

## The Restoration Remembered: The First Whigs and the Making of their History

Like the Victorians before them, twentieth-century historians have found the first Stuarts and the causes of the English Civil Wars, along with the religious and political dissent of those tumultuous years, the most compelling episodes of the seventeenth century.<sup>1</sup> All too often, we find the Restoration and Revolution of 1688–89 portrayed, particularly in textbooks and surveys of Stuart era, as an anticlimactic denouement to the conflicts of the first half of the century.<sup>2</sup> But this was not true in the eighteenth century. Georgian historians did not look upon the mid-century crisis, with its bloody battles and sectarian squabbling, as the focal points of their national past. For them, the English Revolution was 1688. Nor was the Glorious Revolution simply glorious. It was a definitive turning point in British history, when the nation was rescued from the caprices of an arbitrary monarch pursuing an absolutist style of governance and placed back on its lineal progression towards an ever increasingly rational, constitutional government. Naturally, such a narrative demanded heroes, deliverers from an evil that might have been, as well as villains, those who would have deliberately altered their nation's natural historic course.

Modern historiography confirms this eighteenth-century interest in the ideas and activities of late seventeenth-century Whigs. Georgian reformers, republicans, radicals, and Whigs celebrated a pantheon of seventeenth-century Whig heroes and martyrs. A Whig reading of the Revolution of 1688–89 influenced the political culture of Wilkesite agitators, as well as that of enlightened intellectuals like Thomas Hollis, Jacob Price, and Joseph Priestly.<sup>3</sup> Georgian historians told the reading public a tale they seemed eager to hear: that of the heroic saving of England's blessed constitution by a handful of committed patriots in the 1680s. Even radicals in the second half of the century, those who criticized the Glorious Revolution like Tobias Smollet and Catherine Macaulay, saw it as a step, albeit insufficient, toward democratic progress.<sup>4</sup>

Equally well served by modern historians is the story of how seventeenth-century republican and Commonwealth texts and ideas were transmitted by

a second generation of Whigs in the 1690s and early 1700s to eighteenth-century audiences. John Toland's editions of Algernon Sidney's *Discourses* and James Harrington's *Oceana* in 1700, the writings of Lord Bolingbroke, and John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon's *Cato Letters* – all helped to fuel eighteenth-century republicanism and continue a tradition of English radicalism.<sup>5</sup> Mark Goldie's four volume collection of primary documents, devoted to the 'reception of Locke's politics', as well as recent work by Annabel Patterson on early modern English liberalism have further demonstrated the strength with which Republican and Lockean ideas were appreciated and disseminated in the mid and late eighteenth century.<sup>6</sup>

But what is less well understood is how the first Whigs themselves participated in the crafting of their own history. This essay focuses on the making of the Whig narrative and its transformation in the eighteenth century. It argues that 'Whig history' was first fashioned, in the very midst of the struggles of religious and political radicals in the late seventeenth century, by those radicals themselves. The first Whigs began the process of selecting heroes, of cleansing Whig antics and excesses, and of demonizing Stuart villains. The Whig activists and propagandists of the 1680s were not only politicians, conspirators, rebels, and at times, desperadoes. They were story-tellers as well. Once their voices were unleashed by the Revolution, they began to write its history: through the republication of Exclusion era propaganda and the dying speeches of their fallen brethren; through martyrologies, cheap broadsides, and verse; and through sophisticated political diatribes, memoirs, and histories.

In the early 1700s, Whig stories were compiled, reiterated, and embellished by a number of Whiggish inclined antiquarians. These histories, together with the memoirs from the period, particularly those of Bishop Burnet, were consulted and lavishly relied upon by later Georgian historians as diverse as David Hume and Charles James Fox. But these eighteenth-century intellectuals also honed the story of the first Whigs to further fit their own tastes and concerns. The traditional political discourse of the first Whigs, the significant role of lower and middle class party activists, and the religious zeal and importance of Dissent among late Stuart radicals, received only the mildest of attention in the eighteenth century. On the other hand, the constitutional nature of the revolution was increasingly exaggerated, discoursed in Lockean terms, and celebrated along with the stature of its supposed heroes.

While the story that the first Whigs told was their own saga, and thus 'about Whigs', it was not fully 'whig history' in the sense that we use that term today. Theirs was not a story of progress so much as one of triumph and completion with the Revolution. Time and again, seventeenth-century Whigs reiterated that they were by no means innovators, but rather preservers of an ancient constitution. They took their cues, models, and tropes from their distinct vision of English medieval history and from the Protestant Reformation. Their enlightened eighteenth-century successors, on the other hand, envisioned

their Whig forefathers as British patriots, forward-looking men, not satisfied to simply conserve the old but also herald the new.

We use the term 'whig history', coined by Herbert Butterfield in 1931, primarily as a historiographical criticism. The whig historian, according to Butterfield, writes a present-centred history that employs the past to legitimate and celebrate contemporary institutions and mores. The Victorian 'Protestant, progressive, and whig' historian who so piqued Butterfield revolved his interpretation of British history around the growth of individual liberty, parliamentary government, and religious toleration. Butterfield certainly was not worried that the focus of these historians was almost exclusively the domain of high politics. Their sin was to frame history as a story of continuing liberal progress. For Butterfield the idea of a forward movement or continuing positive progress in history was but 'a gigantic optical illusion', imposed on the sources by the historian.<sup>7</sup> By the mid-eighteenth century, historians were most often guilty of both whiggish presentism and progressivism. They moulded the late Stuart past in service to contemporary concerns while framing it in the story of continuing progress. It was, in short, a self-congratulatory history of ongoing success.

The last twenty-five years have witnessed a renaissance in Restoration scholarship. Treatment of the period may well have finally broken the whiggish paradigm that has so confined the historiographical topics and themes investigated. In other words, we may be finally thinking outside the whig box that was built initially by the first and second generation Whigs themselves, then embellished, popularized, and disseminated in the mid and late eighteenth century. Recent scholarship has begun to restore to the history of the first Whigs the predominant political discourse they employed; the role of lower and middling class activists and propagandists; and the importance of religious motivation.<sup>8</sup>

The first Whigs were definitely not secular, Lockean liberals seeking to secure the peoples' natural rights. Still late Stuart Whigs were keenly interested in England's legal traditions, in the location and balance of power, and in the constitution, or more precisely, what they so often portrayed as England's ancient constitution. Indeed the first Whigs spoke a political language that probably would have surprised and disappointed many of their enlightened descendants, for the pronouncements of Restoration Whigs were not articulated in the heroic republican discourse of Algernon Sidney or in the universal-rights language of John Locke, but in a form something more akin to the traditionalism of Edmund Burke.<sup>9</sup>

The political language employed most often by Whigs in the late seventeenth century was not based on what Burke disdainfully labeled 'metaphysic rights'.<sup>10</sup> Certainly some Whig writers spliced the language of natural law together with arguments from antiquity, common law, and Scripture; but rarely did they construct whole arguments on such abstract foundations. Locke's *Two Treatises*, in this regard, are unique for the purity of their natural

law discourse.<sup>11</sup> It is worth remembering as well that the *Two Treatises* were published only after the Glorious Revolution in 1690. While the influence of Locke on the formation of early Whig principles prior to the Revolution is the subject of some debate, what is certainly true is that the first Whigs constructed their political vision in the 1670s and 1680s without the benefit of the *Two Treatises*.<sup>12</sup> Despite the glorification of Algernon Sidney in the eighteenth century, his brand of classical republicanism was not synonymous with early Whig ideology. Although the *Discourses* were not published until 1698, many of Sidney's basic political ideas were asserted during his trial (a transcript of which was published) as well as in his dying speech. Thus Whig radicals had access to some of Sidney's ideas. But those principles – such as popular sovereignty and the contractarian relationship between the king and people – could be and were being put forth in another political language. This language, the one which dominated Whig polemic, was ancient constitutionalism.

In 1957 John Pocock first described how the ancient constitution was formed out of a preoccupation with immemorial custom, particularly by Elizabethan and Jacobean common law theorists. The 'common law mind', as Glenn Burgess has shown, was a pervasive mentality within the political nation and provided a 'shared language' with which to discuss England's political past and future on the eve of the Civil Wars.<sup>13</sup> Having survived the Civil Wars and restoration of the King, ancient constitutionalism was reasserted with gusto by Whigs during the Exclusion Crisis. It posed a strong counterpoint to the royalist/ Filmerian vision of government so hotly being propagated from the pulpit. The ancient constitution provided Whigs with an alternative authority to that of Scripture. Set in the language of common law, ancient constitutionalism was a particularly English story, one that appealed to an English preoccupation with empiricism and pride in their national heritage. It had an outwardly conservative appearance; it was supposedly based on age-old traditions, allowing Whig constitutionalists to represent themselves as restorers rather than innovators. Throughout the seventeenth century, arguments from tradition and custom were commonplace. They furnished robust arguments against alteration while simultaneously accommodating considerable change. Even 'the men who made the revolution of 1640' couched their most extreme steps in conservative language. As Robert Zaller writes, 'For them the antiquity of the thing is the surest guarantee of its legitimacy, and "innovation" is the cardinal political sin'.<sup>14</sup> The Whig propagandists of the 1680s were medievalists. They founded their particular version of England's Gothic constitution upon, as William Petyt put it, the 'dark and neglected paths of antiquity'.<sup>15</sup> These were the venerated historical sources that 'allowed them to appeal to the past even as they moulded the future'.<sup>16</sup>

It is in the numerous debates between Whig and Tory pamphleteers during the Exclusion Crisis that we find a growing obsession on the part of Whigs with establishing the medieval origins of contemporary institutions.<sup>17</sup> The contest that generated the most heated discussion, linked as it was to the wider

controversy of the Exclusion Bill, concerned the birth of parliament and its functions. Many royalists, following Filmer, asserted that parliament was a Norman creation whose role was to aid, advise, consent, and execute. The king himself remained the sole legislator.<sup>18</sup> Whig polemicists fired back, rummaging through medieval records, searching for parliament's origins among the ancient peoples of the pre-Norman era. What was at stake, in so far as pamphleteers like William Petyt and William Atwood were concerned, was not only the Exclusion Bill before parliament (which licensed parliament to meddle with the royal succession) but every subject's rights and privileges.<sup>19</sup> What security could they hope for if law was but subject to kingly desire?

But recourse to ancient constitutionalism was not only found in the Whig pamphlet literature of the Exclusion era. The Rye House Plot conspirators in 1682 and 1683 employed it. The Declaration that accompanied Monmouth's rebellion in 1685, penned by the notorious Plotter, Robert Ferguson, relied on it.<sup>20</sup> And, quite naturally, ancient constitutionalism informed numerous Whig justifications of the Glorious Revolution in 1688 and after. Robert Ferguson's manifesto, *A Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange's Descent*, published in the very midst of the Revolution, used the ancient constitution to demonstrate, throughout English history, how those kings who had violated the original trust placed in them by the people had thereby abdicated their roles, ceased to be king, and were replaced by another. But the right to resist a tyrannical prince was more than simply precedent; it was part of every Englishman's birthright, dating back to the Saxons, consented to by 'William, the first Norman king'.<sup>21</sup>

While this is not the language of Sidney or Locke, many of the basic principles are the same: sovereignty ultimately rests in the people who choose their magistrates and who, in turn, are beholden to the law. Magistrates who violate the law may be, if necessary, forcibly removed. But ancient constitutionalism had its limits: the discourse of personal rights was absent from it. Seventeenth-century Whigs never intended to replace or dismantle the patriarchal order of their traditional society with one based on independent, self-possessing, contracting individuals. For eighteenth-century Whigs interested in the enlightened notions of the moral progress of mankind and universal rights, this particularist, traditional political language would not serve their ends. They ignored it. It was too distant, too archaic. Yet, as they thumbed their copies of the *Discourses* and the *Two Treatises*, they did believe they were echoing the language of their seventeenth-century forefathers. And indeed they were, only these were the very discourses that the first Whigs themselves had so often chosen to ignore.

Thus the political idioms of Sidney and Locke, although not employed by the first Whigs, were assimilated by their eighteenth-century successors *quid pro quo*. This, in part, helps to explain the glorification of Sidney by Georgian historians, as well as their vision of late Stuart struggles as basically political. Both the *Discourses* and the *Two Treatises* are about the praxis of power; and both,

while not exclusively ahistorical, lend themselves to universal application. Both Locke and Sidney, writes Blair Worden, move away from ‘the antiquarian wrangles of the Restoration period into the territory of theoretical abstraction’. Both defend natural rights, appeal to the universal claims of reason, and base political authority upon it.<sup>22</sup> But this is not the whole story. Eighteenth-century historians were not simply reading Locke and Sidney. They were also reading the memoirs, histories, and polemic of the first Whigs themselves.

The first Whigs were highly self-conscious of their role in history. We see this time and again in the ways in which they imagined, wrote, and spoke about their combat with the Stuart monarchy. A few comments voiced on the floor of the House of Lords by the Whig politician, John Hampden, the younger, are illustrative. In the spring of 1689, following the accession of William and Mary, Hampden was called before a special committee of the House of Lords charged with investigating the trials and executions of Lord Russell, Algernon Sidney, and other supposed Rye House plotters in 1683. ‘The method of revolt’, Hampden confidently told the committee, ‘was the old English form of protest against tyranny and the expedition of [Prince] William but a continuation of the Council of Six [the elite circle of Rye House conspirators]’. Monmouth’s Rebellion, he continued, was but ‘another struggle for liberty’.<sup>23</sup>

Hampden himself had been implicated in the Rye House conspiracy and had suffered mightily for it, particularly under James II, who had tried him anew in 1686: imprisoned, fined, and publicly humiliated. Hampden had the opportunity in 1689 to declare before the committee that the conspiracy had been fabricated by royalists in order to destroy innocent men, namely Essex, Sidney, and Russell. Instead Hampden acknowledged the participation of elites in the conspiracy, and framed the story of the plot within an ‘old English’ struggle against tyranny. The Rye House plotters and the Monmouth rebels were, after all, doing nothing more than what the barons at Runnymede had done before them. Hampden labelled his dead friends liberators, and the forces that brought them to the scaffold, tyrannous. Rebellion was customary practice, as English as Magna Carta.

These few remarks do not amount to a grand teleological expression of English history. But they do show how keenly aware the first Whigs were of their place in history and of stylizing themselves as liberators. It was their retelling of the 1680s, particularly in the years immediately following the Revolution, that informed subsequent versions. A good example from the popular press are the Whig martyrologies published in 1689, 1693, and 1705.<sup>24</sup> Written primarily by the Whig poet and journalist, John Tutchin, who had himself participated in Monmouth’s Rebellion, the martyrologies were modelled on John Fox’s *Acts and Monuments* and contained the last prayers and dying speeches of seventy-two martyrs, most of whom were among the rank and file of Monmouth’s ragtag army. These were by no means sophisticated books; they were meant for popular consumption. Still Tutchin’s little

books had a significant influence over the writing of subsequent Whig history. His story of the ‘bloody assizes’ in the west, with its demonization of James II’s officials, became the standard account of what happened following Monmouth’s failed invasion in the spring of 1685. Further, while Tutchin glorified all the Rye House martyrs, he reserved his highest praise for Lord Russell, the true darling of these popular collections, and as we shall see, the foremost idolized Whig hero.

At a more sophisticated level, we find the propagating of a decidedly Whig version of events in many of the national histories and personal memoirs written in the 1690s and early 1700s by first and second generation Whigs. History was the Whigs’ most favoured literary genre. In the 1680s, they had used it to revise the medieval past – extolling the virtues of Saxon liberties; denying the Norman conquest; and asserting the original contractual nature of the English polity. Thus already familiar with its propaganda value, Whigs in the 1690s and early 1700s used it to reiterate basic Whig ideology and write the story of the Revolution. Three of these histories, consulted time and again by subsequent historians, were: White Kennett’s *The Complete History of England* (1706); Laurence Echard’s *The History of England* (1707–18); and John Oldmixon’s *The History of England during the Reigns of the Royal House of Stuart* (1729–39).

Unlike later publicists, these authors included the importance of the religious issues and divisions and roles of common Whig activists. In fact, Whigs like the Plotter, Robert Ferguson, loomed large in their stories of the pre-Revolution because they were made to bear the burden of the worst of the era’s political excesses. White Kennett’s history of the period was sympathetic to the Whig leaders, including the first earl of Shaftesbury and the duke of Monmouth. But of Ferguson, the man so often by the side of these men, Kennett repeated the worst slanders. Ferguson, the bloody-minded conspirator, had concocted the Rye House Plot in 1683, which had resulted in the deaths of Essex, Russell, and Sidney; and he had led the gullible Monmouth to his ruin in 1685. Further, Kennett asserted that Ferguson was an agent on the royal payroll, working for the destruction of the Whigs.<sup>25</sup> Although not nearly as partisan as Kennett or John Oldmixon, Laurence Echard also targeted Ferguson and those men (soldiers, artisans, barristers) among the lower echelon of Rye House conspirators as the only ones ‘bloody-minded’ enough to plot the assassination of the royal brothers. Both Kennett and Echard glorified the Revolution. Concluding his description of the events of 1688, Echard wrote, ‘thus was finished and completed the stupendous Revolution; a Revolution the most bloodless in beginning and progress, the most effectual in conclusion and consequences, that ever befell this powerful nation’.<sup>26</sup> The political machinations of commoners, like those of James’s officials in 1685, were ‘bloody’; but the Revolution, devised by its aristocratic handlers, was always ‘bloodless’.

John Oldmixon was a keen supporter of the Revolution. But of the Whig antiquaries, he was also the farthest from the events of the 1680s. With his

work the attention to religious issues and the lower strata of Whig activists begins to fade. From the outset he announced that his books would show 'how the royal house of Stuart . . . did endeavor to subvert the constitution and subject this kingdom to arbitrary power [ . . . and] that in the prosecution of their design, they met with vigorous opposition from the most virtuous and generous of the English nation, who asserted their liberty upon all occasions'. Of Charles II, Oldmixon wrote, 'The truth is, King Charles hated the constitution of England, as it is free and Protestant, and did not care what became of it, as long as his family was in the saddle'. James II's reign was but a 'confessed series of tyranny'. For Oldmixon, the Tories were the harbingers of popery and slavery while the Whigs were the certain champions of the constitution, liberty, Protestantism. He could not ignore Whig debacles: the Rye House Plot and Monmouth's Rebellion. But he too chose to blame them on royalist conspiracies or 'that arch-traytor and villain', Robert Ferguson, and others of his kind.<sup>27</sup>

Memoir-writers also crafted their narratives by emphasizing the constitutional nature of the Revolution and by celebrating Whig heroes and martyrs. The supreme source of the period sympathetic to the Whig struggle was Bishop Gilbert Burnet's *History of His Own Time*, first published posthumously by Burnet's son in 1724 and 1734.<sup>28</sup> Burnet's power as a propagandist in the 1690s has recently been explored by Tony Claydon.<sup>29</sup> But Burnet's more lasting legacy was as a memoirist of the period from 1660 to Queen Anne. He drew in particularly sharp relief the last years of Charles II's reign and those of James II, when he himself was active in opposition circles. As Horace Walpole put it, Burnet's detailed and intimate picture of the period gives the reader the impression that he has 'just come from the King's closet or from the apartments of the men whom he describes, and was telling the readers, in plain honest terms, what he had seen and heard'.<sup>30</sup> For the eighteenth-century historians, Burnet's influence was gigantic. In James Ralph's history, published in the 1740s, Burnet is referred to simply as 'the historian'.

The power of Burnet's memoirs, as well as the Whig martyrologies, is exemplified in their ability to portray the enemies of liberty. For the first Whigs were not only good at celebrating their elitist heroes, they were also very good at exaggerating their suffering and demonizing their opponents. The blackest villains of the conflict between the Stuart monarchy and the Whig opposition come out of the events that took place in the aftermath of the duke of Monmouth's failed rebellion. Chief Justice George Jeffreys' notorious campaign of vengeance known as 'the bloody assizes' gave the Whigs hundreds of fresh martyrs, including their first female sufferers. It also fully illuminated the true colours of James II and his ministers.

The stories of Colonel Percy Kirk's Tangier regiment, known sardonically as 'Kirk's lambs', are illustrative. Kirk's regiment helped round up and execute rebels in the wake of General Feversham's victory over Monmouth at Sedgemoor. The Whig martyrologist, John Tutchin, thought Kirk's behaviour

particularly barbarous and described him as executing nineteen men without trial and ordering music to play so that their wives and children could not hear their screams.<sup>31</sup> Burnet took this information and went further. He decided that it was Kirk's time in Tangier, 'by the neighbourhood of the Moors', that had made him 'so savage'. In Taunton, as prisoners were being hanged, Kirk and his company drank healths to each prisoner and 'observing the shaking of the legs of those whom they hanged, it was said among them, they were dancing; and upon that music was called for'.<sup>32</sup> In the eighteenth century, these powerful images were reiterated and further embellished. David Hume took Burnet's description and made it even more literary: 'colonel Kirke, a soldier of fortune, who had long served at Tangiers, and had contracted, from his intercourse with the Moors, an inhumanity less known in European and in free countries . . . as if to make sport with death, he ordered a certain number to be executed, while he and his company should drink the king's health, or the queen's, or that of chief-justice Jefferies. Observing their feet to quiver in the agonies of death, he cried that he would give them music to their dancing'.<sup>33</sup> Laurence Echard and White Kennett reported the highly fictionalized story of how Kirk promised to spare the life of a rebel if his maiden sister would lie with him. She agreed, but regardless Kirk had the brother hanged from the signpost in front of the house in which he defiled the girl, and where he drew back the curtains, 'presenting the credulous abus'd girl with that barbarous spectacle to his treachery and cruelty'.<sup>34</sup>

However the 'ravages of this barbarian', as Hume put it following Burnet, were nothing compared to those of 'violent Jefferies'.<sup>35</sup> Tutchin had described Jeffreys at the opening of the assize proceedings as one about to 'breathe death like a destroying angel and to sanguine his very ermines in blood'.<sup>36</sup> While Tutchin told numerous stories of Jeffreys' cruelty in the face of terrible suffering, Burnet added to them and described Jeffreys as being 'perpetually either drunk or in a rage'.<sup>37</sup> He further decided that Jeffreys had 'hanged about six hundred persons', a number he seems to have plucked from the air. Tutchin had already reported that the number was around 251, which historians today believe to be correct. Regardless, Burnet's number was repeated or further exaggerated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.<sup>38</sup>

The real target of blame, though, was the tyrannical King himself. Burnet made sure of this initially through an almost off-handed remark at the end of his first paragraph describing Jeffreys' behaviour: 'and the King was so well pleased with his proceedings that when he came back from so much bloodshed he created him a baron and peer of England'. Later Burnet portrayed James II as eager to know every gory detail of Jeffreys' progress in the west, even happily discussing the punishment of the rebels with foreign ministers. The Georgian historian John Millar, following Burnet, writes: 'regular accounts of those judicial proceedings were transmitted to James who was accustomed to repeating the several particulars with marks of triumph and satisfaction'.<sup>39</sup> For Burnet, as well as other Whig writers, it was important to

show that James's officials had not just run amok in the west, but that the King himself was in full complicity with those horrible events. James reacted to the news of Jeffreys' vengeance with a sort of ghoulish delight and handsomely rewarded his friend upon his return.

First-generation Whigs not only wrote villains into their saga, they also provided the next century with heroes to revere: among them were the martyrs of the Rye House Plot prosecutions; the followers of Argyle's and Monmouth's invasions; and even the Protestant Deliverer himself (although 'Dutch William's' legacy was certainly problematic). But eighteenth-century historians had their own ideas about who was worthy of hero worship and who was not. The two men who matched their ideals first and foremost were William, Lord Russell and Algernon Sidney. In the constellation of seventeenth-century stars, they stood out as the greatest hero-patriots. Yet their celebration in the eighteenth century is puzzling. After all, both men were cut off early in the struggle that culminated in the Glorious Revolution. Neither published anything before 1688 other than their dying speeches. When there were so many other men and women around them, more daring, more notorious to the public, more willing to publish their politics, outlawed, exiled, and imprisoned, why then these two?

Part of our answer lies in the fact that the eighteenth-century elites who wrote history depreciated the ideas and activities of non-elite party supporters. Nor did it matter to them that Restoration contemporaries would have been far more familiar with the Whig tenets of Robert Ferguson, who published over eleven tracts in the 1680s alone, than either Locke or Sidney. Political virtue, it seems, was not an attribute that they assigned to the preachers, soldiers, printers, shop-keepers, merchants, and barristers who printed, supported, defended (often with their lives) and who declared (often from the scaffold) the ideas and agenda of the Whig opposition. In the republican discourse of men like Sidney, virtue was the possession of a moral aristocracy. The dirty politicking at the street level, the religious enthusiasm, and the social class of so many of the Whig activists in the 1680s made them unfit for hero worship of the enlightened kind.

William, Lord Russell, had the virtue of a fine pedigree and had further distinguished himself in the years prior to his death by a good marriage, and by a few fiery pro-Exclusion, anti-papist speeches in Parliament. Along with the earl of Essex, Sidney, and a handful of other elites, he participated in a series of discussions in 1682 and 1683 in which the plan to assassinate the royal brothers at Rye House Mill was concocted. Upon its discovery, Russell was charged with treason and tried. Although he was inarticulate during his trial, Russell ensured his legacy with the dying speech he handed the sheriffs on the scaffold. The speech, published, and disseminated through Britain, was a rhetorical masterpiece, resonating with themes and tropes from the discourse of Protestant martyrdom. It helped transform the half-hearted conspirator into a patriotic liberator.<sup>40</sup>

It was not simply Russell's speech that created his legacy. For it was not really until the Revolution that Russell's image became larger-than-life. In the immediate post-Revolution era, Whigs did their utmost to mould Russell into a Protestant martyr and freedom fighter. Upon the floor of the House of Lords in the spring of 1689, Russell's former chaplain, the Reverend Samuel Johnson, told the committee investigating the Whig lord's death that 'He [Russell] was very sensible he should fall a sacrifice; and that arbitrary government could not be set up in England without wading through his blood'.<sup>41</sup> Russell's friends published numerous declarations of his innocence, declaring time and again that his execution was a 'judicial murder'.<sup>42</sup> But more telling was Russell's portrayal in more popular literature. In numerous penny broadsides like *An Account of the Pretended Prince of Wales* (1688) Russell was declared 'the most virtuous, noble, and innocent person'.<sup>43</sup> In the Whig martyrologies published in 1689, 1693 and 1705, Russell was the ultimate noble, Protestant, saint, hero. He – not Monmouth, not Sidney, and certainly not Shaftesbury – was the darling of these collections of vignettes of Whig sufferers of Stuart despotism.<sup>44</sup> Russell was further celebrated and acquitted of all wrong-doing in the post-Revolution histories of Kennett, Echard, Oldmixon, and James Ralph. Thus Oldmixon sobbed that while 'history rejects all intemperate thoughts and expressions, how can one see one of the most noble, most virtuous, most innocent and most beloved Lords that ever lived' brought to trial only to be murdered by 'forms of law', without 'horror'.<sup>45</sup> Little wonder that by 1784 two plays were published celebrating the life and death of the 'godlike Russell'.<sup>46</sup>

Russell was young, handsome, and manor born. He died a violent death. Sidney did too. In fact, it would seem easier for us to understand Sidney's glorification than Russell's. After all, here we have the author of the *Discourses*. But the rub is that the hero worship of Sidney was a product of the eighteenth century, not the seventeenth. Certainly, Sidney's Whig friends honoured the grand old man. But they were embarrassed by him as well. Sidney was far too associated with the chaos and topsy-turvy world of the Civil Wars and Republic. Most of the first Whigs were not republicans and wanted to distance themselves from that era as much as possible. Sidney's final loving embrace of the 'Good Old Cause' in his dying speech was mortifying for them.<sup>47</sup> Sidney's fate was not forgotten by Whigs following the Revolution.<sup>48</sup> The martyrologists were kind to him. But Sidney's true apotheosis would have to wait until after the publication of the *Discourses* in 1698 and even more so to a more distant time when the English were more eager to revile the tyranny of the Restoration than the violence of the Civil Wars.

What about John Locke? Late eighteenth-century intellectuals were certainly fond of him, first as the author of the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, and, increasingly so in the second half of the century, as the author of the *Two Treatises*.<sup>49</sup> But Locke was not worshipped by the first Whigs and their immediate predecessors. For despite Richard Ashcraft's

effort to place Locke in the midst of every conspiracy in the 1680s, he was not remembered by the first Whigs themselves as being an integral player in their cause.<sup>50</sup> It is true that Locke was expelled from Cambridge in 1683 and absconded to Holland where he frequented the haunts of Whigs, Dissenters, and Monmouth followers. But more importantly, Locke was never outlawed, never imprisoned; nor did he join the invasions of either Argyle or Monmouth. He only published his political ideas after the Revolution . . . anonymously. In the 1690s and early 1700s he was rarely mentioned by either first- or second-generation Whigs.<sup>51</sup> He is nowhere to be found in the Whig martyrologies. The histories of Kennett, Echard, Oldmixon and even Burnet fail to notice him. In the trial of Dr Sacheverell in 1710, which was designed to uphold the Whig interpretation of the Revolution, Whig prosecutors never mention the *Second Treatise*. Trenchard and Gordon's *Cato's Letters*, that rich depository of republicanism published between 1720 and 1723, only refer to Locke three times and only once in connection with his political thought.<sup>52</sup> Locke, writes Peter Laslett, 'carefully expunged from all his records every overt mention of this book [the *Two Treatises*]'. Even in his own library, Locke placed it under 'anonymous'.<sup>53</sup> Locke, it seems, helped to write himself out of the conspiratorial politics of the late seventeenth century.

It is also telling to note just whom late eighteenth-century historians forgot to rank among the first Whigs. Anthony Ashley Cooper, the first earl of Shaftesbury, is conspicuously missing from their pantheon of seventeenth-century heroes. Charles James Fox summed up the attitude of many of his contemporaries in 1803, while writing his history, when he wrote to a friend that he was 'quite glad I have little to do with Shaftesbury; for as to making him a real patriot or friend to our ideas of liberty, it is impossible, at least in my opinion'.<sup>54</sup> Although recent work suggests that J. R. Jones exaggerated Shaftesbury's leadership among the first Whigs, it is still clearly evident that Shaftesbury was instrumental as an opposition leader in Parliament, as a political agitator, and as a patron of Whig hacks and ideologues, particularly during the crucial years of the Exclusion Crisis.<sup>55</sup> If there was ever a Whig who deserved recognition for his opposition to a Stuart monarch, it is Shaftesbury.

But if eighteenth-century Whigs had amnesia insofar as Shaftesbury was concerned, it is because their seventeenth-century predecessors had already begun the process of politically cleansing the first Whigs. Even by the time of the Glorious Revolution, Shaftesbury was being written out of Whig history. He was, writes K. H. D. Haley, 'an embarrassing skeleton in the cupboard, best left there in obscurity if possible'.<sup>56</sup> There are no laudatory portraits of him in post-Revolution propaganda. Whig martyrologists do not eulogize him; in fact, they barely mention him. While Kennett and Echard were fair to Shaftesbury, Burnet and Oldmixon cast him in darker hues as conniving and resentful, consorting with the likes of Robert Ferguson.<sup>57</sup> Why? In part, it is because Shaftesbury, like Sidney, had a long career, and Cromwell's long

shadow still tainted those it fell upon. But also because many of the tactics of Shaftesbury and Whig radicals during the Exclusion Crisis were thought best forgotten by the time of the Revolution: the tall tales of Titus Oates, the packing of juries, the perjuring witnesses, the sheriff's riot, the clubbing, the plotting, and the sleazy politics of desperation. These were not the memories that the stalwart Williamite Whigs of the 1690s wanted to pass on. Instead, the antics of Shaftesbury, Ferguson, Oates, and other such party men were forgotten; while stories of Stuart barbarism, bloody assizes, and a bloodless, glorious revolution were celebrated.

By the mid-eighteenth century, Georgian historians, using generally the same sources, established, elaborated upon, and reiterated the narrative, themes, tropes, and character studies that composed their new-modelled Whig history. English and Scots, conservatives and liberals, barristers and philosophers, these educated elites told basically the same story about the Restoration: one the age of Democratic Revolution and Enlightenment understood, appreciated, and could take pride in.

In the 1750s, David Hume published his highly popular, multi-volume *History of England*. Hume was certainly no card-carrying Whig. He detested John Wilkes and all demagogues and partisans. His history consistently identified seventeenth-century high culture with royalism; superstition and vulgarity with puritanism. He had nothing kind to say about the Civil War. Cromwell, the Republicans, and the Puritans were bigots and hypocrites, motivated either by selfish aims or furious zeal. Like modern revisionists, Hume did not believe that constitutional issues had precipitated the Civil War. But he did believe in a process of positive change over time and, in that sense, as John Pocock has pointed out, his history was 'deeply whig'.<sup>58</sup> For Hume, the Revolution of 1688/89 ended the conflicts of that century. The Glorious Revolution was a singularly happy event: 'We, in this island, have ever since enjoyed, if not the best system of government, at least the most entire system of liberty, that ever was known amongst mankind'.<sup>59</sup>

Hume was also deeply sympathetic toward selective Whigs, particularly the elites. Of Lord Russell's execution, Hume eulogized, 'his melancholy fate united every heart, sensible of humanity, in a tender compassion for him . . . The integrity and virtuous intentions, rather than the capacity, of this unfortunate nobleman, seem to have been the shining parts of his character'. Sidney, the soldier-republican, was portrayed by Hume, as he was so often by others, as a 'gallant person . . . full of those ideas of liberty which he imbibed from the great examples of antiquity'. His execution was 'one of the greatest blemishes' of Charles II's reign.<sup>60</sup> Hume was hardly alone in his veneration of Russell and Sidney. Their violent deaths garnered even greater respect and teary sympathy from Whig personalities like Charles James Fox. 'Thus fell Russell and Sidney', lamented Fox, 'two names that will, it is hoped, be for ever dear to every English heart. When their memory shall cease to be an object of respect and veneration, it requires no spirit of

prophecy to foretell that English liberty will be fast approaching to its final consummation'.<sup>61</sup>

Fox's *A History of the early part of the Reign of James II* (1808) was, in many respects, an ultra-whiggish reply to Hume. Fox felt that Hume had been far too friendly to princes in his history, particularly James II, who had attempted to establish 'that system which had been pursued by all the Stuart Kings', civil despotism. The lesson gained from seventeenth-century history was the necessity of the people to always be 'vigilant' of the 'power of the crown'. The best illustration of that lesson did not come from the mid-century conflict between king and parliament, but from the reigns of the later Stuarts. Fox felt that Charles II had nearly been 'successful in subduing his subjects, and eradicating almost from the minds of Englishmen every sentiment of liberty'. The Whigs alone possessed any 'just notions of liberty'; their creed was 'justice, benevolence and equality'.<sup>62</sup> Of the infamous Rye House Plot, a Whig conspiracy to assassinate Charles II and the duke of York, Fox confidently asserted that no one now believes in the guilt of 'the conspirators of higher ranks'. The noble heroes, Russell, Sidney and Essex, would certainly not have sullied themselves with the half-baked assassination plans of preachers and barristers. But their trials were fixed, the verdicts foregone conclusions. Of Russell's death, Fox lamented, 'the story of the last days of this excellent man's life fills the mind with such a mixture of tenderness and admiration that I know not any scene in history that more powerfully excites our sympathy or goes more directly to the heart'. Yet 'within five years from the death of Sidney arose the brightest era of freedom known to the annals of our country', ushered in by the Glorious Revolution.<sup>63</sup>

The Scottish professor of law, John Millar, agreed with Fox. In his *Historical View of the English Government* (1787), he also declared that the struggle behind the Revolution was essentially constitutional, and that the Whigs were the great preservers of English liberty. 'While the King [here, Charles II] was thus advancing with rapid strides in the extension of his prerogative, we may easily conceive the disappointment, indignation, and despair of those patriots who had struggled to maintain the constitution'.<sup>64</sup> Their recourse to 'violent measures in defence of their natural rights, is not surprising'. Regardless, Millar asserted that the heroes, Russell and Sidney, were ignorant of any assassination plot. True they may have casually discussed some insurrections plans, but they were not to be blackened with the plotting of regicide.<sup>65</sup> Millar was also certain that the translation of French sources by Sir John Dalrymple, showing that Sidney had been a pensioner of Louis XIV, was dubious.

Millar was more civil toward his compatriot and fellow barrister, John Dalrymple, than most other Whig contemporaries, who found his *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, first published in 1771, an outrageous attack on the first Whigs. Dalrymple's translation of letters of the French ambassadors to the late Stuart courts showed that Charles II was not the only one receiving subsidies or conspiring with Versailles. Sidney, Russell, and Shaftesbury, among

others, had all intrigued with the French King.<sup>66</sup> But the besmirching of these good patriots was not readily believed or taken kindly by those who saw them as more than mere politicians. Horace Walpole, for one, found Dalrymple's revelations about Russell and Sidney, and his straightforward account of the designs of the Rye House Plotters, simply preposterous. Dalrymple's history was but a 'base attempt to decry two of the most virtuous and favourite characters in our history – those martyrs to liberty, Algernon Sydney and Lord Russell'. Dalrymple was obviously trying to 'depreciate and calumniate all the friends of the Revolution'. Walpole even went so far as to suggest the complicity of George III who, he asserted, sent Dalrymple to France to sully 'the heroes who withstood the enemies of Protestantism and liberty!'<sup>67</sup>

Yet Dalrymple's history did indeed give a far more accurate picture of the complex and often dirty politics of the pre-Revolution era. Sidney had accepted bribes from the French, but so had many others on both sides of the political divide. The refusal on the part of eighteenth-century liberals to believe that their noble hero, Sidney, was on the take and somehow above the fray reflected their lack of understanding of the true machinations of Restoration politics. Moreover, Dalrymple did not exclude from his narrative, as had so many others, those Whig partisans of more humble origins who so often did the more odious work of politics: the clubbing and conspiring, the drawing up of declarations, and the propagating of Whig tenets. Dalrymple was certainly not kind to men like the Plotter, Robert Ferguson – a Whig propagandist, a Rye House conspirator, a Monmouth rebel, and a member of William of Orange's invading force – but he did not forget him. Even so, Dalrymple was a creature of his time and gave a thoroughly sympathetic account of the Rye House lords and of the Revolution. Of the upper echelon of Rye House conspirators, he wrote: 'This band of friends was composed of Lord Russell, illustrious from the nobility of his descent; of Hampden, deriving still greater lustre from the commoner his grandfather [John Hampden]; of Lord Essex, the friend of Russell; and of Algernon Sidney, who derived his blood from a long train of English nobles and heroes, and his sentiments from the patriots and heroes of antiquity'. He also understood that his revelations were bound to upset the Whig establishment, but he tried to assure them 'that when I found in the French dispatches Lord Russell intriguing with the court of Versailles, and Algernon Sidney taking money from it, I felt very near the same shock as if I had seen a son turn his back in the day of battle'.<sup>68</sup>

Most importantly, though, Dalrymple, like all of these eighteenth-century writers, believed that the Revolution had been about 'sav[ing] that blessed constitution'.<sup>69</sup> Religious concerns were secondary or minor within their narratives. As Fox put it, Tories who assert that the Glorious Revolution was simply about one King's Catholicism were wholly wrong: 'the lesson is very different as well as far more instructive'.<sup>70</sup> Rather, it was about sanctity of liberty and how it must always be vigilantly guarded against encroachments of tyranny. For many Georgian liberals, sympathetic first to the American bid for

independence and later to the opening stages of Revolution in France, 1688 represented England's commitment to social progress and political liberty.

Georgian historians were not particularly interested in late seventeenth-century religiosity. In part, this was the natural product of the very kind of history that they were writing. Whiggish history, after all, is essentially political history, concerned with the triumph of liberty, parliaments, and rights. Further, there were salient political reasons in the eighteenth century, particularly in the second half, that called for an interest in the constitutional issues of the 1680s. The reign of George III prompted Whig and reformers to recall the behaviour of their forefathers in their struggle against a meddlesome monarch. Radicals linked the English liberties supposedly won in 1688/89 with new demands for parliamentary reform, freedom of the press, and even the abolition of the slave trade.<sup>71</sup>

But perhaps more important was the simple fact that eighteenth-century enlightened intellectuals found religious enthusiasm unpalatable; it was, in a word, unfashionable. Thus the ferocious nature of antipopery and the crucial role of zealous nonconformity in the late Stuart era failed to command their attention. Their lack of sympathy for the confessional issues and conflicts of the seventeenth century often translated into misrepresenting or minimizing religious motivation or even ignoring it altogether. A prime example is the Popish Plot (1678-81). In the decades following the Glorious Revolution, as Jonathan Scott has shown, the extreme antipapism that made the plot a viable reality to contemporaries became increasingly incomprehensible to later historians.<sup>72</sup> For Hume, the plot is but a 'gross absurdity', swallowed by the credulous.<sup>73</sup>

But even more basic misunderstandings are manifest in the way Georgians interpreted the first Whigs' use of the term 'Protestant'. Whigs in the late Stuart era often talked about their cause as the 'Protestant cause'. The context in which they understood this word was the European Protestant Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. Most English were Protestants and as such they saw themselves as products of the Reformation with brethren throughout Europe, fighting a vigorous and malicious opponent, Roman Catholicism. In the late seventeenth century, the threat of Catholicism was intimately bound up with France, as the supreme Catholic power, and hence absolutist monarchy as well. 'Popery and slavery, like two little sisters', as Shaftesbury put it in 1679, 'go hand in hand, and sometimes one goes first, sometimes the other; but wheresoever the one enters, the other is always following close at hand'.<sup>74</sup> If Catholicism was joined with arbitrary government, so Protestantism became linked with liberty. But what did the first Whigs mean by 'liberty'? What was their 'Protestant cause'? First and foremost, it was not about the rights of mankind but rather about freedom from the superstition and idolatry they associated with Catholicism and from the arbitrary whims of popish kings. The 'Protestant cause', so the first Whigs repeatedly declared, was the desire not to institute anything new but to secure the 'true Christian religion' and the 'government established by law'.<sup>75</sup>

But in the eighteenth century the word 'Protestant' had a narrower meaning. If the first Whigs understood Protestantism in a European context, Georgians saw it in an essentially nationalistic one. 'Protestantism', writes Linda Colley, 'lay at the core of the British national identity'.<sup>76</sup> It became imbued with nationalistic pride. Where Georgian historians read 'protestant' in late Stuart sources they saw 'patriot'. When Lord Russell stood before Parliament in November 1680 and declared 'that if I should not have the liberty to live a Protestant, I am resolved to die one', he was thinking of the Marian martyrs before him and all Protestant sufferers throughout Europe.<sup>77</sup> But eighteenth-century historians understood this statement and others like it in more secular terms; for them, it was not unlike Patrick Henry's famous 'give me liberty or give me death', the fearless rhetoric of a more modern revolutionary. The Revolution was stripped of its more troublesome and antique associations; the struggles and sacrifices of the 1680s now became the simpler and steadfast foundations of national memory.

Building on the story conferred to them by the first Whigs, late eighteenth-century intellectuals remade the history of the Restoration to their liking. A measure of their success is the very paradigm that has imprisoned late Stuart scholarship over the last two hundred years. If liberal historians of the nineteenth century, as well as liberal, Marxist, feminist, and revisionist historians of the twentieth century, found the history of the early Stuarts and the mid-century crisis far more intriguing than the Restoration, it is because by the eighteenth century the struggles of Whigs and Tories had been cleansed of the voices, actions, and concerns of ordinary people; because the Restoration was portrayed as a more secular age wherein religious complexities and enthusiasm counted less; and because the second half of the seventeenth century was seen as the age of great thinkers, Locke and Sidney, and thus the domain of intellectual and political rather than that of social and cultural history. We can be thankful that the scholarship of the last quarter century has begun to rediscover the Restoration on its own terms, valuing the late Stuart era for what it was rather than what its predecessors wanted it to be.

*Purdue University*

MELINDA S. ZOOK

#### Notes

\* Earlier versions of this essay were given at the Midwest British Studies Conference at the University of Chicago, October 1999, and the British Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies in Aberdeen, Scotland, August 2000. I would like to thank Lois G. Schwoerer, Newton Key, and Johann Sommerville for their comments.

1 Timothy Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage: Interpretations of a Discordant Past* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995).

- 2 A classic example is G. M. Trevelyan, *England Under the Stuarts* (London, Methuen, 1930) which devotes ten of its fifteen chapters to the period between 1603 and 1660. More recently in David Underdown, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-century England* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996) five chapters cover the period before 1660 and one focuses on the late Stuarts.
- 3 John Brewer, *Party Ideology and Popular Politics at the Accession of George III* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1976); J. G. A. Pocock (ed.), *Three British Revolutions* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1982); Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715–1785* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- 4 H. T. Dickinson, ‘The Eighteenth Century Debate on the “Glorious Revolution”’, *History*, 61 (1976), 40–1.
- 5 Caroline Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman* (Cambridge, MA., Harvard University Press, 1961); Blair Worden, ‘Republicanism and the Restoration, 1660–1683’, and M. M. Goldsmith, ‘Liberty, Virtue and the Rule of Law, 1689–1770’, in David Wootton (ed.), *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society, 1649–1776* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1994); Robert Zaller, ‘The Continuity of British Radicalism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries’, *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 6 (1981), 17–38.
- 6 Mark Goldie (ed.), *The Reception of Locke’s Politics*, 4 vols (London, Pickering & Chatto, 1999); Annabel Patterson, *Early Modern Liberalism* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997); *Nobody’s Perfect: A New Whig Interpretation of History* (New Haven, Yale University Press, forthcoming 2002).
- 7 Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (New York, Norton paperback, 1965), pp. 3, 20. Also see Adrian Wilson and T. G. Ashplant, ‘Whig History and Present-centered History’, *Historical Journal*, 31 (1988), 1–16.
- 8 Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987); Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (eds), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1990); Richard L. Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1992); Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678–81* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994); Melinda Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England* (University Park, PA., Penn State Press, 1999); Janelle Greenberg, *The Radical Face of the Ancient Constitution* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001), see chapter 6.
- 9 J. G. A. Pocock, ‘Burke and The Ancient Constitution – A Problem in the History of Ideas’, *Historical Journal*, 3 (1960), 125–43.
- 10 Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (Indianapolis, The Liberty Fund, 1999), p. 153.
- 11 John Pocock, ‘The Myth of John Locke and the Obsession with Liberalism’, in J. G. A. Pocock and Richard Ashcraft (eds), *John Locke: Papers Read at the Clark Library Seminar* (Los Angeles, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1980), pp. 1–24; Martyn Thompson, ‘Significant Silences in Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government*: Constitutionalism, History, Contract and Law’, *Historical Journal*, 32 (1987), 275–94.

- 12 J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689–1720* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977), see pp. 1–20; Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and John Locke's Two Treatises* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1985). On the influence of Locke during the Revolution itself, see Lois G. Schwoerer, 'Locke, Lockean Ideas, and the Glorious Revolution', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 51 (1990), 531–48.
- 13 J. G. A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1957; reissue, 1987); Glenn Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution* (University Park, PA., Penn State University Press, 1992), p. 17; also see J. P. Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–40* (New York, Longman, 1986), pp. 86–110.
- 14 Robert Zaller, 'The Continuity of British Radicalism', p. 20.
- 15 William Petyt, *Ancient Right of the Commons* (London, 1680), pp. 74–5.
- 16 Janelle Greenberg, 'The Confessor's Laws and the Radical Face of the Ancient Constitution', *English Historical Review*, 104 (1989), 637.
- 17 A good example is the 1679–82 print war over the bishops' rights in parliament which took the form of a historical quest for parliament's medieval origins. See Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England*, pp. 40–2.
- 18 Sir Robert Filmer, *The Free-holders Grand Inquest* (London, 1679); George Hickes, *Jovian, Or an Answer to Julian the Apostate* (London, 1683), p. 202.
- 19 William Petyt, *Ancient Right of the Commons*; William Atwood, *Jani Anglorum facies nova* (London, 1680).
- 20 Zook, *Conspiratorial Politics*, on the Rye House Plot, pp. 103–9; on Monmouth's *Declaration*, pp. 131–4.
- 21 Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange's Descent into England* (London, 1688), pp. 13–14.
- 22 Worden, 'Republicanism and the Restoration', pp. 158–9.
- 23 H.C. Foxcroft (ed.), *The Life and Letters of George Savile, Bart. First Marquis of Halifax* (London, 1898), 2 vols, II, 95.
- 24 *A New Martyrology or the Bloody Assizes* (London, 1689); *A New Martyrology or the Bloody Assizes* (London, 1693); *The Western Martyrology, or the Bloody Assizes* (London, 1705). I have written about these books at some length in "'The Bloody Assizes": Whig Martyrdom and Memory after the Glorious Revolution', *Albion*, 27 (1995), 373–96.
- 25 White Kennett, *A Complete History of England* (London, 1706), 3 vols, III, 408–9, 438. Ferguson's conversion to Jacobitism in 1690 and his identification with the worst excesses of the 1680s made him someone from whom the Whigs anxiously wished to distance themselves. Kennett's assertion that Ferguson had always been in league with the Stuart court is probably based on Whig attempts to smear him in the 1690s.
- 26 Laurence Echard, *The History of England* (London, 1707–18), 3 vols, III, 1150.
- 27 John Oldmixon, *A History of England during the Reigns of the Royal House of Stuart* (London, 1730), 3 vols, III, 781, 631, 312, 702.
- 28 Subsequent editions of *History of His Own Time* were published in 1725, two more in 1735; one in 1753; and another 1766. In addition, six extracts from Burnet and one abridged edition were published in the eighteenth century.
- 29 Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996).

- 30 Walpole quoted in David Allen, 'Introduction' to Bishop Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, abridgement by Thomas Stackhouse (Rutland, VT., Everyman's Library, 1979), p. v.
- 31 Tutchin, *The Western Martyrology* (London, 1693), p. 216.
- 32 Burnet, *History of His Own Time* (Oxford, 1933,) 6 vols, III, 58–9 (hereafter, cited as *HOHOT*). Kennett tells the same story, *A Complete History*, III, 434.
- 33 David Hume, *The History of England*, 6 vols (Indianapolis, The Liberty Fund, 1983), VI, 462.
- 34 Echarde, *History of England*, p. 1068; Kennett, *A Complete History*, III, 434. Hume's prosaic account is worth quoting: 'A young maid pleaded for the life of her brother, and flung herself at Kirke's feet, armed with all the charms, which beauty and innocence, bathed in tears, could bestow upon her. The tyrant was inflamed with desire, not softened into love or clemency. He promised to grant her request, provided that she, in her turn, would be equally compliant to him. The maid yielded to the conditions: But after she had passed the night with him, the wanton savage, next morning, showed her from the window her brother, darling object for whom she had sacrificed her virtue, hanging on a gibbet . . .', *The History of England*, VI, 462–3. St Augustine tells a similar story about a Roman soldier, and Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* contains a similar plot.
- 35 Hume, *The History*, VI, 463.
- 36 Tutchin, *The Western Martyrology*, p. 250.
- 37 Burnet's claim that Jeffreys was perpetually drunk is suspicious. Burnet, *HOHOT*, III, 59. Nonetheless, it is repeated in James Savage, *History of Taunton*, originally written by Joshua Toulmin in 1791 (Taunton, 1822), pp. 501–11; Hume, *History of England*, VI, 463; John Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1790), 3 vols, I, 199.
- 38 Burnet, *HOHOT*, III, 60; Robin Clifton, *The Last Popular Rebellion* (New York, St Martin's Press, 1984), p. 239; Fox, *The Second Part*, p. 123; Armand Carrel, *History of the Counter-Revolution in England* (London, 1846), p. 198.
- 39 John Millar, *A Historical View of the English Government* (London, 1787), p. 419; Burnet, *HOHOT*, III, 60–1.
- 40 'The Paper Delivered to the Sheriffs by my Lord Russell', in *A Complete Collection of State Trials*, ed. T. B. Howell (London, 1816), 22 vols, IX, 689–91.
- 41 *Journals of the House of Lords*, XIV, 381.
- 42 John Hawles, *Remarks upon the Tryals of . . . Lord Russell* (London, 1689); Robert Atkyns, *A Defense of the Late Lord Russell's Innocency* (London, 1689) and *Lord Russell's Innocence further Defended* (London, 1689); Henry Booth, *The Late Lord Russell's Case* (London, 1689).
- 43 *An Account of the Pretended Prince of Wales . . . [and] a short account of the murder of the earl of Essex* (London, 1688).
- 44 Tutchin, *Western Martyrology*, pp. 36–49.
- 45 Oldmixon, *History of England*, III, 680. Russell himself declares in his dying speech that he was the victim of 'forms and subtilities [sic] of law'. 'The Paper Delivered to the Sheriff', *State Trials*, IX, 694.
- 46 Thomas Strafford, *Lord Russell, A Tragedy* (London, 1784), prologue; also see *Russell: or The Rye-House Plot. A Tragedy* (London, 1784).
- 47 *A Very Copy of a Paper Delivered to the Sheriffs, upon the Scaffold . . . by Algernon*

- Sidney* (London, 1683). In the last sentence, Sidney thanked God that he died ‘for that OLD CAUSE in which I was from my youth engaged’.
- 48 See, for example, *Sidney Redivivus; or to the Opinion of the late Honourable Colonel Sidney as to Civil Government* (London, 1689).
- 49 The influence of Lockean political discourse on both sides of the Atlantic in the eighteenth century has been challenged in work such as that of J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1975) and John Dunn, ‘The Politics of Locke in England and America in the Eighteenth Century’, in John W. Yolton (ed.), *John Locke: Problems and Perspectives* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 45–80. I agree with Isaac Kramnick’s argument that while the influence of Locke’s politics in the early eighteenth century is minimal, *The Two Treatises* were certainly important to reformers and liberals in the second half of the century. See his ‘Republican Revisionism Revisited’, *American Historical Review*, 87 (1982), 629–64.
- 50 Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and John Locke’s Two Treatises*.
- 51 There were, of course, exceptions. In the 1690s, William Atwood’s *The Fundamental Constitution of the English Government* (London, 1694) referred to the *Two Treatises* as did James Tyrrell’s *Bibliotheca Politica, or An Enquiry into the Ancient Constitution . . . in Thirteen Dialogues* (London, 1694).
- 52 John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, *Cato’s Letters* (Indianapolis, The Liberty Fund, 1995), 2 vols, I, 370; II, 743, 808.
- 53 John Locke, *The Two Treatises of Government* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993), see Laslett’s introduction, p. 7; John Harrison and Peter Laslett (eds), *The Library of John Locke* (Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications, n.s., 1969), p. 43.
- 54 Fox, *A History of the early part*, Preface, pp. xli–l.
- 55 J. R. Jones, *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678–1683* (London, Oxford University Press, 1961); K. H. D. Haley, *The First Earl of Shaftesbury* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 498–652.
- 56 Haley, *Shaftesbury*, p. 216. The third Earl of Shaftesbury was devoted to his grandfather’s memory, but as Haley points out, his ill health ‘restricted in participation in politics to little more than exercise of his influence at local elections’, p. 216.
- 57 Oldmixon, *History of England*, III, 653, 679; Burnet, *HOHOT*, II, 349, 357.
- 58 J. G. A. Pocock, ‘The Significance of 1688: Some Reflections on Whig History’, in Robert Beddard (ed.), *The Revolutions of 1688: The Andrew Browning Lectures, 1988* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 287.
- 59 Hume, *The History of England*, VI, 531.
- 60 *Ibid.*, VI, 434–5, VI, 436–7.
- 61 Fox, *A History of the early part*, p. 50.
- 62 *Ibid.*, pp. 103, 79, 156, 167.
- 63 *Ibid.*, pp. 50, 58.
- 64 John Millar, *An Historical View of the English Government*, first published in 1787 and dedicated to Fox, 4 vols (London, 1803), III, 403–4.
- 65 *Ibid.*, p. 405.
- 66 Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, for a list of the pensioners, see vol. I, Appendix, pp. 381–3.

- 67 *The Last Journals of Horace Walpole* (London, 1910), 2 vols, II, 238, 271, 272–3.  
68 *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, I, 24–5; Original Preface, p. xxiv.  
69 *Ibid.*, Original Preface, p. xxii.  
70 Fox, *A History of the early part*, 103.  
71 Kathleen Wilson, ‘Inventing Revolution: 1688 and Eighteenth-Century Popular Politics’, *Journal of British Studies*, 28 (1989), 360; Caroline Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*, pp. 320–77; John Brewer, *Party Ideology and popular politics*, pp. 163–201.  
72 Jonathan Scott, ‘England’s Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot’, in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, Mark Goldie (eds), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, pp. 108–31.  
73 Hume, *The History of England*, VI, 340.  
74 Quoted in Haley, *Shaftesbury*, p. 510.  
75 Thomas Hunt, *The Great and Weighty Consideration relating to the duke of York* (London, 1680), p. 14; James Tyrrell, *Patriarcha non Monarcha* (London, 1681), preface.  
76 Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging a Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1992), p. 369.  
77 Quoted in B. D. Henning (ed.), *History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1660–1690* (London, The History of Parliament Trust, 1983), 3 vols, III, 1219.

Address for Correspondence

Dr Melinda S. Zook, Department of History, Purdue University, 1358 University Hall, West Lafayette, IN 47907-1358, USA, e-mail: mzook@purdue.edu