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Introduction

The Covenanting movement’s ideology was the product of interaction of political thought and the political process. The resistance of the Scottish Covenanters was justified as it were movement of a chosen people attempting to bring on change through active participation in the political process. While the movement proved to be successful at first, the splintering of the movement and the following Cromwellian occupation of Scotland made the Covenanting ideology look like an ideology of power. The Restoration settlements that restored episcopacy in favor of Presbyterianism revitalized the Covenanting movement as one of protest, subjecting its members to repression. In recent years, however, the idea of the movement as solely a movement of protest has begun to change. According to historian Allan Macinnes the historiography of the Covenanting movement has misunderstood the significance of the movement and its contribution to the political discourse of the Three Kingdoms.¹ Three misunderstanding that existed are firstly that the movement was aristocratic and a conservative reaction, secondly that it promoted political federalism under the guise of religious uniformity, and thirdly that the movement was only limited to the Scottish lowlands. Macinnes argues that these misunderstandings have been a result of the Restoration era’s political labeling, castigating radicals as extremists and conservatives as moderates; in other words, framing the Covenanting movement in terms favorable to the Restoration regime.² Macinnes has argued for a different understanding of the movement. The persisting image of the Covenanters as an extremist group has been a result of Restoration policies. The Restoration regime tried hard to create a narrative in which the Covenanters were blamed for the Civil War, how Presbyterian had undermined authority, and what consequences this had had. The regime employed political memory to secure this narrative.

Political memory is a concept that was first coined by Aleida Assmann. According to Assmann political memory is a form of institutionalized top-down memory that has a long-term durability. The stabilization of political memory requires a collective participation of a society, because it forms the base of a constructed identity. Political memory is focused on institutions, nations, and states and examines how memories are used for political action and the formation of group identity.³ The difficulty with political memory is that its main constituents, institutions, nations, states, do not have a memory like individuals do. Assmann

argues that they ‘make’ a memory, and with the aid of symbols, texts, images, monuments, etc, they construct an identity.\(^4\) Because political memory has a clear function: stimulating ideology and creating unity, whatever is included should support a narrative. Of course, victories are much easier remembered than defeats. What does not fit the specific ideology can be forgotten. What is included usually strengthens the self image of a nation and should support specific goals for the future. At the same time however, defeat can also be an important constituent of political memory. Victimhood and martyrdom can be the pillars on which a nation’s identity is constructed.

Historian Matthew Neufeld has attempted to reconstruct the censored memory of the Civil War after the Restoration of 1660 in his book *The Civil Wars after 1660: public remembering in late Stuart England*. Neufeld argues that the lengthy retaining of the Restoration’s political and religious settlements well into the eighteenth century was a result of the ways in which Restoration and post-Restoration England dealt with the memory of the Civil War and Interregnum. In dealing with this memory, a recognizable religious minority was blamed for the troubled recent past mainly through a legislative framework. This became clear shortly after the reinstalling of Charles II, when it was decided to disregard, and not remember, the recent past in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion.\(^5\) Shortly hereafter, however, this was replaced by a memory that sought to blame the puritan minority by providing historical justification on behalf of an Anglican oriented authority.\(^6\) In acts concerning the anti-puritan legislative framework, people with a connection to the religious minority were excluded from power and authority. Central to Neufeld’s argument, however, is highlighting within this legislative framework, how much and in what ways the experience of the Civil War was narrated in such a way that ensured that the nation could move forward as fast and without as many issues as possible.

The Restoration regime tried to ensure that only certain historical works about the period were published, relying on censorship to construct a version of the past that fitted their preferences. What was remembered was decided by the regime. According to Neufeld nations do, and did, “foster and broadcast certain representations of their shared past openly to be recalled and discussed and applied to their present predicaments.”\(^7\) Inherent to this is that

\(^7\) Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660*, 7.
other aspects that detracted from this history were simply left out of it. The version of events that was presented to the public, and thus was remembered, is defined by Neufeld as ‘public remembering’. Public remembering refers to “those representations of the past that were put abroad for common and open consumption, discussion, and debate.”

In addition, public remembering also refers to “the process of constructing and disseminating representations of public events, usually in the form of a story.” Historical works were important in deliberately constructing a public memory. They were expected to narrate public events and derived authority because this specific version of events formed the explanation to what had happened. Other kinds of narratives, including letters, petitions, and pamphlets, were deemed more incomplete than histories, however, these are still useful in studying memory because these can contain information that was not a part of the constructed memory.

The Early Modern period, with the early 1640s in particular, saw a surge in the publication of printed materials. These works were generally available to a great number of people. Even though illiteracy levels were high, it was possible for non-readers to grasp the content of popular texts. The significance of these texts is that they were read and that they exercised social influence because of this. Literature such as news items and pamphlets became a part of everyday life during the seventeenth century and the practice of politics was a topic that was much debated through this. Public opinion was created and influenced by the expansion of the printing press. The material that flowed from this press facilitated critical debate about news, politics and culture. The Scottish Covenanters have been partly held responsible for this expansion. Taking notice of the fact that the Covenanting movement started in 1638 with the signing of the National Covenant, a line between the emergence of the movement and the expansion of the printing press can be drawn. Historian Joad Raymond has studied Covenanting pamphlets and argued that they can be regarded as ultimately responsible for changes in the London book market of the mid-seventeenth century.

This is to illustrate that the Covenanters were firmly embedded in and taking part in a society with a specific preference for printed materials. The Covenanters were responsible for the writing of certain texts, however, they were also written about.

A great number of books on the Covenanters exist. Most of these books however, have dealt with the course of the Covenanting movement, and to a lesser extent with what
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happened after the power of the movement came to an end. How the Covenanters were remembered is a topic that has not yet been researched thoroughly. Because the Covenanting movement was far from uniform in its end days, it is interesting to research how the Covenanters were dealt with and remembered after the authority of the movement came to an end. In the decades to come, abrupt changes in the authority of England and Scotland took place, most importantly the Restoration in 1660. Inherent to these changes were differing views on religion and power and because of this, the memory of Covenanters and their legacy were treated accordingly. As noted above by Macinnes, the memory of the Covenanters has mainly existed of them being a militant protest group in search of power. As this image has started to change over the recent years in favor of the Covenanters, it is safe to say that the Restoration regime dealt with the movement effectively. However, it would be too one-sided to explore exactly how the Restoration regime attempted to shape the memory of the Covenanters, as the outcome of this would be straightforward. How both the Restoration regime and the Covenanters themselves tried to influence Covenanter memory is what is studied in this thesis. A question fitting to this is: How was the memory of the Covenanters shaped during the Restoration era with regard to Restoration regime initiatives as well as Covenanter initiatives, c.a. 1651-1685?

Neufeld’s objective, reconstructing memory of the Civil War in England through histories, is similar to what is done in this study with regard to the Scottish Covenanters in the same period. Neufeld’s book will form the backbone to this thesis. How Neufeld’s concept of public remembering was applied to the Scottish Covenanters is the topic of study here. I will add to Neufeld’s argument by examining how the Restoration regime dealt with the Scottish Covenanters in particular. Neufeld focuses on a general puritan minority, whereas I go more into depth on a specific part of this minority in the period 1660 to 1685. At the same time, Neufeld has mainly focused on literature published by the Restoration regime. He has focused on how the Restoration regime attempted to shape the history of the Civil War in such a way that it sanctioned the legal framework that restored the monarchy and the Episcopal Church, and also on how this was successful. As Neufeld, I focus on how the Restoration regime portrayed the Covenanters and thus tried to shape an image fitting to the Restoration narrative, however; in addition I also focus on how the Covenanters themselves opposed the Restoration

regime and published works in favor of the movement. My addition to what Neufeld has researched is that I examine if and how the Restoration regime was opposed in their attempts to shape history and construct a narrative. The Covenanter and the Marquis of Argyll in particular have had a bad reputation in the centuries following the Restoration. What is interesting is how the Restoration regime was opposed by the party they were trying to forget.

The literary primary sources I use are mostly histories, as Neufeld also has focused on. As political memory can be regarded as an elitist construction, it is only one sided and offers one interpretation of past events. According to historian Raingard Esser the manifestation of this version of the past was not exclusively restricted to written texts, as there were more ways “in which an interpretation of current policy and a construction of belonging was harnessed to history.” In early modern society, a constructed past also came forward in plays, processions, and songs, as well as in diaries and personal memories. Early modern historiography, however, is one of the places where a common, either real or constructed, past manifested itself. For this reason, the materials I mainly use are histories of some kind, either published on behalf of the Restoration regime or the Covenanter movement.

A selection has been made on what material to include and what not. The material has firstly been selected on the basis of publication. Because the construction of a certain narrative during and after the Restoration is the approach here, it is important that the material central to the study dates from the same period. This study therefore focuses on texts dating from the Restoration period that were circulating in Britain and thus were read and discussed by a variety of people. Strikingly, there seem to be two periods in which material was published. The first period is after the Restoration in 1660 to shortly after the Pentland rising in 1666. In 1660, the Covenanting movement had just been assigned to oblivion, whilst in 1666 the Covenanters rose against King Charles II. The period between 1660 and 1670 respectively saw the forming of the foundational narrative of a puritan and thus Covenanter conspiracy against the Church and the state. The second period coincided with the end of the Restoration, when resistance to the succession of a Catholic king surged and the Covenanting movement proved to be active once again. During the early 1680s, there were concerns over the near future of the kingdoms and the Duke of York ascending the throne. At the same, the period between 1680 and 1685 saw a surge in the printing of written material and public discourse, because the pre-printing censorship had been suspended shortly beforehand. As a

14 Neufeld, 13.
result of public activities of the Covenanters, they were discussed and written about. When nothing in particular happened with or to the Covenanters, no material appeared either. The publication of texts on the Covenanting movement was receptive to events concerned with the movement. Another selection criterion has been topic. I have selected material that either focused on the Covenanters in general, the Marquis of Argyll, or on the Marquis of Montrose. These topics all reflect a different part of the movement. The first is concerned with a more general reflection on the ideas and ideology of the movement, the second with the de facto leader of the movement, and the third with a dissident Covenanter.

1651 is chosen as the start date in the research question, because the power of the Covenanters came to a definite end when Scotland became a part of the Commonwealth. 1685 is chosen because James II became king that year. After the National Covenant was signed in 1638, a number of years followed wherein the Covenanting Movement was the legal authority in Scotland. The origins of the movement were a result of religious innovations and the discontent that flowed from this. The dissatisfaction of the Scottish people came to a peak when the new Service- and Prayer Book, which were modeled on the Church of England, were became a part of the Church of Scotland. This ultimately led to the challenging of King Charles I because the Covenanters placed divine power over regal power, and they took authority into their own hands. In the years to come after 1638 a few wars were fought, alliances were made, and plots were initiated. After a few successful years, however, the first cracks became visible and the Covenanters were unable to maintain their position. Because of the inability of the Covenanters to consolidate their power, and the devastating Cromwellian conquest of Scotland, the authority of the movement came to end in 1651 after the battle of Worcester.

The cracks that became visible earlier on in the movement were, for example, the dissent of James Graham, the Marquis of Montrose. Montrose, who first was a Covenanter, decided for himself that Charles I ultimately possessed authority over the Scottish people and turned to the King’s side. He led a number of very successful expeditions into Scotland to fight against his former allies, but was eventually defeated in 1646 after which he fled to Norway. After a return to Scotland, he was hanged in Edinburgh in 1650 on behalf of the Covenanters. Another instance when the Covenanting movement was split was in 1647 when some members of the General Assembly led by James Hamilton signed a secret agreement between them and King Charles I that secured a military alliance between the Covenanters and the King. In return for this alliance against the English Independent faction in Parliament, the King assured them his support for the establishment of Presbyterianism in England for a
period of three years. The unofficial leader of the Covenanting movement, Archibald Campbell, Marquis of Argyll strongly disagreed with the Engagers and Hamilton in particular, leading to a split within the General Assembly. One faction was led by Argyll, known as the more radical Kirk Party, and another faction was led by Hamilton, known as the Hamiltonians and Engagers, drawing a line between radical Covenanters and Royalist Covenanters. After Charles I was executed in 1649, the Kirk Party turned to his son, Charles II who lived in exile in Breda in the Dutch Republic. He signed the Treaty of Breda in 1650 that made Presbyterianism the established religion in England as in Scotland, and made Charles II swear allegiance to the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643.

The question above will be addressed in several chapters. The first chapter is a more general chapter with a specific focus on the historiography of the history of memory, and more specifically in the Early Modern period. The second chapter is on the Restoration context, for example, the Restoration settlements are addressed in this chapter. The third chapter focuses on Early Modern print culture on the British Isles. It explores how printed materials became important in the lives of the people and how this fostered politically active citizens. This chapter emphasizes why it is important to focus on printed materials during this period. The fourth chapter is a chapter on context; it is an overview of what happened to the Covenanters after 1651, focusing specifically on their position in relation to the Restoration and afterwards. This chapter contains factual information on what exactly happened to them. For example, after the Restoration, King Charles II gave out a general pardon for all Covenanters, except for four men. Argyll was one of these men and was subsequently executed. It is known that many Covenanters fled Scotland after 1660; the reasons why and consequences are explored in this chapter. The fifth, sixth, and seventh chapter are on the memory of the Covenanters. The fifth chapter addresses the Covenanters in general, the sixth Archibald Campbell, Marquis of Argyll, and the seventh James Graham, Marquis of Montrose. Within the movement Argyll and Montrose were key players who both took on a different role as the movement progressed and ended. How was Argyll, for example remembered? Was he remembered positively or negatively? Was the Covenanting movement remembered for their efforts over the course of thirteen years? Or were they remembered for their lack of unity during the last few years of their power? Perhaps they were not not
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remembered very much at all at the time and was this something that came along later. Were they made into martyrs or were they portrayed as guilty of stirring up the people? Among these, there are many more questions that are answered here.
Dealing with a troubled past: Historiography

Studying the dynamics of remembering and forgetting in the Early Modern period can give insights into the processes of constructing memory and identity. Studying memory goes beyond simply studying a course of events. It, for example, combines how societies dealt with their past in political terms and how people treated or how they were expected to treat their recent past. During the 1970s, the topic of memory slowly started to become an appealing field of study for historians. During the 1990s, the topic of memory studies took a flight as scholars combined their approaches in dealing with the topic, enriching both the method and content of the field. By the turn of the century, memory studies had made valuable and indispensable contributions to the field of cultural history.¹⁷

The policies concerned with remembering within a society are central to this thesis. Leading in the field of collective memory are Jan and Aleida Assmann. They studied collective memory over enduring periods of time as this becomes visible within the domains of art, images, script etc. These artifacts protect the collective memory embedded in it from losing its meaning over time. The Assmanns specifically focus on the strategies used by societies to build cultural heritage through these artifacts. The result of constructing tangible memory is what they call cultural memory.¹⁸ Aleida Assmann has coined four formats of memory: individual, social, cultural and political memory. Individual memory has the smallest reach and is restricted to the memory of a person. Cultural memory has the biggest scope and even goes beyond the actual activity of remembering. The concept of cultural memory essentially entails memory preserved as tangible content. Cultural memory forms the basis of group identity and goes beyond the living memory of a society. It reflects the desire to be remembered through the commemoration of great people, deeds, and events. Social memory is the product of a group of people that share the same beliefs, values, and attitudes, and that have witnessed the same historical events.¹⁹ Social memory concerns the memory of a group of people. As social memory, political memory has a greater scope than individual memory. Political memory, as cultural memory, is a format of memory that is based on more durable carriers of symbols and objects, while individual and social memory come and go with successive generations of people. We speak of political memory as a form of institutionalized top-down memory that has a long-term durability. In academia, according to

¹⁸ Hutton, 79.
¹⁹ Assmann, “Four Formats of Memory,” 23.
Aleida Assmann, political memory is discussed as “the role of memory on the life of ideology formation and its immediate impact on collective identity formation and political action.”

Even though social memory and political memory seem to overlap, they are still quite different because social memory represents a bottom-up memory. Social memory is different because it is concerned with the ways in which historical events are perceived and remembered by individuals. Political memory, as a result, is focused on institutions, nations, and states and examines how memories are used for political action and the formation of group identity.

The difficulty with political memory is that its main constituents, institutions, nations, states, do not have a memory. Assmann argues that they ‘make’ a memory, and with the aid of symbols, texts, images, monuments, etc, they ‘construct’ an identity. The distinctiveness of political memory can be brought down into three respects. Political memories are not connected to other memories, but “tend towards homogeneous unity and self-contained closure.” Secondly, political memory is part of a narrative that is emotionally charged, it is thus not fragmentary and diverse, but it sets a clear message. Lastly, to stabilize political memory so that it can be transmitted from generation to generation, political memory is anchored in material and visual signs. It is not only fixed in sites and monuments, however, commemorative events that reactivate memory and collective participation are also a part of the stabilization of political memory. Political memory is thus hard to change and secured for the long term.

Because political memory has a clear function, stimulating ideology and creating unity, whatever is included should support the narrative. Of course, victories are much easier remembered than defeats. What does not fit the specific goal can be forgotten. In some cases, however, defeat is the basis for the unifying narrative. The narrative is then not one of strength, but of heroic victimhood. An example of this is the defeat of the Serbs in Kosovo by the Ottoman Turks in 1389. The battle of Kosovo Polje is central to the self-image of the Serbs and their nation and the independent Kosovo is of importance to the existence narrative of the nation of the Serbs. This sort of political memory “serves as an invigorating heroic memory in a political situation that is under external or internal pressure.”

---
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contribute to a heroic narrative. What even goes beyond defeat is the concept of trauma and victimhood. In the case of the Covenanters during the Civil War and the Restoration, suffering and death can be changed for martyrdom and sacrifice, because of the Covenanters’ active commitment to their cause. In this way, the Covenanters were victims of both the Civil War and Restoration, and could incorporate this in their narrative.

In *The Civil Wars after 1660* Neufeld has also discussed Jan and Aleida Assmann, however, he has put the focus on social memory. Neufeld defines social memory as “the process of developing and upholding an awareness of the past that is useful for sustaining a sense of common identity.” In maintaining a nation, having a common identity is essential; in creating this common identity, choices are made in regard to what to and what not to include. Because of this, aspects of the past and the present are connected, however the ideological implications of these connections are not always admitted to. According to Neufeld, who quotes Jan Assmann, social memory has a tendency to emerge in two phases. Social memory emerges firstly in communicative memory and secondly within cultural products such as poems, plays, memoirs, sermons, etc. Communicative memory can be kept alive in three generations, thus up to eighty years. Neufeld argues that during the second half of the seventeenth century, it could have been possible that communicative memories of the past, the Civil War and interregnum, circulated among various different groups all the way into the eighteenth century. These groups could be families, kin networks, but also within church groups or businesses; their memories were maintained to a large extent.

As a result of this circulation of memories, these memories have been caught in all kinds of cultural products, known as cultural memories. These cultural memories can give people a sense of connectedness to each other and can form the basis of group identity. More importantly, it enables a group to see its distinctiveness from other groups. Being able to have a certain connection based on a shared past and being different from others in this sense is what allows groups to exist. Neufeld emphasizes that cultural memories have a tendency to remain the same over longer periods of time, especially when applied to crucial and foundational moments of conflict. The cultural products that survive from a formative period of time remain largely the same and give an insight in the attitude towards events or people in a specific period of time. As Assmann also argues, Neufeld acknowledges that the regimes constructed their own representation of a collective past, one which was allowed to
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be recalled and discussed openly. Aspects of the past that did not fit well into this constructed collective past were suppressed from public remembering and discussion. It is thus that Neufeld identifies public remembering, referring to “those representations of the past that were put out for common and open consumption, discussion and debate. Particularly during moments of political tension or crisis, memories of the past conflict were articulated for the purpose of orienting the polity towards a certain policy.”

According to Neufeld, ‘public remembering’ is a more fitting term for this phenomenon, because it refers to those memories included and, more importantly, allowed to be recalled in public. Neufeld has largely focused on historical writing in his book and sees them as “the most important product of cultural remembering in Stuart England.” Because the Restoration regime was able to regulate which histories of the troubled past were published, they can give insights into the debate on the question of the distribution of power and authority of the state and Church. They were emotionally and intellectually charged debates that were focused on securing peace and stability in the three kingdoms. What becomes clear is that Neufeld’s concept of public remembering is similar to Assmann’s idea of political memory.

Part of remembering is forgetting. Aleida Assmann argues that memory is selective by nature, and that remembering requires forgetting. Forgetting allows that what is remembered to stand out from every other event that had happened. Forgetting and remembering, however, are not as strictly opposed as it might seem. Assmann argues that there are two ways of forgetting; an active mode of forgetting, and a passive one. Active forgetting is biased. It entails censorship or the elimination of artifacts and documents. Passive forgetting, however, is the fading of memories. This happens in cases where there is no immediate relevance or commemorative value to certain events. Active forgetting is one of the central elements of this thesis. The dealing of the Restoration administration with the heritage of the Scottish Covenanters could point towards the promotion of the active forgetting of this group. On the one hand creating a set of objects that stored memory favorable to the Restoration regime, and on the other hand the destruction of material that referred to the Covenanters.

Unpleasant memories can be forgotten when there is a need for it and a society can agree upon this by employing media that promote more significant memories. Forgetting, however, can also happen on the basis of intentional strategy and instruction. Sometimes, on the political level this mechanism of forgetting is used. There are two ways in which this
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mechanism can unfold: the first is forgetting as punishment, whilst the second is forgetting as a blessing and mercy. The first mode is a form of persecution, because someone’s or something’s existence is questioned. By erasing passages from history writing and banning communication on a certain topic, an event can be excluded from memory. The excommunication of someone or a group is a form of erasing membership from a community. Whilst it seems that deliberately forgetting only has negative implications for the people involved, it can also be a blessing for a person or a group. It can heal social relations by not forgetting important events, names, and entire existences, but by forgetting the question of guilt of those who are guilty. Often, however, in cases of Civil War, where there are several groups that were divided and made into enemies, it remains difficult to reintegrate these with each other. Forgetting guilt only works when an entire group is committed to keeping these memories away. In the case of the War of the Three Kingdoms, puritans were excluded from having a position in public authority, and were partly excluded from society. At the same time, the Restoration and forthcoming settlements were forced upon a certain part of society. This is why blatantly forgetting the Covenanters could most likely not work.

Because puritans were excluded from public authority, a certain kind of violence was inflicted on them. According to Ethan Shagan in “Early modern violence from memory to history: a historiographical essay” violence should be studied rather as a means to control societal relations and the distribution of power than assessing the extent to which violence was performed. The concept of violence as such, defined by the Oxford dictionary as “behavior involving physical force intended to hurt, damage, or kill someone or something”, and “strength of emotion or of a destructive natural force,” has more dimensions to it than just physical violence. Shagan emphasizes that it can take on other forms as well, such as economic violence and ideological violence. In the case of the Covenanters, some physical violence was inflicted on individual members during and after the Civil War. During the Restoration however, the violence inflicted on the Covenanters was mostly ideological on a predominantly religious basis. The Restoration regime tried hard to create a narrative in which the Covenanters were blamed for the Civil War, how Presbyterian had undermined authority, and what consequences this had had. Because this had a lasting effect on societal structures, this ideological violence can still be classified as violence. The one-sided concept of violence

34 Assman, Cultural Memory and Western Civilization, 84.
as inflicting physical harm does not apply here, however, ideological violence with lasting effect on society does. In this study, the concept of violence is thus treated as ideological violence, rather than as physical violence.

Based on several case studies, Shagan argues that there are two ways historians can study violence in early modern history. The first approach is studying violence through the intellectual and cultural systems that authorized and shaped it. The goal with this approach is understanding the causes of violence. Through this, a historian can attempt to explain violence in its own terms, seeing it as a rational or understandable result of the society in which it happened. It searches for causes in experiences, minds, and cultural assumptions of the particular age. Herein violence is treated as an abnormal phenomenon deviating from the status quo, in need of explanation. The second approach, however, treats it as normal and a way of contact and communication; it treats violence as the explanation. In this approach, historians can study violence as “space of socio-cultural interaction, with the goals of understanding its consequences.” Shagan emphasizes that the two approaches are certainly not incompatible and that historians can and should adopt both in some circumstances. The difference between the two, however, is in the ideological treatment of violence. The first approach explains violence as a distant source, whilst the second approach sees violence as something inherent to society, allowing violence to be a constructive power rather than just a destructive product.

Tying in to Shagan and Aleida Assmann and the deliberate forgetting of certain events, Erika Kuijpers and Judith Pollmann emphasize that the research on memories of violence and how this was dealt with by individuals and communities points out that it is not a given that a shared memory is developed after a series of troubled events. In modern times, it is still quite often the case that political regimes, individuals, and communities attempt to conceal or deconstruct the recent past in order to overcome it. Kuijpers and Pollman emphasize that this is not surprising, because difficult memories of humiliation can stand in the way of the rebuilding of communities and social relations. In many peace agreements well into the nineteenth century, oblivion has been one of the conditions for peace.

For early modern victims, this was no different. According to Kuijpers and Pollmann,
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two factors can hamper the emergence of a collective memory. First, continuing ideological violence and dislocation prevent a commemorative community to emerge, because there is no feeling of closure for victims. Whilst victims often felt a sense of shame and guilt regardless of whether these victims were guilty of anything, there were cases in the early modern period where outsiders questioned the innocence of victims. One of the explanations used was for example the invitation of divine wrath. According to Shagan, religion was the key factor in most controversies of the early modern world, however the intense role of religion in public controversy can seem quite irrational to people for whom religion remains largely confined to the private sphere of belief. In addition to the first factor, political circumstances can also demand silence. Kuijpers and Pollman have given two reasons for this; the first is that memories of past events do not align with the new political situation, or that a lack of consensus on what happened politically that initiated the events dictates silence. Having to do with the question of who is to blame and trying to conceal this. Purpose and meaning to suffering are essential in forming a collective memory culture, meaning that the events should have led up to a greater goal, shared by all members of a society.

Long before the surge of nationalism and the nineteenth century, memory already was a deeply political matter in Early Modern society. According to Pollman and Kuijpers almost all Early Modern claims to rights or authority were also claims about the past. If something could be proven to be old, Early Modern people would believe something to be legitimate. In asserting status and establishing kinship, being able to prove lineage was highly desirable. In Tudor and Stuart England, commemorative events, like Accession Day and Guy Fawkes Day, were used to develop a memory culture around the Protestant rule. Even though it seems that establishing a particular political memory was important for authorities, on a smaller level knowledge of the past was of vital political importance. In small villages and cities, in order to back up legal and political claims, common knowledge about the past was necessary. That is also why creating a favorable narrative has been of importance to Early Modern English monarchs. Specific to them, as historian Kevin Sharpe has argued was that English kings and queens were able to create a representation of themselves through the publication of images, written text, and spoken word. Some of them, Elizabeth I and Charles
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II, were masters at creating a favorable image. Elizabeth I was able to portray herself mostly on the divine side of kingship, making the nation and queen into one. Charles II was able to popularize himself as an approachable king by secularizing his position, whilst being able remain mystical.\textsuperscript{48} Central to the narrative of all royal authority in England was the tension between the sacred and the regal. The image and the narrative that were created around the king or queen were of importance for his or her position; their authority was derived from it.\textsuperscript{49} In England, the nation had grown to become one with the Tudors and more specifically with Queen Elizabeth. In Scotland, however, the monarch was not a divine person, but more like a first among equals and the Presbyterian Church accepted regal authority over divine authority. Because of this, James VI was unable to see the importance of image and had problems with sustaining and enhancing his authority.\textsuperscript{50} Image building, representation, and subsequent memory were of great importance in Early Modern England, and Charles II had made himself a master of the art. He was able to popularize himself, and in doing so must have been forced to do this by making others less popular than himself. Tying in to Assmann, Kuijpers, and Pollmann, in order to create a favorable image of Charles II that gave him authority, other images that could possible damage his authority had to be destructed.

What Charles II essentially did was managing the past to suit the needs of the present, however, he did not use the past for the present as he was focused on the forgetting of certain groups and events. Erna Paris has identified four methods by which authorities can shape the past to fit the present. The first method is lying about an undesirable past. The issue with lying is that people will most likely remember what had happened even when they were ordered not to do so. Denial is the second method, however, will not succeed because of the same reasons as for lying. The third method, mythmaking, omits undesirable parts of history, whilst highlighting episodes that have commemorative value. A fourth method is confronting and where possible righting a troubled past, which happened in Germany after the Second World War.\textsuperscript{51} The approach taken by the Restoration government, method two, did not work. According to Neufeld, the English and Scottish public after the Civil War and Interregnum were not trying to re-fight the struggle and were trying to leave it behind them. The Restoration settlements that were central to the extent the English and Scottish people
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were allowed to remember the wars were either praised and justified, or attacked and contested. The goal of the settlements was to resolve the issue of the presence of a troubled past, however, there was the issue that the people who fought on the wrong side of the conflict were excluded from power and authority.\textsuperscript{52} Through this, the people in power represented only one side of the conflict, and the authorized commemoration and remembering of the Civil War was designed by a legislation that attempted to guarantee peace and security in the kingdoms. As a result, the group of puritan Christians in the kingdoms, of which the Scottish Covenaners were a part, was named guilty of the wars of the recent past.

Before and after the Restoration of Charles II, the immediate response of the political nation was to make the recent past disappear. Miserable conditions, suffering, the loss of life and property as a result of the war, the divergent ideas on social divisions and religious convictions, and the opposition of Charles I execution, were all factors that contributed to the desire and need of the new political authorities to make the past go away and destroy reminders of it. Among the taking away of signs of the republic, and the alteration of inconvenient and awkward records, the ultimate response after the Restoration in dealing with the past was the enacting of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. In order to stimulate peace and security, forgetting the past and the troubles embedded in this past, was officially regulated by the law.\textsuperscript{53}
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The Restoration and the Restoration settlements

After Charles I was tried, convicted, and executed for high treason in 1649, the monarchy was abolished and the Commonwealth of England was declared. Over a period of about ten years, England was a republic. Scotland became a part of the republic, because the Scottish armies were defeated by the armies of Oliver Cromwell. After the death of Cromwell in 1658, Lord Protector of the Commonwealth, his son Richard got in charge, however, failed to maintain it. In 1660, the monarchy was restored and Charles II, son of Charles I, was invited to become the king of England. Over the years, there had been a number of attempts to restore the Stuart monarchy by force, these all failed. Eventually Charles II was able to reclaim the throne without having to fight for it, by simply being invited by the English Convention Parliament which opened on April 25th 1660. Charles II had already been king in Scotland since 1649; he was crowned in Scone and had attempted to reclaim the English throne several times with expeditions from Scotland. He eventually had to flee the country and took up residence in the Netherlands, before he was recalled by the English Parliament.

The English, Scottish, and Irish people were happy with the return of the Stuart king. Their hope was that the return of the monarchy would restore unity and stability in the Kingdoms. As he resided in Breda, Charles II put out a declaration wherein he claimed that he felt he was the only person who could reunite the Church and the state and could restore peace in the kingdoms. Already in his April 4th declaration, he promised a pardon to those who had supported the republic in spite of the monarchy, portraying himself as a unifying force. While it proved difficult to serve the needs of all the people in a divided politics, eventually agreements were reached. A polity was constructed upon which politics and religion could go forward. The settlements are both known as the first and second Restoration settlements, and as the political and religious settlements. The first and political settlement, An Act of Free and General Pardon, Indemnity, and Oblivion (1660), was mostly aimed at making sure that the recent past would not become the basis of future conflict. This settlement was designed by the Convention Parliament and was to conceal the past as much as possible. For example, because Charles II had been crowned in Scotland in 1649, he was able to claim that he had been king ever since. His reign was thus officially dated from January 30th 1649. Based on these dates, the whole Interregnum period had not happened.
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55 Harris, “The Restoration in Britain and Ireland,” 205.
56 Neufeld, 9-10.; Sharpe, Image wars, 114.
Constitutionally England was brought back to the period before the Long Parliament had put a halt to the personal rule Charles I was attempting to install. The legislation concerned with this was repealed and Charles II had the same rights his father once had had. The constitutional return to 1641 was not easily agreed upon. A group of Presbyterian members of parliament wanted a more a limited restoration. They argued for a greater role for parliament. This would give them control over the military and enabled them to appoint the major offices of state. On the other hand, there were members of parliament who preferred a total return to the monarchy of the Personal Rule. Eventually it was decided that legislation that had been royally approved would remain valid, while everything that had not would be declared null. Legislation limiting the authority of the king, as had been approved after 1641, would have to be freshly designed. Most important, however, was the Act of Free and General Indemnity and Oblivion passed by the Convention Parliament. In this act, it was not mentioned who was to blame for the conflict, it suggested that the country had accidently got itself into a Civil War. Concealing the past by forgiving and forgetting is how Charles II and his Convention parliament imagined peace to be achieved in the kingdoms.

The second settlement, the religious one, had set its main goal on forgetting and punishing those who were seen as responsible for the troubled past. The parliament in charge of this settlement, the Cavalier Parliament, pointed at the so called puritans, and thus the Covenanters as well, as being to blame for what had happened. A copy of the Solemn League and Covenant, which had been a military and religious Covenant treaty signed by both the Scottish and English Parliaments in 1643, was publicly burned in the spring of 1661, openly blaming the Covenanters for the troubled events. While the first settlement remained in place, the Cavalier Parliament was less focused on the reconciliation of the various groups. It went about purging the state and the Church of the people who they deemed responsible for the war; men who were either puritan or Presbyterian.

Such acts of oblivion were not new at the time. Kuijpers and Pollman say that “early modern authorities might go a long way in trying to propagandize and assert their version of past events, yet even in the densely governed Early Modern city there were very clear limits to the ability of rulers to control memories.” If even city authorities had difficulty in maintaining a favorable political memory, a king had to try even harder. The importance of political memory is one of the reasons why acts of oblivion were experimented with during
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the Early Modern period. The issues with these problematic acts were firstly that it was difficult to regulate and control such orders, and secondly that in order to forget something, the legal system had to know the things that were supposed to be forgotten and fell within the borders of the act.\textsuperscript{61} According to Ross Poole, however, acts of oblivion were not designed to make people forget about the past, but more to prevent people from learning about the past. Memory is knowledge with implications for the present that offers an agenda to act and acts of oblivion deny the past as a reason to act in the present.\textsuperscript{62} In such, these past events are no longer part of the narrative.

There had been no religious unity before and after the Civil War and a religious argument between Charles I and the Scottish Presbyterians had a share in the start of the Civil War. Religion was a delicate subject and groups had varying hopes for the future of the Church in England. Sects were hoping for liberty of conscience, Presbyterians and puritans wanted to return to the state of the Church before the war with slight changes in discipline, and the Anglicans wished for a return of the bishops and the Prayer Book.\textsuperscript{63} Whilst Charles II had expressed his wishes for liberty of conscience for everyone, the dominant Anglican party in the Cavalier parliament did not think this was the solution to the religious differences. As a result, in 1661 the Anglican Episcopalian Church was reestablished. From that moment onwards, there was no toleration for the sects, and there were no changes to the Church and liturgy that might have enabled Presbyterians to become part of a national church with unifying powers. The Act of Uniformity of 1662 required all ministers and teachers to agree to everything in the Book of Common Prayer, or else be excluded from the Church. About ten percent of the clergymen, nearly 1,000, could not adhere to the Prayer Book and subsequently had to give up their livelihood.\textsuperscript{64}

A legal code was installed to make sure the measures taken regarding Church membership were abided. People from outside the Church were kept away from town government and from major urban centers, as was recorded in the Corporation Act of 1661 and the Five Mile Act of 1665. Dissident church service was criminalized in the Quaker Act of 1662 and the Conventicle Acts of 1664 and 1670. The Presbyterians even acknowledged that it was inevitable that the Bishops would return, instead they wished for a form of episcopacy they could live with. It proved difficult to make legislation against puritans and
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Presbyterians; only a small majority of the Cavalier Parliament was in favor of doing so. Measures against sects, however, were no problem at all. From this, it becomes clear that not everyone shared the beliefs of a small Anglican majority of the Cavalier Parliament. Differing views on how to deal with people who adhered to the Presbyterian religion were possibly widespread in the country.

Along with the Act of Uniformity, however, another restricting act was assented, namely the Licensing Act. Through this, the regime attempted to secure itself by controlling the gathering and movement of people, their public meetings and worship, and their access to information. The aim of the act was to limit the capacity of the press in regard to book production; the number of master printers was restricted to twenty, limiting them to having a maximum of two presses and two apprentices. Printing itself was allowed in three places: London, Oxford, and Cambridge. Every printer had to be registered with the Stationers’ Company in order to safeguard the second aim of the Licensing Act; ensuring that what was printed had been officially sanctioned. This meant that no books could be printed without a license. Charles II controlled the presses and could decide on what was and what was not printed.

In Scotland, no such thing as the English Stationers’ Company existed. The Scottish Privy Council together with the burgh councils of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen could control the printing of materials and the circulation of ideas. Pre-existing laws against heresy and lèse-majesté made it possible that legislation against unlicensed printing of religious or political material was passed in late 1661. If a printer failed to get permission for a work, sanctions of the ‘highest peril’ were threatened with. Punishments were thorough for anyone who disregarded the pre-publishing censorship. When in 1664 the scaffold speech of Covenanter Archibald Johnston of Wariston was printed and sold in Edinburgh without permission, the Edinburgh Council imprisoned as many booksellers and vendors as possible in order to investigate how such a thing could have happened. At the same time though, works that were deemed to be too royal were also forbidden as they could be controversial as well. A strict government policy existed towards the circulation of news, even if the news was not officially printed. Coffee houses were opening and closing in Edinburgh, because there was a fear of seditious and subversive discussion among its visitors.

Not only pre-print materials were checked, some thirty books were banned after the
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Restoration that had been published beforehand, because they contained ideas that threatened the new regime.\textsuperscript{68} After 1671 only one printer, Andrew Anderson, had a monopoly on printing in Scotland that was granted to him by the Stuart government. The Anderson family had to approve everything before it was allowed to be printed, from bibles to pamphlets, to books, and songs. The monopoly was often challenged during the 1670s and 80s, however, it was never repealed during those years. The Andersons saw their monopoly as crucial to the maintenance of public peace.\textsuperscript{69} The restrictions on printing hindered the spread of political and religious ideas through Scotland, as was the objective. Still, according to Jackson “words as such” were not sanctioned against, however, “words used in contexts where they could create political and social disobedience” were.\textsuperscript{70} Covenanter ideas were among the words that could cause disobedience, and thus they were sanctioned. Issues of Covenanter books and the Solemn League and Covenant were publicly burned and possession of these works was fined.\textsuperscript{71} At the same time, these sanctions interfered with the development of the Scottish printing industry.
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Print culture and public sphere

As noted in the chapter above, the Restoration authorities were afraid of critical public discourse. The censorship in the printing industry was one of ways to regulate this. The late Early Modern period and the later Stuart years, however, saw a surge in the political activity of the people. People started reading more, discussed topics of a political nature and became more critical overall. This is why historians such as Joad Raymond speak of the emergence of the public sphere during these years. The emergence of the public coincided with the expansion of the printing industry and these are said to have been mutually dependent. The Restoration regime feared the political activity of its people and legislated against any activities that could be a threat to the state. The idea of public sphere was first coined by sociologist Jürgen Habermas. Habermas has placed the emergence of the public sphere in the eighteenth century, being a combination of the previously divided public and private realms of society. The public sphere was originally the place of public authority, the state, the sphere of the police etc., whilst the private sphere was the civil society that existed. The combination of the public and private realms resulted in the public sphere that Habermas argued has put the state in touch with the needs of society, this being facilitated through public opinion. Habermas has defined the public sphere as being a place where discourses of the state, that can also be critical of the state, are being formed, spread, and debated. The public sphere came to be seen as an institution that could regulate the authority of the state. The formation of public opinion and the active participation of the people in politics are central to the idea of the public sphere.

Recent historians have been researching the emergence of the public sphere in the mid-seventeenth century, taking into account that Habermas’s definition of public sphere mainly concerns a bourgeois society. It is argued by historians such as Joad Raymond and Jason Peacey that the emergence of the public sphere coincided with the expansion of the printing industry in the 1640s. When the shift in print production took place from bigger volumes to smaller and more importantly cheaper, items such as pamphlets and petitions, the emergence of a public sphere can be indicated. The shifting political climate was influenced by the availability of cheap print, because events from the Civil War and the Interregnum
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were often commented upon and discussed. Cheap print became an essential part of the increasingly public dialogue about political issues.  

According to Peter Lake and Steven Pincus in the book *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England* the emergence of the public sphere in England does not fit the four phases of public sphere distinguished by Habermans: the ancient, the medieval, the bourgeois, and the degraded or transformed. They note a post-reformation period that is dated from the 1530s to the 1630s, the most formative period being the reign of Elizabeth I. Issues of religious identity and division came together with issues of dynastic and geopolitical rivalry to create a series of public spheres. These can be found in the protestant opposition to the Catholic regime or the other way around. More recently, however, research has revealed that the stimulation of the emergence of public sphere also came from within the center of the regime, mobilizing opinion both in and outside of parliament. Elements within the regime exchanged with their allies, clients, and connections, all involved in the same polemical and communicative strategies. These contributed to a post reformation public sphere, wherein there was room to discuss both religious and non-religious issues. For a short period of time in the 1630s, during the reign of James VI/I, a peculiar cultural politics emerged: “with its reform of the court, performance of royal power in a number of settings and ritual centered reform of the church this amounted to a series of linked maneuvers engineered to shut down the public sphere opened up in the previous decade.”

Lake and Pincus place the transition from the post reformation public sphere at the start of the Civil War, calling the new public sphere post revolutionary. All sides of the conflict resorted to generating the resources necessary to secure military and ideological victory. The war was not only played out with guns the the written word became increasingly important. There was a remarkable generation of newsprint, polemic, propaganda, and petitioning and the new techniques of popular and public political maneuver were used by all contemporaries. More specifically, as Lake and Pincus argue, “constant and constantly increasing demand for news, information, and political comment ushered into being new forms of literary production, such as the printed newspaper.”
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reformation public sphere was that all of this was happening in public. During the Elizabethan years, the discussions were on public matters; however, mostly happened within private settings. For example, the discussions of parliament happened in private. In addition, something that was distinctly new was the intensity, speed, and volume of popular and public political discussion.82

Due to urbanization and an accommodation to market exchanges in the seventeenth century, people in England had a relatively higher income than before. Because of this, wage earners were able to actively be a part of the consuming group of people who bought broadsides, pamphlets, sermons, and all kinds of literary works presented to them during and after the Civil War. This was all coming together in coffee houses; the place Habermas located his idea of the bourgeois public sphere. According to Lake and Pincus “coffee houses had become spaces in which merchants, tradesmen, aristocrats, and clerics assembled in urban settings to discuss news, politics, and trade – political economy – while purchasing and consuming the newly fashionable exotic drinks of coffee, tea, and chocolate.”83 According to Joad Raymond “in coffee houses, news was received, spun and unspun; for those with the time and money they provided an opportunity for political reflection that informed and ultimately empowered public opinion.”84 This meant that people increasingly came together in a relatively free setting to exchange opinions on all sorts of public matters.

The Restoration saw a change in the nature of public sphere, as the open discussions of the 1640s and 1650s were not matched during this period. However, while it continued to swell and shrink, the level of public discussion never returned to the silence of the 1630s and a qualitative shift can be seen. The issues that corresponded with the Restoration, religious, constitutional, national interest, and political economy were constantly under public scrutiny.85 Although legislative measures were taken by Charles II to contain and avoid discussions of a certain nature, the emergence of coffee houses and public debate obstructed his plans. Officially published literature might suggest that Charles II controlled public discussion, what Lake and Pincus argue, however, suggests otherwise. The public was still involved in discussing public issues, even though this might not only have happened through the publication of written texts.

It had been argued by contemporaries that factious sermons and seditious pamphlets had not only been the forerunners but also the sources and causes of the rebellion. If the
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restoration regime in 1662 would not be cautious, 1662 could easily turn into 1642 again. These arguments were mainly made by Robert L’Estrange, who was a propagandist usually in search of and wanting to expose dissent and republican intrigue. L’Estrange’s concern for the Restoration regime was that the same group that had caused the monarchy to fall in the first place was planning on doing it again by employing the same means: printed materials. Supervision of the press was the first measure taken against assault on the monarchy. In the same year that nonconformists were curbed by the Act of Uniformity. In 1662, L’Estrange became supervisor of the Press and overseeing the Stationers’ Company to regulate their monopoly.

To maintain the authority of the Restoration regime, the government combined positive intervention with restrictive practices in the print business. Newspapers, for example, were strictly limited. Authors, printers, and publishers were often punished for seditious libel, which was a less serious offence than treason. The attempts to regulate and limit the number of presses was only partly successful, however, a secret service was developed to investigate and monitor subversives, and propagandists were hired to counter or to subdue critics. Because of this, pamphlets for example, the literary vehicle to express an opinion publicly, appeared to a lesser extent than in the 1640s and 1650s, when the publication of pamphlets reached a height. At the same time, an opposition press survived until the revolution of 1688, through periods of oppression and muted disquiet.

One example of a time when the government acted as a result of a seditious publication was when in 1664 John Twyn was executed for printing The Execution of Justice also known as Mene Tekel or the Downfall of Tyranny. Twyn refused to identify the author of the book; however, it was suspected that it was written by Captain Roger Jones, who had been an officer in Cromwell’s army. The anonymous writer of the book advocated for the deposing and killing of Charles II, which awkwardly fell together with a plot formed in Yorkshire. In this, the government saw the connection between the written and the real world, affirming the idea that “paper-pellets lead directly to bullets” and that “dispersing seditious books is very near a-kin to raising of tumults; they are as like as brother and sister.” This example illustrates how seriously the Restoration government took the written word.
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The Covenanters after 1651

The first Restoration settlement put the Constitutional clock in England back to 1641, before the Long Parliament put restrictions on Charles I’s move towards personal rule. In Scotland, parliament passed a Rescissory Act in early 1661. The difference with England, however, was that all legislation enacted from 1640 was declared void, meaning that the clock was actually put back as far as 1633. In 1640, the Scottish people had initiated a parliament themselves and went around the king in doing so. The king officially had the authority to call a parliament, but he had not done so since his coronation in Scotland in 1633. Since 1633 there had been no parliament and no official legislation, this is why the constitutional state of 1633 was reinstated when all legislation from 1640 was proclaimed null. The monarchy was restored to the height of its powers and the Covenanter’s authority was blot out.

After the execution of Charles I, the Scots declared Charles II king, and crowned him at Scone in 1651. The Cromwellian period was not supported from Scotland. Because the Covenanters were still in charge at the time of Charles I’s execution, they required their next king to be a covenanted king. As a result, Charles II agreed to sign the National Covenant of 1638 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643 before he became king. Because Charles II later felt that he was forced by the Covenanters to sign these documents and because he disliked Presbyterianism in itself he decided put the clock back to 1633 and to restore the monarchy’s pre-war height of power.

Like Charles II, the traditional ruling classes in Scotland were fed up with Presbyterian rule. The Covenanters had not been a unified force during the last years of their rule. One example is the Engagement of 1647 where three Scottish nobles made an agreement with Charles I. One half of the Covenanters agreed to this, the other half did not. The Engagement would have made peace with Charles I. The problem was that he would not have been a covenanted king, which was unacceptable to some. James Hamilton, who took the initiative for the Engagement led the group of Covenanters that were in favor of the treaty. The treaty was rejected by the faction led by the Marquis of Argyll. Within the movement, the Engagement can be regarded as a crisis. An open crisis was eventually averted and both groups remained part of government, however, still remained divided.

The traditional classes wanted to reverse the power of the clerical estate and they hoped that restored monarchy would help them rejuvenate their own political and economic
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prosperity. In 1661, the Scottish parliament approved legislation that would give the king the opportunity to settle a form of Church government that was “most agreeable to the word of God, most suteable to the Government, and most complying with the peace and quyet of the kingdome.”

Later in 1661, Charles II went around parliament and announced that he decided that the government of bishops, which had been in place before the Covenanters were in charge, would be restored again. Episcopacy was installed and the formal legislation for it was approved during a parliamentary session in 1662. What also was included was that Presbyterian dissent would not be allowed anymore after that. The ministry counted about 950 members at the time, one third of it was driven out of the Church after this announcement. The English Act of Oblivion was of course not in place in Scotland. When a Scottish Act of Indemnity was eventually passed in September 1662, some 700 were excluded from its provisions.

As a result of Charles II’s policies, many Scottish Covenanters fled the country. One of the places they sought refuge was in the Dutch Republic, mainly because the Dutch Republic had a protestant nature favorable to Presbyterians. For quite some time, there had been several Scottish communities in the Netherlands. The expansion of the communities after 1660, however, had everything to do with the Restoration legislation of Charles II. The incoming flow of refugees in the exile community depended solely on religious and political discontent, and this sets this particular flow of exiles apart from other migration in the period. The religious intolerance was boosted by Charles, who wanted retribution from the Presbyterians.

These exiles formed a distinctive community within the already existing community of migrated Scots. This fostered a climate wherein ideas and intrigues could be developed, propagated and maintained. Often, there were made plots against the Stuart government. Obviously, these ideas were well received in a community of which most of its members had been forced out of their country. It comes as no surprise that the governments at home in Edinburgh and in London saw the exiles as a threat to the regime. The exiles used their position in the Dutch Republic to carry on with their religious and political provocative plotting, which was the main reason why they were exiles in the first place. This was mainly
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done by ministers who were against the restored Church and continuously fought against it.\textsuperscript{97} The exiles were often bothered by the English and Scottish restoration regimes by formal banishments, or more directly through harassments of accomplices of the English ambassador in the Dutch Republic.\textsuperscript{98} Outside of the problems the exiles encountered, they were able to let their Covenanters ideas roam free in the communities they lived in. Even though the Covenanters were not tolerated anymore through all sorts of legislation, the Restoration government was not able to ban the group and their ideas out completely.

The remaining group of Covenanters could still influence their accomplices that had remained in Scotland, as was made clear after the Pentland Rising of 1666. This rising was a direct result of the return of episcopacy and it ended with an eruption of armed violence during November 1666. Several Covenanters were put to trial afterwards and were executed for treason subsequently.\textsuperscript{99} This rising proved that the Covenanters were still around. After the Pentland rising, some literature on the topic specifically and on the Covenanters in general appeared. Most of these works, however, came out of the exile community. This way, the Covenant community abroad and the community at home could foster one another. Some of these works are dealt with in the next chapter and include, for example, \textit{Naphtali}. Even though about ten men were executed, the Covenanting movement continued existing. Another instance where they were greatly tested was in 1679 when a group of Covenanters murdered the archbishop of St. Andrews, James Sharpe.\textsuperscript{100} This murder was regarded as an act of rebellion and government forces defeated Covenanter forces at Bothwell Bridge in June 1679 and this ended the short rebellion. The Covenant side lost a great deal of men and another large part of them was taken prisoner. What remained was a hard-lined faction of Covenanters that remained in arms. As a result, the Covenanters made their efforts more public than they had done since the Restoration. One example is the \textit{Sanquhar Declaration} wherein the Covenanters openly declared to disown Charles II who had been, according to the Covenanters, reigning as a tyrant.\textsuperscript{101} Charles II had unlawfully taken the ecclesiastical power and thereby forfeited his right. Once again, the Covenanters declared themselves to be solely under the law of God rather than the law of their king.\textsuperscript{102}

Interestingly, one of the more active members of the remaining Covenanters was Archibald Campbell, the Earl of Argyll and the son of the late Marquis of Argyll. The young
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Argyll had been a royalist at first and mostly formed his opinion during the years Charles I was killed. He distanced himself from his father, as the young earl went on to rally for a royalist rising during the years Cromwell was in charge in Scotland. When Charles II’s brother James came to Scotland and was unwilling to denounce his Catholicism, Argyll could not agree and was driven to the Covenanter side. Eventually, Argyll was arrested after having organized a rebellion in 1685, when James II was king. As his father, he was executed in Edinburgh for treason and his head was put on display near Edinburgh Tolbooth.\footnote{David Stevenson, “Campbell, Archibald, ninth earl of Argyll (1629–1685),” \textit{Oxford Dictionary of National Biography}, (Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2005, accessed 6 June 2017, http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy-ub.rug.nl/view/article/4473.}
The Covenanters in text

Most of the written works on the Covenanters appeared during the early years of the Restoration, before the installing of the Licensing Act in 1662. Up until then books could be, to some extent, published freely. After 1662 this was no longer the case. The topic was no longer allowed after 1662, because the Restoration regime sought to blame the Scottish Presbyterians for the troubles of the Civil War. As described in a previous chapter, according to Neufeld, the way they attempted to do this was by banning them from holding office and altogether forgetting the Covenanters and forcing their legacy into oblivion. If the Licensing Act was adhered to and the Restoration government had been successful, no works on the Covenanters should have appeared in the years from 1662 to 1679, when the act was repealed. The censorship of books and published materials was put in place to ensure this. To some extent, this was successful. A number of books on the Covenanters appeared around the years 1660 and 1661, and around 1680, which would seem logical taking the Licensing Act into account. Fact is however, that the Covenanting movement never disappeared, and that a great deal of its people fled to the Dutch Republic, for example. The free press in the Dutch Republic allowed Scottish writers to publish their works and subsequently ship them to Scotland, where the works were ultimately read and discussed. These authors did not, of course, adhere to the Licensing Act and were able to stir public discussion in Scotland and there was not much the Restoration government could do about it. Because of a series of events at home in resistance to Charles II, for example the Pentland rising in 1666, the Battle of Bothwell Bridge in 1679, and the Sanquhar Declaration in 1680, as well as the undesired succession of a Catholic king stirred up Covenanter discussion during the early 1680s.

One of the first anti Covenanters works that appeared after the Restoration was *A fair warning for England to take heed of the Presbyterian government of Scotland as being of all others the most injurious to the civil magistrates, most oppressive to the subject, most pernicious to both* written by John Bramhall and published in London in 1661. Bramhall spent a great deal of the Civil War and Interregnum in exile on the European continent; after the Restoration, however, he was nominated as archbishop of Armagh in Ireland. He wrote a great number of books and fought against any dissent within the Church of England. In this work, *A fair warning*, Bramhall argued against the influence of Presbyterians in any matter. The Covenanters were not the sole subject of his work, as he sketched the whole development
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of Presbyterianism and corresponding dissent in Scotland. For example, Bramhall started in the sixteenth century and addressed the abolition of the bishops in 1580, the church reformatons of John Knox, and many more instances in which he thought Presbyterians undermined authority.\textsuperscript{105} He laid out precisely how Presbyterians undermined authority and what consequences this had had, arguing that there was little difference between Catholics and Presbyterians by saying: “the Pope as well as they, and they as well as the Pope, do make Kings but half Kings, Kings of the bodies, not of the souls of their Subjects.”\textsuperscript{106} Bramhall ultimately worked to explain in his conclusion why the Covenant was wicked and void, because “it was devised by strangers, to the dishonour of our Nation, imposed by Subjects, who wanted requisite power upon their sovereign and fellow subjects, extorted by just feare and unjust sufferings.”\textsuperscript{107}

An example of a text that evoked a great deal of discussion, but was printed abroad, was called \textit{Naphtali}. \textit{Naphtali, Or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland For the Kingdom of Christ} was a Covenanter account of the what the writers saw as the tyrannical persecution of Presbyterians during the first few years of Charles II’s Restoration.\textsuperscript{108} The Restoration regime took all kinds of measures to suppress Presbyterian dissent; they used tests of conscience, financial levies, and penalties to ensure this. In Presbyterian literature terms like ‘persecution’ and ‘suffering’ were used in criticizing the government’s policies. The piece defended Covenanter ideas on the basis of scripture, history, and natural law. It was first published anonymously in 1667; however, this publication did not include the publisher and where it was published; the original document consisted of 386 pages. It was later suspected by the Restoration government that the piece was written by James Stewart and James Stirling, which turned out to be true, and at least Stewart went into exile to Rouen as a result.\textsuperscript{109} The book can be divided into three parts. The first part in an introduction of eighty pages and contains several copies of documents that were central to the history of the Covenants. Following is \textit{A True and Short Deduction of the Wrestlings of the Church of
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Scotland, a history of persecution of Scottish Covenanters during the Restoration. Lastly, a lengthy part containing the scaffold speeches of some men executed for their part the Pentland rising against the government. The central argument of the book, as explored into depth by Calvin Beisner in the PhD thesis called “His majesty’s advocate: Sir James Stewart of Goodtrees (1635-1714) and Covenanter resistance theory under the Restoration monarchy”, is relatively simple in comparison with other texts of the time. It argues that Scotland had a number of covenanted obligations to God, and this argument is rooted in scripture, history, biblical-, and natural law, and on the civil-law principle of self-defense.110

This book can be seen as a justification of the Covenanter and Presbyterian ideology and policies, rather than a smear campaign against the Restoration government. Due to this, it can be argued that this was not so much an attack on the Restoration government, as it was a justification, and is of a different nature than the publications by the Restoration regime. The work emphasized the Covenanter ideas on the distinction between regal and divine authority. The writers argue that

“we would not be here mistaken, as if we denied to the Civil Magistrat any power, which the Holy Scriptures allow unto Him; for as we assert his office to be an Ordinance of God, and his person (being lawfully therewith vested) to be signally impressed with a special character of Majestick Authority, wherefore, in a due subordination to Him who is Lord over all, he should be subjected to and obeyed, so we cheerfully grant, that, whereas the Heathen Magistrat (because of his moral incapacity to exerce more power) about religion and ecclesiastical affairs, hath only a power in [unclear] and thus ad rem.”111

A king that adhered to his regal power and did not confuse this with divine power, would, as the writers state, not be denied any power. Continuing, the writers of the work list all the duties that a Christian magistrate should fulfill. These duties are, among others, that the magistrate “should provide necessary and convenient accommodation and encouragement, as to persons, places, and revenues” for preaching and propagating the gospel, and for nursing piety and learning.112 Further on, it is questioned why it does not suffice the present king, Charles II, “that he have an external power, of providing for the Church, and protecting of her
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from outward violence or inward disorder, but must he also have an internal power, of doctrine, government, and discipline, and the several form and acts thereof.” Of course, there is much more that can and has been retrieved from this work, however, the point I am making here is that this book justified the proceedings of the Covenanters, rather than smearing the Restoration government.

Another writing that was published from within the movement and came out of the exile community was An Apologeticall Relation of the particular sufferings of the faithfull ministers & professours of the Church of Scotland, since August, 1660. Since the author, John Brown, lived in Rotterdam in the Dutch Republic, because he could not comply with the return to episcopacy in 1662 on behalf of Charles II, the work was most likely printed in there as well. Even though An Apologeticall relation and Naphtali both came from within the movement, they differed in nature in that Naphtali attempted to justify the Covenanting movement, their proceedings, and their branch of Presbyterianism, whilst An Apologticall relation sought to blame an external party for what had happened to the movement. The work by Brown blamed a popish party and emphasized the sufferings the Covenanters had to endure, trying to create a status of martyrdom for the movement. He argued that “a most cruel persecution by a popish prelaticall and malignant party, setting them on with rage, against all who desire to keepe themselves unspotted & free of the contagions of this evill time” tried to settle “first prelacy and then popery” in Scotland. In the construction of martyrdom, Brown described the trials and executions of the Marquis of Argyll and James Guthrie, who was a minister. He did this by displaying their suffering as part of broader issue. Of course, the lawfulness of the movement was also demonstrated in Brown’s work; however, this was not done the same as in Naphtali. In Naphtali, events from the history of Presbyterianism were pointed out and were justified. In An Apologeticall relation several topics were chosen, such as the ‘defensive’ war, the general relation of the king to the Scottish parliament, the stance of Charles I towards the Scots and many more, and these were subsequently justified by an argumentation based on scriptural texts and history. The main difference with Naphtali is that An Apologeticall relation blamed a popish party for
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their suffering, thus campaigning against this.

Why was it important for the Covenanters to publish texts like these, outside of functioning as a justification for their cause? These texts, where Covenanters were the targeted audience, could help to contribute to a sense of community to a group that had little freedom to exercise their beliefs. At the same time, the language of victimhood and persecution that were substantiated with biblical texts enabled Presbyterians to withstand the sanctioning of nonconformity put in place by the Restoration government. Whilst the texts fostered debate on all kinds of topics, the prime reason for publishing them might have been keeping the Covenanter community together. Of course, a justification of the Covenanter cause was as important in the texts, however, provoking debate possibly was not why the texts were published.

The Restoration government saw these works not as a justification, but as a protest campaign and provoking dissent. It was ordered by the Parliament of Scotland that Naphtali ought to be burned, because the work posed a threat to the “peace of the kingdom, thereby to raise new sedition and troubles, and to involve the kingdom again in an unnatural and bloody war.” This act of parliament, however, acknowledged that there already was a great amount of these books distributed through the country, to prevent the ideas from spreading; the work was burned in the high street of Edinburgh on December 13th 1667.

As illustrated by the burning of Naphtali in the streets of Edinburgh, the text was not received with praise everywhere in the kingdom. In reply to Naphtali, the Bishop of Orkney, Andrew Honeyman wrote Survey of Naphtali. In this complaint, Honeyman criticized the vocabulary of victimhood and suffering employed by Stewart and Stirling. He argued that the Presbyterian stance to persecution was inappropriate to their actual circumstances. The book consists of six chapters, all directed at one specific subject in reply to Naphtali. In the preface, Honeyman expressed the widespread fear that dissent would lead to the overthrowing of the government and arguing that it was his duty to go against Naphtali: “in discovering strange doctrines that are disseminated throughout the Land, tending to the utter overthrow of civil Order and Magistracy, if such evil principles be received into the hearts of people.”

Strikingly, the authors of Naphtali are not called by any name, as their names were still
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unknown; Honeyman consequently speaks of the Libeller when he addresses the author. The first chapter, for example, addresses “the Libeller’s outrageous reviling of the King’s Majesty, the Parliament, the Council, the Commission, the City of Edinburgh, and all the Judges and Nobles of the Land.”122 The second chapter addresses the king’s supremacy and the third, fourth and fifth episcopacy. The last chapter is called “the Libellers tragical complaints of persecution, and his vain glorying of the Martyrs of his way, with other evidences of his pride and arrogancy.”123 Honeyman calls out Stewart and Stirling by summarizing how their talk of ‘persecution’ cannot be called accordingly, because “this Libeller goes about to justifie wat lawful Magistrates have judged to be Rebellion” and that they “should be left under the disgrace of being persecutors of the godly.”124

It seems that the Restoration regime eventually let go of their initial strategy of silencing the Covenanters. Due to ongoing Covenanter activity and the inability to silence the movement, the regime resorted to actively influence the memory of the Covenanters. The Restoration government not only tried to prevent Covenanter ideas from spreading, they also reacted to them. The government tried to promote loyalist ideas and undermine the Covenanters, as did Honeyman for example. In 1680, after the Declaration of Sanquhar Charles II ordered that the declaration, which was deemed villainous and treasonous, was officially printed and spread in order for people to become acquainted with the principles and practices of these villains. At the same time, another strategy to undermine Presbyterian nonconformity by using a radical strategy was the decision to publish “particularly extravagant Covenanter manifestoes, such as the ‘Queensferry Paper’, in London in 1680.”125 In trying to persuade English nonconformist to becoming loyal to the Anglican Church and corresponding king, a number of Covenanter scaffold speeches were printed and spread. It was supposed to prove that the Covenanters were irrational and that English dissenters were wrong in deeming them innocent of any religious crimes.126

An example of a literary piece that rolled off the presses in London was *Mock Poem, or Whiggs Supplication* by Samuel Colville. It was printed in London in 1681 and was reprinted several times, for example, in Edinburgh in 1687 and 1695 as *Whiggs Supplication: A Mock Poem*.127 The poem sarcastically describes the issues within the Covenanter
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movement, as well as the disputes between Scottish Presbyterians and English nonconformists. In the poem, Colville emphasized the idea that Presbyterian dissenters were in favor of assassinations, as they were collectively held responsible for the death of the Scottish archbishop Sharp who was murdered in St. Andrews in 1679 stating “I think it powder was, and Leed / To shoot the Bishop through the head.” Through this, suggesting that the Covenanters might kill the king, might have stirred up the English against the Covenanters. The publication of this mock poem was in line with Charles II’s policies, as he resorted to an active printing press in campaigning against the Scottish Covenanters.

In the poem, Colville mentions the words Covenanters and Covenant several times. For example, in this part, Colville mocks the impact the Covenanters had and what influence they had.

“And yet its known, that the Nation
Did take it, at their instigation;
For which, of late, they were so hearty,
When it was the prevailing party,
That they urg’d State, as they were wood,
To take some’s Means, and others blood:
And others they compel’d to flee,
And hide themselves beyond the Sea:
And that, Sir, for no other reason,
But Ante-Covenanting Treason.”

In these lines of the poem, Colville expressed his disbelief of how the Covenanters could have become so influential. Since it is a sarcastic poem, the approach, is criticizing the Covenanters.

Another part of the poem explores Covenant ideology. The main point of the Covenanters was and had always been the division between regal and divine authorities; as they continued to justify in their written works. Colville, however, does away with this distinction in the following lines:

“And in his Wars, Civil and Forraign,
Make me Command in Chief, like Turrain
And though he grant not our demands,
Away with Covenants and Bands;

129 Colville, Mock Poem, 53.
Kings must command, we must obey,
They Rebels are, who truth gain-say."

As Colville argues, kings must command and the people should obey, whoever goes against this truth can be considered a rebel. At the same time, a king does not grant demands, something the Covenants asked from their kings. They demanded their kings to be subscribed to the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant. What comes forward in these lines is that Colville considered this nonsense by saying “And though he grant not our demands, Away with Covenants and Bands.” The poem was printed during a time when the Restoration regime took part in an active campaign against the Covenanters, it could very well be the case that Colville was influenced to write this poem by the government. It has been argued that this poem by Coville is the Scottish version of the English Hudibras, which was a satirical account of the, among others, Presbyterian parties of the Civil war. Hudibras was written by Samuel Butler during the Civil War in several parts and these parts were published after Charles II was restored. Butler took his inspiration from Cervantes’ Don Quixote, changing the chivalric obsession of Don Quixote for a disillusioned Presbyterian. The main theme, Calvinist hypocrisy, also came forward in Colville’s version of Hudibras. Colville’s poem can be considered a critique from within the Presbyterian tradition, because his mother was a Scottish Presbyterian poet, whom herself had been active in the resistance to the ecclesiastical policies of James VI/I and Charles I. This could indicate that the Covenanters were in disregard, meaning that either the policies of the Restoration regime had worked, or that the Covenanters had lost the unity within their movement. The ultimate critique of the Covenanters was the following: “Presbytery-men” were “beasts of prey…/ Who do establish Gospel order/ By Rapine, Sacrilege, and Murder” claiming that all Presbyterians were monsters.

Even though the Covenanters were able to publish a number of thought provoking works, the works in favor of the Restoration regime proved to have the lasting effect. Partly through texts like the abovementioned, the Covenanters were in disregard all through the Restoration. The justifying works of the Covenanters seem to have been much less influential than the attacks of the Restoration regime were, because a negative image of the Covenanters has persisted over the past centuries. An explanation of this could be that the Covenanters
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only targeted and reached a Covenanter audience. As a result, the Covenants reached a far smaller audience than the Restoration regime could. As the government was in charge of what was printed at home and what was not, it could regulate the publication of works in reaction to what was published by the Covenants; the Restoration regime was in charge and most likely had a bigger scope. Strikingly, the works defending the Covenants came out of the exile communities. This could be explained by the fact that the printing industry in Scotland was censored and publication of material on the Covenants was impossible. Mostly in times where something happened that brought the Covenants to the attention of the public, works were published by either the Covenants or the Restoration regime. It is most likely that the Restoration regime had a greater scope and this might explain why they could shape the image of their enemy.
The Marquis of Argyll in text

One of the leading figures of the Covenanting movement was Archibald Campbell, also known as the Marquis of Argyll. He was born between 1605 and 1607 as the son of Archibald Campbell, seventh earl of Argyll and his wife, Lady Ann Douglas. He later went on to study at the University of St. Andrews. Argyll became involved in public affairs after he had looked after the Argyll inheritance for a number of years. His father’s title had been forfeited when he became Catholic and joined the Spanish service, as a result, Argyll became the first man of the family. In 1626 Argyll married the daughter of his guardian William Douglas, Earl of Morton. Argyll and Lady Margaret Douglas, had several children of which Archibald Campbell, Earl of Argyll, who later became a politician, clan leader, and a Covenanter, was one.135 The Marquis of Argyll was mainly involved in all kinds of public affairs regarding disorder in the west Highlands and Isles. As leader of Clan Campbell, he continuously tried to bring more and new areas under Campbell control, areas that had previously been owned by other clans, such as the MacDonald or MacLean clan. The result of his policies was widespread bitterness and unrest with those who had lost land or felt threatened by clan Campbell: “political reaction to the territorial ambitions of Clan Campbell was the most important polarizing factor within Gaeldom prior to the outbreak of the Scottish Civil War.”136 Argyll was always working towards obtaining more and more power and influence, as was already demonstrated in his younger years as clan leader.

During the Covenanter years, Argyll appeared on the forefront of the movement. He was always present in parliament, was a part of discussions with the king on the future of Scotland, took part in military affairs by defending the west coast of Scotland from landings from Ireland, acted harshly against royalist forces etc. In 1641, there was even talk that Argyll was becoming the ruler of Scotland. At the time, Montrose had already turned on the Covenanting movement and had chosen the king’s side. Montrose had been removed from the political scene in Scotland, and anyone who made allegations against Argyll could count on ruthless punishment from him. The Covenanters demanded that Argyll was appointed the lord chancellorship, the most prestigious office of state. Charles I, however, refused this. When Charles I’s attention was directed at Ireland in light of the Catholic risings, he left the power

in Scotland with a handful of committees dominated by Covenanters and indirectly by Argyll, eventually consolidating his power in Scotland and being awarded a marquisate.

Even though the years after the signing of the National Covenant in 1638 were quite intense, the years after 1641 when the Covenanters had consolidated their power to some extent were also quite turbulent. During its later years, the movement split. In 1647, Argyll could not prevent the Engagement from happening, which would hurt the friendly relations the Covenanters had had with the English parliament. With regard to choosing sides, the Covenanting movement deeply split over the issue in the months following the negotiations. The Engagement ultimately failed and Argyll’s power was restored and he became the leading figure in the kirk party regime. This meant that the regime became dependent upon the Church of Scotland, turning into a radical regime. When Charles I was executed many Scots blamed the kirk party and Argyll for not standing up against the armies of Cromwell, and permitting the execution to take place. In negotiations with Charles II on the terms of his kingship, Charles II assured Argyll of his friendship, hoping that Argyll could change the endless list of concession demands of the kirk party. Eventually, however, Charles II’s reign only started in 1660, when he was restored. In 1660, Charles II found himself no longer on good terms with Argyll and had him arrested for treason when Argyll came to his court in London. His trial began on February 13th 1661, with charges of treason of his actions during the times of the Covenanters and for having a part in the execution of Charles I. In the official “Charge of high treason, murders, oppressions, and other crimes, exhibited to the Parliament of Scotland” on behalf of Charles II, Argyll was accused of “having laid aside all fear of God, Loyalty and Obedience to their sovereign Lord and King, natural reciprocal duty to their Countreymen and fellow subjects, have most [unclear], treacherously, perfidiously, and cruelly committed the crime of high Treason…”

Eventually, however, while being able to defend himself in most of the allegations, Argyll was convicted for compliance and was beheaded on May 27th 1661.

At the time of his execution, public opinion of Argyll was very much divided. Presbyterians regarded him as a martyr for the Covenanter cause, whilst royalists hated him intensely and blamed him for the Scottish involvement in the Civil War and as responsible for the execution of Charles I. One of the first publications to appear after Argyll was beheaded in 1661, was one of his own works called Instructions to a son by Archibald, Late Marquis of
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Argyle; written in the time of his confinements.\textsuperscript{139} It was printed in London for a J. Latham in Saint Paul’s Church-yard. We might expect from someone who is imprisoned that they write a piece on their innocence, on justifying the reasons of their confinement, or perhaps an autobiographical reflection of life. This book, however, was neither. In this book, Argyll took the liberty to advise any reader on issues such as basic wisdom, career development, and statecraft. Considering time wherein this book was published, it is striking that the publisher of the book wrote to the reader “that the author of this ensuing treatise, was an able statesman, and of excellent natural endowments, a master of reason, and the most accomplished scholar of experience.”\textsuperscript{140} The book had several chapters on abstract matters such as religion, marriage, court, and friendship, but also on traveling, housekeeping, hospitality, and tenants and the estate. As Argyll states in the first few pages, the book was written to keep the memory of Argyll alive because it was the “singular and the right way” of transmitting someone’s memory “to posterity, especially of his own.”\textsuperscript{141} Although admitting by saying “I do confess, twas my great misfortune to be so deeply engaged in these Fatal Times” that he did have an important part in the Civil War. Fact is that he does not admit to having done anything wrong, because he argues that it was a misfortune that he became involved in the affairs; it had been bad luck rather than Argyll’s own involvement. In his work, Argyll flatters the king in all kinds of ways. First Argyll argues that his son should do his sovereign service on all fair occasions, but also says that ‘they’, most likely the Scots or the nobility, had ancient merit with good princes.\textsuperscript{142} The Covenanters did not fight to abolish the monarchy and thus Argyll did not fool anyone by saying these things, however, the timing he chose to say them and in which this book was published is telling. Other than that, however, the book is more of a guide on how, or not, to behave in the contemporary world. The book was published around the same time Argyll was beheaded, and the publisher seemed quite the admirer of Argyll. It seems that the publisher attempted to create an image of Argyll that went against the standard image of Argyll being a traitor to the crown.

The works mentioned in the previous chapter, \textit{Naphtali} and \textit{An Apologetical relation} both mention the trial and execution of Argyll. As the authors of both books considered themselves Covenanters, it appeared they stood firmly behind the marquis. It might seem straightforward that the Covenanters would stand behind Argyll, while they belonged to the
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same movement. During the later years of the Covenanting movement, however, Argyll attracted a great amount of power and influence and could have been held responsible for the difficulties within the movement and with the radical regime. The authors of *Naphtali* and *An Apologetical relation* did not. On the contrary, *Naphtali* and *An Apologetical relation* do not even mention this particular period in the life of the marquis. Of course, criticizing Argyll would not fit the general Covenanter martyr narrative and that is essentially what the authors of both books attempted not to do. At the same time, however, the books do not award too much attention to Argyll.

*Naphtali* has a chapter on last speeches and testimonies by individuals who suffered in Scotland after the Restoration, as a result of the restoration. The chapter opens with Argyll, and is followed by a number of others. Some of them were executed around the same time as Argyll was, such as Covenanted Minister James Guthrie. Others were executed much later and were the men held responsible for the Pentland rising of 1666; many of them were ordinary men. They were given more attention than Argyll was. The following chapter is entirely dedicated to the last speech, testimony and death of preacher Hugh McKail who received much more attention and praise by the authors of *Naphtali* saying that: “he had devoted himself to the service of God in the Ministry of the Lord Jesus, and the edification of souls, very early; adding, albeit I have not been so with my god, yet thou hast made with me and Everlasting Covenant ordered is all things and sure; this is all my desire, joy and salvation.” Argyll was only mentioned a few times in *Naphtali*, still addressed with praise, because the authors state that he “had been eminent in the work of God.” This, however, is the only instance where the authors address Argyll’s personal contributions, at other times he is mentioned with Warriston and Guthrie. These men were “led like innocent sheep to the slaughter” because of their “good deeds”, “loving of our nation and building of our synagogue.” While Stuart and Stirling discussed the achievements of, for example, McKail into depth, they failed to do so with Argyll. In *An Apologetical relation* the story of Argyll is explored a bit more extensively. Brown wrote positively of the ‘noble’ Argyll and argues in favor of him. For example, Brown discussed that Argyll was executed for compliance, while there were many more compliers in Scotland: “and yet this nobleman must be sentenced to death, for complying for the good of the countrey.” In addition, Brown questioned the
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Restorations regime’s motivations “can they […] be condemned, as guilty of heigh treason, when providence bringeth back the prince after ten years absence, for acting so under the conquerour, for the good of the land, to prevent its utter ruine, & destruction?” 148 In contrast to Naphtali, An Apologetical relation goes more into depth on the trial and execution of Argyll and Brown tried to counteract the reasons why Argyll was sentenced to death. Striking is, however, that these two books were the only two that appeared going against the Restoration regime’s campaign to undermine Argyll and the Covenanters.

One example of a work that is entirely devoted to Argyll is An appendix to The history of independency being a brief description of some few of Argyle’s proceedings, before and since he joyned in confederacy with the independent junto in England: with a parallel betwixt him and Cromwell, and a caveat to all his seduced adherents by Clement Walker. 149 It was published in London in 1661; however, Walker himself had already died in 1651. Walker had also written A History of Independency, this was a piece of propaganda against the radical faction in parliament and the army. It was in demand after the Restoration and was reprinted in 1661, as was the piece on Argyll. 150 His reputation as a political pamphleteer most likely added to the influence he could exercise through his works. In An appendix Walker describes Argyll as someone whose “dealing with his Kindred, Friends, and Confederates […], will be a warning to all religious Protestants, how they trust such an Apostate Covenant, whose ambition and avarice has ruined the KING, Church and State, or three flourishing kingdoms.” 151 This appendix to the influential The History of Independence is one of the works that contributed to the efforts of the Restoration regime in trying to shape the memory of the Marquis of Argyll. In addition to that it addressed the political life of Argyll, it also criticized Argyll’s personality.

Whereas the The History of Independence required people to be able to read, a song required much less of its recipients. One example of a song that was written down was Ane brief explanation of the life, or a prophicy of the death of the Marquis of Argyle. 152 The lyrics were printed in 1686; however, it is unsure when the song appeared first. It is possible that the song existed much longer than this year suggests, however, it could also be the case that it
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only appeared after the son of the Marquis, the Earl of Argyll, was executed for treason in 1685. It is most likely that, if it had existed longer, the song came back to the attention of the people because of Argyll’s son. The song speaks of the Marquis rather than the Earl of Argyll and for this reason it is likely that the song already existed longer. The text can be seen as a satirical poem, as it mocks Argyll, though the rhyme has a serious and royalist tone. It describes the life and death of Argyll and, more importantly, narrates everything Argyll had done wrong in his life. The author of the piece remains unknown; however, he or she is very critical of the marquis. The poem opens with a few introductory lines of which the last two read: “Take here a list what thou hast done, / And in thy crimes read thou thy doom.”153 The poem then indeed continues as a list of all of Argyll’s crimes, ranging from the wrongdoings with regard to other clans to his betrayal of the king. Argyll is held responsible for the troubles in the three kingdoms as the author argues: “At Glasgow Synod, thou was he, / Who first forsook His Majesty. / Who caus’d division to spring, / ‘Twixt Subjects and their Native King.”154 As the Covenanting movement first took its form during the Glasgow assembly of 1638, it is clear that the author blamed Argyll. As the poem continues, many episodes and historical events pass. The Solemn League and Covenant is discussed, as is the Engagement, a plot to murder the king, and eventually the prophesied death of Argyll. The poem ends with the lines “So let them perish great and small, / that had a hand in our Kings fall. / Amen, amen, so let them say, / Who reads these Lines even every day.”155 The lines of the closing stanza suggest that this was a song that was read and repeated quite often. As the words of a can rhyme stick easily, the royalist message embedded in it can too.

Arguably, the royalist message was most likely spread to a greater extent than the Covenanter message was. The reputation of the Marquis of Argyll has been similar to the reputation of the Covenanters. Allan Macinnes has attempted to alter this image in a recent biography on the Marquis called The British Confederate: Archibald Campbell, Marquess of Argyll, c. 1607–1661. Although the Covenanters Stuart, Stirling, and Brown tried their best to defend Argyll, the work by Walker and the song may have been more influential. Interestingly, no Covenanter works appeared that had Argyll as their main topic; on the royalist side this did happen. Argyll was only a small part of both Naphtali and An Apologetical relation, whilst he was the sole subject of discussion in both An Appendix to The History of Independecy and Ane brief explanation. In addition, these works appeared at
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a time of heightened interest in Argyll. The first was published around his execution and the second after the execution of his son. During the time in between the two occasions, however, no works on Argyll of royalist making appeared. At the same time, no Covenanter works specifically on Argyll appeared as well. An explanation for this could be that the Covenanters themselves were already shaping a slightly negative image of Argyll, because he had drawn too much power towards himself, as even his son distanced himself from him. One way or another, however, the image of Argyll was most likely influenced by the royalist accounts of his life. The Covenanter works hardly seemed to have changed this. Forgetting the Marquis of Argyll did not entirely succeed, though de-popularizing did.
The Marquis of Montrose in text

The Marquis of Montrose, also known as James Graham, was like Argyll one of the leading figures of the Covenanting movement during its early years and he became one of the officers in the Scottish army. James’s parents, John Graham, fourth earl of Montrose, and Margaret Ruthven, both died before he had reached the age of eighteen. After his mother’s death in 1619 when Graham was only seven years old, he was sent to Glasgow to study. After his father’s death in 1626, his uncle Archibald Napier, first Lord Napier, became his guardian. Later, Montrose also studied at St. Andrews University. Apparently, Montrose had been interested in military tales from ancient writers, which would prove beneficial for him during his later life. After his marriage to Magdalene Carnegie and the birth of two children, Montrose completed his St. Andrews education abroad. He traveled to France and Italy and subsequently studied there. It is suspected that he attended French military school in Angers, because he spent several months there. It seems like Montrose already had an interest in military affairs from a young age.

During the first few days of the Covenanting movement Montrose ignored his military interest and avoided involvement on either side of the conflict. Once he was in, however, he soon became one of the more active members of the opposition. While he was not recognized by the Marquis of Hamilton, the representative of the king during the Glasgow assembly, as one of the seven leading figures, he did take a leading part in the signing and securing of the National Covenant. At the same time, however, Argyll was taking control of the movement. When positions within the army were allocated, Montrose was given command of forces that had to repress a royalist rising in the North East of Scotland. Apparently, Montrose felt insulted that he was not given command of the whole army, which was awarded to General Alexander Leslie who was much more experienced. In suppressing the royalist rising, however, the forces of Montrose were successful. By 1939, Montrose was changing his allegiance as he was a part of a meeting with Charles I and because he could not find himself in the demanded constitutional changes of the Covenanters. Montrose established a secret correspondence with the king and was a member of the Covenanters at the same time.
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Montrose could not accept the radicalism of the Covenanter and was soon no longer regarded as one of the leading figures. On some occasions Montrose felt humiliated by Argyll and these humiliations fostered some dislike for him and his move to dominating Scotland.

His eventual turn to the royalist side came after Montrose and a few others had made a bond that had to protect the covenant against the domination of Argyll. This bond was discovered and Montrose was thrown in prison as a ‘plotter’. He tried to warn the king of what he thought was going on in Scotland, but was unsuccessful. By the time he got out of prison, Charles I’s main priority was not Scotland anymore, as there had been Catholic uprisings in Ireland and crises at home in England. The marquis could not understand that Charles I had set Scotland aside and decided to rally royalists in Scotland. Eventually, Charles I made him lieutenant-general in Scotland for the English army and led a few successful expeditions into Scotland that made the Covenanting regime tremble for a while. Eventually, he was defeated in Philiphaugh by some of the Scottish forces. He tried to reestablish the army during the months that followed; however, shortly after in 1646 he went into exile. Upon his return to Scotland in 1650, in the form of a failed military invasion, Montrose was captured, given to the Covenanter, and brought to Edinburgh. Montrose was sentenced to death for the damage he had brought the Covenanters in 1644 and 1645. To send a message to other dissenters, he was hanged rather than beheaded, his head was displayed on the Tolbooth in central Edinburgh, and the rest of his limbs were put on display in other burghs. For the future, these were all ingredients for martyrdom.

The Covenanters regarded Montrose as a traitor; the royalist regarded him as a hero. So did Charles II. Upon Montrose’s return to Scotland in 1650, the king and he were in correspondence on how to take Scotland. When Charles II settled on the terms of the Covenant, on which he would become king in Scotland, Montrose was left to the Covenanters. As soon as Charles II was restored in 1660, Montrose had a state burial in Edinburgh. An anonymous piece of work of the funeral of the “great lord Marquesse of Montrose” appeared shortly after in 1661. The report of the funeral speaks of “the most valiant and loyal subjects” and of “glorious Martyrs” that had their reburying. It describes how Montrose was taken from Holyrood Church to St. Giles’s Church, the great amount of nobles that were present, and that the corpse was carried by fourteen earls. Later, the writer
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describes a remarkable event that took place during the funeral: “before the beginning […] there was nothing but stormy rains, but the corps no sooner came out but fair weather with the countenance of the sun appeared, and continued till all was finished, and then the clouds returned to their frowns, and the storm begun afresh.” As this passage illustrates, after the Restoration the status of the Marquis as a martyr took on great form. The following description of life also adds to this. His time with the Covenanters is not left out; however, it is kept short. The author argues that it was for his “great abilities” and the “great esteem he had among the people” that the Covenanters lured him to their side. When he found out about “their hypocrisies and rotten enterprises” Montrose abandoned them. What comes forward here is that Montrose was not to blame for his patriotism, and was a hero for eventually choosing the right side. The authors closes by emphasizing the heroism of Montrose for future generations by saying: “whose fame and acts shall serve as examples of future Loyaltie, Gallantry and Piety: and it is hoped that none will be so mad again as to worship meteors, when God Almighty hath provided a shining Sun.” The Covenanters were once again denounced, whilst Montrose was glorified.

The martyrdom of Montrose was emphasized in the anonymously printed *The state martyrrologie. Or, innocent blood speaking its mournfull tragedy, in the history of the late anarchy since 1648. to this present time 1660*. It was printed in London in 1660, right after the Restoration. The one-sheet pamphlet contained a list of martyrs that had died from 1648 to 1660, a number of portraits of several of them, and a summary of the events from those years. One of the portraits was of Montrose and his name was listed as fifth in the list of “worthy persons who have suffered violent deaths for their loyalty to his sacred Majesty KING Charles the second.” Not much else is said of the martyrs listed, other than the summary of the events of which all of them had been a victim. Still, Montrose was recognized as one of the more important martyrs that had died during the Interregnum for the cause of Charles II, emphasizing his loyalty to the kings.

The most extensive work that appeared on Montrose was “*The compleat history of the warrs in Scotland under the conduct of the illustrious and truly valiant James Marquesse of Montrose, General for his Majestie Charls 1st. in that kingdome, together vvith a brief character of him, as also a true relation of his forein*”
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negotiations, landing, defeat, apprehension, tryal, and deplorable death in the time of Charls 2d” by George Wishart. It appeared in 1660, after the Restoration. Wishart had been bishop of Edinburgh before the war broke out. After the signing of the National Covenant in 1638 he fled to Newcastle where he remained until the Scottish army approached the city. Wishart was eventually captured by the Covenanters and imprisoned in the Tolbooth in Edinburgh; however, he was freed by Montrose. Wishart and Montrose remained together until Montrose fled the country. Before he wrote this book, Wishart had already written another book in the deeds of Montrose called *The memoirs of James, the Marquis of Montrose*. This book gave Montrose the reputation of a heroic figure internationally. As a protest against Montrose, Montrose was hanged with a copy of Wishart’s book around his neck. The international attention for Montrose decreased shortly after the publication. Wishart’s motivations for writing the book were probably that he wanted to spread the word about Montrose as they had been well acquainted during the time Montrose had fought against the Covenanters. The book described the death of the Marquis, the affairs of the kind under the conduct of Montrose in the years 1644, 1645 and 1646, and a continuation of the Montrose’s history. Although this last part of the book was included, the bulk of the book was taken up by the second part, Montrose in the years 1644, 1645 en 1646. The book praised Montrose from beginning till the end and fostered a positive image of him after he had been executed by the Covenanters. Since the tables were turned after 1660 and Montrose was no longer a villain, this book fits perfectly in trying to restore his image, whilst damaging the image of the Covenanters.

Interestingly, there are a few instances in which Montrose and Argyll appear together in some material. For example, the abovementioned song on Argyll from the previous chapter also mentions Montrose. At some point, Argyll’s cunningness is discussed by saying: “Thou earnestly with the King did plead: / Montrose his army should disband, / And he himself depart the Land.” It was the work of Argyll that Montrose had to go into exile, not because Montrose had overplayed his hand. Later, the author clearly makes his point: “Montrose the Glory of our Land / Who bravely for our King did stand: / Him thou caus’d murther samefully / and made the Mapp of misery.” Even though this poem was directed at mocking Argyll, the heroism of Montrose was once again emphasized.

Another example of a work where both appear is *Blood for blood, or, Murthers revenged briefly, yet lively set forth in thirty tragical histories: to which*
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are added five more, being the sad product of our times with a subtitle that reads faithfully digested for the benefit of posterity.\textsuperscript{173} As the subtitle indicates, this book had the intention of informing future generations. Whatever was written down then, were the stories that were to be remembered. The original author of the book was John Reynolds, however, he passed away in 1650, whilst the book was published in 1661. The book has one chapter on Montrose and Argyll and this chapter was added after the original work was finished. Reynolds cannot have been the author of this chapter, however, it remains unclear who did write the last five cases in the book. The author of this chapter had a clear preference as to whom he admired more. Montrose was described as follows: “a Nobleman rarely accomplished, valiant without faction, no man having done more heroical acts than he, in power riches and parentage equal to any the great men of his own Country, as being descended from the honourable and ancient family of the Grahams.”\textsuperscript{174} Montrose’s had a duty and was someone “who by the special providence of God Almighty standing up to his endeavours to maintain his Masters the Kings in just Rights and authority, the peace, safety and liberty of the subjects, and the honour and splendor of his house.”\textsuperscript{175} In fulfilling this duty, he was opposed by “another great Man of the same country, who was also a Marquess, and bore the title of Argyle.”\textsuperscript{176} Whilst this introduction seems quite neutral, the description of Argyll is not: “a Man both ambitious and cunning; servile (yet envious to his betters) but tyrannical where he could gain an advantage, and willing to any evil to get himself honour and safety.”\textsuperscript{177} Even before the author was well into the chapter, the tone had been set and the reader had been given the author’s opinion.

Whilst what was written and appeared on Montrose was praising and positive, the amount of works that appeared was limited and only appeared around the year 1660. An explanation could be that the Restoration regime sought to silence everything that had anything to do with the Covenanting movement. Of course, Montrose had played a part in the early days of the movement and had a vital role later when he turned against it. The Restoration regime could have thought his involvement with the movement was too much. The name Montrose was associated with the Covenanting movement, speaking of Montrose could then negatively influence the forgetting of it. Forgetting Montrose, even though he had been on the royalist side of the conflict, equaled forgetting the Covenanters. Another
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explanation could simply be a loss of interest. Montrose had been dead for a number of years before Charles II was restored, and while Montrose had been in favor of Charles II becoming king, on his own terms rather than Covenanter terms, he never became king when Montrose was still alive. In that sense, Charles II had been supported by Montrose, but he did not contribute to his Restoration. A reburial and a restored image could then function as a gesture of thanking Montrose, however, not much was to be said after that. The ones who had done the plotting and the scheming, the Covenancers, were the ones that were to be actively forgotten and taken down.
Conclusion

The Restoration regime tried to create a society on its own terms. After years of war, civil unrest, the killing of a king, and the government of Oliver Cromwell, the restored regime regarded itself as the solution to all the previous issues. One of the problems of this regime was that the problems of the past years were still working through in the freshly restored society. A divided public either in favor of or against the restoration of the monarchy and Charles II was to be reconciled by the regime. In attempting to do this the Restoration government had to make a number of decisions regarding the future of the three kingdoms. One of the more important decisions was how to do away with the war years and find a way to resolve this issue. Finding someone to blame for the unrest was one of the prime points on the agenda of the Restoration government. As other historians have shown before, like Neufeld, the Restoration regime blamed a religious minority, the Presbyterians, for the outbreak of the revolutions in Scotland, England, the following Civil War, and the death of Charles I. How they tried to deal with them was by banning the Presbyterians from public authority and from the thoughts of the people. Presbyterians were not allowed to hold public office nor were they to be spoken or written about as a consequence of several acts. The Covenanters were a distinct group of Presbyterians from Scotland who were held responsible for the revolution in Scotland. How they were dealt with and remembered has been analyzed in the chapters above. The answer to the question that fitted to this: “How was the memory of the Covenanters shaped during the Restoration era with regard to Restoration regime initiatives as well as Covenant initiatives, c.a. 1651-1685?” is manifold.

Central to this thesis has been the concept of political memory and the censorship embedded in this. Nations can create an identity on the basis of political memory with the help of symbols, texts, images, monuments, and so forth. As political memory has a clear function, stimulating ideology and creating unity, it is hard to change and often secured for the long term. The Restoration regime employed the strategy of creating a political memory that was favorable to their existence. Political memory usually consists of victories which form the basis for a strong self-image. The Restoration in itself was a victory over the Commonwealth and the Civil War leading up to it. Parts of the history concerned with this did not a fit into a victorious narrative. Therefore, the Restoration regime tried hard to create a narrative in which the Covenanters were blamed for the Civil War, where Presbyterian had undermined authority, and the consequences this had had. The regime employed political memory to secure this narrative.
Charles II did not use the past for the present as such, however, he did try to mould a past that fitted in the present. Active forgetting is what has been studied in this thesis. What happened in Restoration England and Scotland is that certain passages from history were denied. The main issue with this is that the people most likely remembered what had happened even when they were ordered not to do so. As this method of forgetting was quite problematic, the Restoration regime only succeeded in blotting out passages of history to a small extent. However, the Restoration regime was able to negatively shape the memory of the Covenanters.

While there was support for a return of the monarchy, Charles II installed a number of measures that would ensure that there were no threats to his kingship in the future. The way he went about this was by at first portraying himself as a unifying force, pardoning the people who were involved with the Republic. In addition, two Restoration settlements were designed that dealt with the Civil War and the Interregnum. Through these settlements, a polity was constructed upon which politics and religion could go forward. The first and political settlement was aimed at making sure that the recent past would not become the basis of future conflict. A central element of this settlement was the Act of Free and General Indemnity and Oblivion. Concealing the past by forgiving and forgetting is how Charles II and his Convention parliament imagined peace to be achieved in the kingdoms. The second and religious settlement, however, had set its main goal on silencing and punishing those who were seen as responsible for the troubled past. While the first settlement remained in place, the Cavalier Parliament was less focused on the reconciliation of the various groups and it went about purging the state and the Church of the people who they deemed responsible for the war; men who were either puritan or Presbyterian and thus could also be a Covenanter. A third, and restricting, measure was the Licensing Act. Through this, the regime attempted to secure itself by controlling the gathering and movement of people, their public meetings and worship, and their access to information. Through the act, the capacity of the press and book production was limited and Charles II controlled the presses.

This last measure was taken in a time where the printing press had just become important for discussion in society and contributed to the emergence of a public sphere. People – merchants, tradesmen, aristocrats, people who had time and money – came together in coffee houses to discuss news, politics, and trade, and thus empowering public opinion. The printing industry was exploring all possibilities and was growing bigger than ever. The Restoration regime saw this as a threat. According to some, it was the spread of pamphlets and politically rooted texts that had been the source of rebellion in the first place. To try and
regulate this, a measure like the Licensing act was taken.

The Covenanters became a victim of the Restoration policies of Charles II. As in England, the clock in Scotland was put back to 1633 and all legislation was proclaimed null. Even though the Covenanters were no longer in power since 1651, they still existed in 1660 when Charles II was restored. The repressive policies of Charles II did not mean the Covenanters actually disappeared. A number of them fled to countries like the Dutch Republic and Sweden, and others remained in Scotland. The exile communities fostered a climate wherein ideas and intrigues could be developed, propagated and maintained. There were often made plots against the Stuart government. These ideas were well received in a community of which most of its members had been forced out of their country. After the Pentland rising, some literature on the topic specifically and on the Covenanters in general appeared. Most of this work, however, came out of the exile community. This way, the Covenantant community abroad and the community at home could foster one another, as they did.

If the Licensing Act and the restrictions on printing in Scotland were adhered to, no works on the Covenanters should have appeared after 1662. The free press in the Dutch Republic allowed Scottish writers to publish their works and subsequently ship them to Scotland, where the works were ultimately read and discussed. These authors did not, of course, adhere to the Licensing Act and were able to stir public discussion in Scotland and there was not much the Restoration government could do about it. At the same time, royalist authors wrote books and pamphlets on the Covenanters as well, sometimes in answer to a Covenanter book. Examples of book by Covenanters are Naphtali and An Apologeticall relation wherein the authors justified the cause of the Covenanters. These authors used terms like ‘suffering’ and ‘persecution’ to illustrate the victimhood of the Covenanters. Naphtali, for example, justified the division between regal and divine authority, whereas An Apologeticall relation blamed a popish plot the outbreak of the Civil War. These books emphasized the victimhood and the martyrdom of the Covenanting movement, however, this was not enough to shape opinion and memory on the Covenanters.

Royalist books were, for example, Survey of Naphtali and Whiggs Supplication. These royalist authors denounced the Covenanters and their ideology in their writings. In reply to the idea of victimhood illustrated in Naphtali, Honeyman criticizes this vocabulary in A Survey of Naphtali, because he thought that it was inappropriate to their actual circumstances. Honeyman does not only reply to Naphtali as he opposed a number of Covenanter arguments regarding regal supremacy and episcopacy. Honeyman wrote a protest to the whole of the
movement using fair arguments to do this. Colville’s poem also ideologically addressed the Covenanter movement whilst mocking them in his poem. He addressed his disbelief of the influence of the Covenanter movement and the division between regal and divine authority. At the same time the language Colville used was strong, for example, there is an instance where Colville argues that all Covenanter are murderers. Because Colville’s poem was written in popular rhyme, the words of it might have easily lingered in the minds of the people. Even though the Covenanter were able to publish a number of thought provoking works, the works in favor of the Restoration regime have proved to have the lasting effect. An explanation of this could be that the Covenanter only targeted and reached a Covenanter audience, whilst the Restoration regime could possibly spread their works widely. As the government controlled what was printed at home and what was not, it could regulate the publication of works in reaction to what was published by the Covenanter; as such, the Restoration regime was in charge.

Although the Covenanter were a distinct group, there were individuals that might even have made a bigger impact than the movement as a whole had. One of these figures was Archibald Campbell, Marquis of Arygll. Argyll had been one of the leading figures in the Covenanter movement and had gradually drawn more and more power to himself. At the time of his execution, public opinion of Argyll was very much divided. Presbyterians regarded him as a martyr for the Covenanter cause, whilst royalists disliked and blamed him for the Scottish involvement in the Civil War and the responsible party for the execution of Charles I. Only a small number of books appeared that discussed Argyll from Covenanter authors. He was discussed and praised in Naphtali and An Apologetical relation and a work of his own was published. The authors of Naphtali, however, awarded more attention to other Covenanter than to Argyll. In An Apologetical relation the author Brown attempted to counteract the reasons why Argyll was sentenced to death, but this justification was still part of a larger book. No Covenanter works appeared with Argyll as the main subject of discussion. Royalist writers did do this and examples are An Appendix to the History of Independency and Ane brief explanation. In these works Argyll was highly criticized. Walker, in An Appendix to the History of Independency, blamed Argyll for the ruining of the King, Church, and State. Walker argued that Argyll’s character and how he dealt with his family, friends, and confederates already indicated that he was a bad person. An Appendix to the History of Independency was not only a critique of Argyll’s political life as it also criticized his personality. Ane brief explanation added to this by describing everything Argyll had ever done wrong in his life, making him responsible for the signing of the National Covenant and the outbreak of the Civil War. The memory of Argyll was most likely influenced by the
royalist accounts of his life. The Covenanter works hardly changed this. Forgetting the Marquis of Argyll did not entirely succeed, though de-popularizing did.

Different than Argyll, James Graham, Marquis of Montrose, had fought on the royal side during the Scottish war. Whilst what was written and appeared on Montrose was praising and positive, the amount of works that appeared was limited and only appeared around the year 1660. Montrose was officially regarded a martyr by the Restoration regime, because he appeared in *The state martyrologie* alongside others who had died during the Interregnum for the cause of Charles II. *The compleat history of the warrs in Scotland* by Montrose’s friend Wishart was the only work that discussed Montrose on his own. This book gave Montrose the reputation of a heroic figure for his effort in the fight against the Covenanters. At some instances, Montrose and Argyll were spoken about in the same text. In these texts, like in *Ane brief explanation* and *Blood for blood*, Montrose was as pictured as a good man, whereas Argyll was portrayed as the villain. Montrose had to go into exile because of Argyll, not because he had overplayed his hand. The author of *Blood for blood* used phrases like ‘valiant’, ‘heroical acts’, ‘by the providence of God’, etc. to illustrate the character of Montrose. Still, all of these works appeared shortly after 1660 and before 1662. It is striking that even a hero was not spoken about much by the Restoration regime after the installing of the Licensing Act in 1662. An explanation could be that the Restoration regime sought to silence everything that had anything to do with the Covenanting movement. Forgetting Montrose, even though he had been on the royalist side of the conflict, equaled forgetting the Covenanters. Another explanation could simply be a loss of interest. Montrose had been dead for a number of years before Charles II was restored, and while Montrose had been in favor of Charles II becoming king, on his own terms rather than Covenantanter terms, he never became king when Montrose was still alive.

Although the Restoration regime did not succeed entirely in blotting out the Covenanters, as they kept on existing after 1660 and their ideas were kept alive in written word, they were successful in limiting the attention the Covenanters were given. The regulation of the press through the Licensing Act and other measures taken, such as the publicly burning of forbidden books, contributed to the forgetting of the Covenanters. While it has become clear that the initial strategy, silencing the Covenanters failed, the Restoration regime was able to negatively influence the memory of the Covenanters. The limited amount of works that appeared on the Covenantanter side on the movement itself, Argyll, and Montrose could not compete with the works that were written by royalist authors. The royalist authors were much more outspoken in denouncing or praising the leading figures of the movement
than the Covenanter authors were. It remains unsure whether the Covenanters could have ever won a propaganda war from the Restoration regime; however, their efforts in fighting the regime were surely not paper based.
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