, political culture, and republicanism by focusing especially on ideas of gender, and particularly of manliness, which saturated both classical and early modern ideas of tyranny and of virtue, citizenship, governance, and statecraft.

[7] Other classical authors included Florus, Ammianus Marcellinus, Herodian, Josephus, Justinus, Appian, Dio, etc. See Jensen, *Reading the Roman Republic*, chapter 2; Daniel Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 172.

[8] For Augustus and Caesar, see Kewes, 'Julius Caesar in Jacobean England', *The Seventeenth Century* 17 (2002): 155–86; Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians', 38–40. For Nero, see Chapters 3 and 4.

The first half of this book argues that classical discourses of tyranny and of gender fuelled important contestations over conceptualisations of power, patriarchy, and masculinity in early Stuart England, and that the appropriation of classical stories helped to forge conflict in this period through affording statesmen languages with which to warn, to counsel, and also to criticise their monarchs as tyrannical and failed men. The second half of this book argues that English republican thought developed significantly as a solution to the perceived problem of emasculating tyranny experienced during the reigns of the early Stuarts. By attending to the centrality of tyranny and of gender in classical discourses of republicanism, and to important texts which supported and contested the rise of Cromwell through this classical lens, the book's final chapters argue that the fundamental purpose of English republicanism was the realisation of manhood for its citizens. Cromwell as lord protector represented the hopes of this republican discourse and its significant fragility as he was depicted as becoming a tyrant himself. Through these arguments, this book seeks to contribute to a number of historical debates simultaneously concerning the political thought and discourse of early Stuart and Interregnum England, conceptions of masculinity and patriarchy in the early and mid-seventeenth century, the cultural and intellectual origins of the English Revolution, and the character of English republican thought.

In the classical world as well as in the seventeenth century, articulations and conceptualisations of power were canvassed recurrently through formulations of gender. In ancient societies, gender was viewed as a fundamental structure of the 'natural' order of things and of people through the articulation of differences between and within the sexes. Manliness in the ancient world, tied particularly to conceptualisations of power, autonomy, and legitimacy, was a quintessentially public value performed, tested, won, or compromised in the context of public service or duties.[9] Moreover, classical definitions of moral goodness for the individual man and for the political actor or ruler were persistently coded through languages of masculinity, with the lack or failure of goodness being portrayed as emasculated, effeminate, or feminine.[10] Aristotle's political and ethical

[9] Lin Foxhall, *Studying Gender in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 1–23; Myles McDonnell, *Roman Manliness:* Virtus *and the Roman Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), xiii.

[10] For example, the Greek term *malakia* had the double meaning of 'softness' or 'feminine', both signifying a lack of masculinity. See, e.g., Aristotle's discussion *On Virtues and Vices* in Aristotle, *Athenian Constitution. Eudemian Ethics. Virtues and Vices*, trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library 285 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935), 496–99; Todd W. Reeser,

writings, which all educated Englishmen imbibed in late grammar school and university education, provided exclusionary claims concerning the male human. Grounded in biological theories of the female as the privation of the male, Aristotle understood only men as capable of realising the human potential of self-governance by reason, and thereby, the potential to rule self and others.[11] Cicero, whose influence equalled or even exceeded that of Aristotle in this period, not only attended in great detail to the qualities of *virtus*, or manliness, as necessary for political authority but in his writings even masculinised the trait of *ratio* as that which must control (*coerceat, imperet*) the emotional and soft part of the soul which supposedly acted like a woman (*molle, muliebrieter*), in the same way that a master must control his slave, a commander his soldier, or a father his child. As Craig Williams describes Ciceronian thinking, 'We observe that all the images used [of *ratio*] are of men, not women, and all of them are in Roman terms men who by definition have authority and power over others: *dominus, imperator, parens*.'[12] The influence of these two classical writers on early seventeenth-century England cannot be overstated, as Aristotelian thought 'became so deeply ingrained in the European consciousness as to be accepted unquestioningly' and Cicero's writings formed the heart of grammar school education and of English characterisations of the active political life.[13]

In their conscious revival, appropriation, and reinterpretation of the classical world in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, English writers imported not only the histories, grammar, aesthetic tastes, and political and moral ideals of the ancients such as Aristotle and Cicero; they simultaneously imported ancient ideas concerning gender, which helped to shape early Stuart and then Cromwellian understandings of tyranny, power, and legitimacy. As we will see, these classical vocabularies intermingled in this period with the broad and complex vocabularies of masculinities expressed in honour and chivalric codes, religious belief

Moderating Masculinity in Early Modern Culture (Chapel Hill: North Carolina studies in the Roman Languages and Literatures, 2006), 66.

[11] Christine Garside-Allen, 'Can a Woman Be Good in the Same Way as a Man?', *Dialogue* 10 (1971), 534–44; Lynda Lange, 'Woman Is not a Rational Animal: On Aristotle's Biology of Reproduction', in *Discovering Reality*, ed. Sandra Harding and Merrill B. Hintikka (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003), 1–15.

[12] Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 132–34.

[13] For Aristotle, see Charles B. Schmitt, 'Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism', *History of Science* 11 (1973): 159–93, esp. 174. By the end of the sixteenth century in English schoolrooms, Cicero's writings became more commonly used for Latin study and double translation practice than Biblical scriptures. See Freyja Cox Jensen, *Reading the Roman Republic*, 28.

and practice, warfare and domestic governance, householding and patriarchy, fashion, national identity, and languages of Englishness, rights and freedoms.[14] Over thirty years ago, Joan Wallach Scott called for historians to explore the usefulness of gender as a category of historical analysis in realms such as politics, which had been a territory 'virtually uncharted' when she wrote in the 1980s.[15] While Scott sought to explain, if briefly, the significance of gender employed literally or analogically in political theory 'to justify or criticise the reign of monarchs and to express the relationship between ruler and ruled', three decades later these issues still have not been adequately addressed in British political and intellectual history, especially in studies of the period of male rulers.[16] Gender as a category of historical analysis has now been established firmly, including recognition that men as well as women were (and are) 'carriers' of gender; however, within scholarship on seventeenth-century Britain, most studies

[14] See, for example, Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Hilary Larkin, *The Making of Englishmen: Debates on National Identity, 1550–1650* (Leiden: Brill, 2014); Elizabeth A. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London and New York: Longman, 1999); Margaret R. Sommerville, *Sex & Subjection: Attitudes to Women in Early Modern Society* (London and New York: Arnold, 1995); Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500–1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Brendan Kane, *The Politics and Culture of Honour in Britain and Ireland, 1541–1641* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Cesare Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653) and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth-Century Political Thought* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012); Su Fang Ng, *Literature and the Politics of Family in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Simon Ditchfield and Helen Smith, eds., *Conversions: Gender and Religious Change in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017).

[15] Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History,* revised edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 46.

[16] Much more has been done on issues of gender and power during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. See, for example, Carole Levin, *Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994); A. N. McLaren, *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: Queen and Commonwealth, 1558–1585* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana,* ed. Julia M. Walker (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998 and 2004).

Work that has been undertaken for the Stuart period includes Michael B. Young, *James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000); Susan Amussen and David Underdown, *Gender, Culture, and Politics in England, 1560–1640: Turning the World Upside Down* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017); Alastair Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), esp. chapter 3. For the English civil wars and revolution, Anne Hughes has provided the most important analysis in *Gender and the English Revolution* (New York: Routledge, 2012); see also Hilda Smith, *All Men and Both Sexes: Gender, Politics, and the False Universal in England, 1640–1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). Literary contributions include Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Diane Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics during the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

concerning conceptions of masculine governance, patriarchy, and male and female relations have focused on the level of the household, leaving still unexplored many of the vital relationships between traditional political theory, political culture, and ideas of masculinity.[17]

Scholars of political culture and intellectual historians have insufficiently engaged with the findings of gender historians. The outpouring of scholarship on classical republicanism and historical thought has identified the humanist study of the classical tradition as forming a central political vocabulary in seventeenth-century republicanism. Although debates persist concerning whether one classical tradition, or an amalgamation of traditions, most influenced English writers, the obvious intellectual debt to Greek, Roman, and Hebrew sources has been widely substantiated.[18] The field of republican scholarship, however, has largely failed to analyse the highly gendered nature of the classical tradition which influenced it, as well as the ways that classical understandings of manhood in particular were espoused and rejected by the Stuart kings and inherited by English republican writers. For example, Quentin Skinner's ground-breaking scholarship in the history of republicanism has rightly emphasised the

[17] John Tosh, 'What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain', *History Workshop Journal* 38 (1994), 180.

[18] J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton and London: Princeton University Press, 1975); Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Volume 1: The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Skinner, *Visions of Politics,* vol. II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Jonathan Scott, *Commonwealth Principles: Republican Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*: *Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660*; Eric Nelson, *The Greek Tradition in Republican Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Nelson, *The Hebrew Republic: Jewish Sources and the Transformation of European Political Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011); Andrew Hadfield, *Shakespeare and Republicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

The rewards for integrating gender history with political and intellectual history have been much more fully realised in studies of the French Revolution, which have identified issues of gender as a significant cultural contributor to the origins of the Revolution through political scandals, *mauvais discours* against the monarchy and aristocracy, and Enlightenment thought; and have demonstrated how the French Revolution generated feminist ideas, contested patriarchal ideals and structures, and affected relationships between men and men and women and men. See, for example, Sarah Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres in Pre-Revolution France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991); Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*; Hunt, 'The Many Bodies of Marie Antoinette', in *The French Revolution: Recent Debates* (London: Routledge, 2006), 201–18; Olwen Hufton, *Women and the Limits of Citizenship* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1992). Of note for its exploration of these concepts in legal practice is Suzanne Desan, *The Family on Trial in Revolutionary France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

significance of liberty as non-domination in the Roman tradition, noting the fundamental division in Roman and other ancient societies as being between free and servile.[19] Yet while the Roman legal definition of liberty did rest upon non-domination, Roman articulations of the relationship between free and servile relied heavily upon gendered attributions of masculinity and effeminacy. Moreover, the characteristics of ideal manhood which were considered necessary for an individual to possess autonomy and to govern others included much more than freedom from subjection. A man's public reputation for *virtus*, or manliness, was central to his ability to wield power and was simultaneously fragile. Scholars of the classical world (and also of Stuart England) have argued that much of the invective concerning polarising dichotomies between *viri* and non-*viri*, between men and lesser males or non-males, functioned to divide men into legitimate and illegitimate players in the political realm; contestations over political authority and ability centred upon the demonstration of manly activity and ability within the private and public realm.[20] Thus the importance of non-domination as a legal distinction for Roman liberty cannot be disputed, but the practice of liberty within the Roman context rested upon a much broader notion of masculine autonomy than has usually been analysed. Attending to discourses of manliness greatly enriches and expands our understanding of the significance of the Roman heritage in English republican thought.

I.1 Origins of Revolution and Republicanism

The time period addressed by this study begins with the accession of James to the English throne in 1603 and ends with the writings of 'Good Old Cause' republicans just weeks before the restoration of the Stuart

[19] Skinner drew the definition of *civis* from Justinian and other writers as 'someone who is not under the dominion of anyone else [i.e. a slave], but is *sui iuris*, capable of acting in their own right'. See Skinner, 'Liberty and the English Civil War', in *Visions of Politics*, vol II., 313. For an excellent discussion of this view in the early seventeenth century, see 'John Milton and the politics of slavery', in *Vision of Politics*, vol. II, 286–307. See also *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[20] See Richard Alston, 'Arms and the Man: Soldiers, Masculinity and Power in Republican and Imperial Rome', in *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, ed. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 205–224, esp. 207; J. Albert Harrill, 'Invective against Paul (2 Cor. 10:10), the Physiognomics of the Ancient Slave Body, and the Greco-Roman Rhetoric of Manhood', in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001): 189–213, esp. 201–5; Jennifer Larson, 'Paul's Masculinity', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123.1 (Spring 2004): 85–97, esp. 86–87. For early Stuart England, see Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England*, 15–20.

monarchy in 1660. Across the earlier part of this period, we find a growing divide in expressions of masculinity between those men considered fashionable in the Stuart court and those outside or critical of it, including divisions over whether virtuous manhood was enacted through negotiations of peace or through military ventures; in debates over elaborate or austere clothing and long or cropped hair; and in contestations over the worship of God in ornate and allegedly more effeminate and idolatrous ritual or in more austere fashion. In the midst of such debates, imaginative works began to pose questions about tyrants, including the point at which a king who trespassed gendered norms became unfit to rule. These cultural divisions would help to form the competing sides of the English civil wars.

Over the past four decades, 'revisionist' scholars have questioned whether the conflicts of the 1640s and the regicide of 1649 were the result of dynamic and long-standing legal, constitutional, and social divisions, as preceding liberal and Marxist histories had long asserted, or were instead contingent, essentially an aberration in English politics.[21] Revisionist accounts have emphasised the intellectual and social conservatism of early Stuart England, arguing for wide-scale consensus and a predominantly shared world-view of king, court, and subjects.[22] Simultaneously, leading scholars have questioned whether republicanism should be characterised as a response to civil war and regicide or a cause. As Blair Worden has maintained for the revisionist position: 'Regicide was not the fruit of republican theory. Most of its organisers were concerned to remove a

[21] Before revisionism, the English Revolution was understood as 'one of the decisive political episodes of modern times', and historians engaged in bitter debates over its religious, political, social, and economic causes. Marxists understood the revolution as bourgeois, helping to facilitate an emerging capitalist system, while 'Whigs' focused primarily on the constitutional principles established through Parliament, especially the House of Commons, as well as the activities and writings of Puritans. For significant 'revisionist' challenges to this view, see Kevin Sharpe, 'A Commonwealth of Meanings: Languages, Analogues, Ideas and Politics', in *Politics & Ideas in Early Stuart England* (London and New York: Pinter, 1989), 3–71; Conrad Russell, ed. *The Origins of the English Civil War* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1973); Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics 1621–1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979); John Morrill, *The Revolt of the Provinces* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1976); Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). For an overview of the historiographical landscape, see Richard Cust and Anne Hughes, eds., 'Introduction', *The English Civil War* (New York and London: Arnold, 1997), 1–30.

[22] See, for example, Sharpe, 'A Commonwealth of Meanings', 64–71. The real task, in Sharpe's view, was to explain how the civil war could have possibly erupted in Stuart England with its basis of political consensus and lack of fundamental ideological disagreements between king and parliament. Their main target was Lawrence Stone, *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529–1642* (London: ARK, 1972).

particular king, not kingship. They cut off King Charles' head and wondered what to do next.'[23]

Revisionist correctives have often been salutary, and have deepened our understanding of the 'politics of religion' and of the operation of political institutions on the national and local level, while elevating the provincial archive as a site of significant historical research.[24] At the same time, however, the privileging of manuscript and scribal sources within these studies has sometimes narrowed conceptions of the 'political' and even of political 'ideas' and has resulted in some neglect of wider cultural and intellectual contexts of the seventeenth century. 'Post-revisionist' accounts therefore have begun recently to address these contexts through emphasising the construction, circulation, and varied political meanings of images, events, scandals, and prejudices.[25] Due in significant measure to the revisionist position that the 1640s and 1650s were a deviation from the

[23] Blair Worden, 'Milton's republicanism and the tyranny of heaven', in *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, ed. Gisela Bock, Quentin Skinner, and Maurizio Viroli (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 225–46, esp. 226. In a similar vein, Pocock contended that republican doctrine in England developed as 'men came to face the fact that the historic constitution had collapsed'. English republicanism 'was a language, not a programme'. Pocock, 'Introduction', in *Political Works of James Harrington* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 15.

[24] See, e.g., John Morrill, *Revolt in the Provinces: The People of England and the Tragedies of War, 1630–1648* (London: Routledge, 1976); Anthony Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex, 1600–1660* (London: Longman, 1975); Ann Hughes, 'Militancy and Localism: Warwickshire Politics and Westminster Politics, 1643–1647', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 31 (1981): 51–68; Morrill, 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 34 (1984): 155–78; Conrad Russell, 'Parliamentary History in Perspective, 1604–1629', *History* 61 (1976): 1–27.

[25] The narrowing of the political is especially true of works following Conrad Russell's studies of parliamentary history, focusing upon high politics to the neglect of the political and cultural perceptions which may have influenced the high political realm. Within revisionist scholarship, Kevin Sharpe's work greatly broadened this narrower view of the political, although Sharpe's work still tended to be concerned with self-representation and self-interest rather than ideas. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics 1621–1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979); Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliments: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). For a perceptive reflection on these trends, see John Morrill, 'Revisionism's Wounded Legacies', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 78.4 (Winter 2015): 577–94.

For post-revisionist accounts, see Johann Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–1640* (London: Longmans, 1986); L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Richard Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1626–1628* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); Anne Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (London: Macmillan, 1991); Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Alastair Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution*; Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Curtis Perry, *Literature and Favoritism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Peter Lake, 'Anti-Popery: the Structure of a Prejudice', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England*, ed. Richard Cust and Anne Hughes (New York: