

Public ritual, martial forms and the Restoration of the monarchy in English towns

The Restoration settlement undoubtedly initiated a major shift in the logistics of state government. However, the transition to a new political, religious and social/cultural context was far from absolute. Attempts to reinstate pre-war conventions were only partial and the legacies of the sixteen-forties and sixteen-fifties remained eminently accessible.¹ This article uses the lens of public ritual to explore these circumstances from a new, and distinctly urban, perspective. Through an analysis of the provincial ceremonies used to mark both the Restoration of King Charles II in May 1660 and his coronation the following April, it highlights substantial irregularities in the cultural life of urban centres whilst emphasising the high visibility of military symbolism and prominence of both professional soldiers and civilian defence forces. This is an especially remarkable observation when we consider that the number of independent garrisons was now greatly reduced and professional soldiers only really accepted as a routine facet of urban life in certain coastal towns.²

Focusing on both the diversity of ceremonial experience and the saturation of public ritual with martial imagery, the following analysis reveals how a broad range of urban governors could respond to a challenging heuristic context through the creative application of performative practice. This phenomenon was, in part, a response to the fluid status of the military at the moment of transition. Indeed, by May 1660, the state was engaged in a struggle to resolve the issue of the Old Army left standing from the previous administration. As David Appleby has emphasised, the king's supporters were forced to confront the reality that 'the military capacity of the well-equipped, well-drilled Commonwealth regiments far outstripped their own'.³ As a result, intense scrutiny was placed on the figure of the soldier and larger concerns raised over the practical logistics of a peaceful settlement.⁴

These fears reflected wider anxieties linked to the nature of government in the provinces and, in addition to the ongoing problem of demobilisation, ensured that measures were taken to reinvigorate the authority of the county militia, a part-time civilian defence force consisting of officers from the gentry and common militiamen from the respectable middling sort. The return of this group into the hands of the (royalist) gentry from March 1660 had been of critical importance in the public legitimisation of the new settlement. The figure of the militiaman also provided a helpful alternative to the threatening spectre of the demobilised parliamentary veteran. The prominence of trained bands in the public rituals of Restoration was part of a wider process of cultural refashioning that attempted to underscore links with royal authority and reimagine the soldier as a more palatable representation of a ‘gentry-dominated society’.⁵

Still, the relative meaning of soldierly involvement remained unstable. In addition to former parliamentarian troops and the newly assembled trained bands, another group of armed civilians participated in the rituals of May 1660 and April 1661. These were the volunteer troops privately raised and financed as a shadow force to the county militia. Their involvement has, up until now, remained obscured. Significantly, this body was ultra-loyalist and, due to their independent status, less easily controlled by state authorities. When the rituals of Restoration required participation from any combination of these martial ‘groups’, violent clashes remained a distinct possibility. Nonetheless, the coordinated participation of militia, volunteers and professional soldiers *could* be harnessed to provide a practical and symbolic defence of existing power structures. This present study is the first to identify the involvement of these volunteer troops in moments of large-scale ritual practice. It is also the first to emphasise the continued prominence of military vocabularies as a core constituent of ceremonial activity *after* the transition of May 1660.⁶

Whilst previous analyses of Restoration urban communities have debated the extent and motivation of reform in the localities, there have been no comparable assessments of public

ceremony. Most often, the period following the king's return has been categorised by the disintegration of communal sociability and development of new ritual pursuits bound to elite society.⁷ Scholarship dealing specifically with public ritual in the sixteen-sixties has focused almost exclusively on the nature of royal charisma. Anna Keay used evidence of the 'ceremonies of power' to initiate 'a ritual biography of Charles II'.⁸ Likewise, both Jonathan Sawday and Kevin Sharpe have underscored how symbolic performance was actively embraced by the new head of state to camouflage tensions and foster political legitimacy.⁹ Brian Weiser's study of Charles II's progresses provided a basic overview of ritual experience in select towns although the emphasis was placed squarely on the king himself as opposed to those urban representatives that he encountered.¹⁰ Whilst these works do give general consideration to the popular reception of regime change, there have been no sustained attempts to bring the decision-making of local governors into the foreground.¹¹

In order to remedy this imbalance, the following discussion begins by considering the predicament facing the restored monarchy in May 1660, underscoring the particular relevance for urban centres. It then moves on to assess the basic ceremonial experience of the proclamation before unpacking the significance of military symbolism in a range of towns. The same two-part structure is applied to the ceremonies marking the coronation in April 1661 to give a new perspective on regime change that illuminates both the continued capital of ritual practice and the sustained relevance of a form that developed as a distinctive aspect of *sixteen-fifties* ceremonial convention.¹²

Charles II was formally named king on 8 May 1660. Despite not entering his capital until the 29th, the whole month was given over to lavish ceremonial display.¹³ The proclamation itself was first read in Parliament before being taken through the streets of London in procession by the Lords and Commons. According to contemporary observer James Heath, a 'numberless

number' of bonfires were made that evening and 'all the Bells in the City rung'.¹⁴ Comparable scenes of rejoicing were noted in towns across the country.¹⁵ Melton Mowbray burned its bonfires for three days, festivities at Norwich lasted for nearly a week and all of Oxford was reportedly 'perfectly mad'.¹⁶

Behind this jubilant veneer however lay a more strained reality. Not only was mass celebration an opportunity for drunken misbehaviour and potential insurrection, but local officers, particularly those who had remained in government from the republican regime, were left especially vulnerable to accusations of misplaced authority.¹⁷ It is hugely significant that those individuals responsible for orchestrating the ritual honouring of the king in the spring of 1660 were, overwhelmingly, those who had been in office during the previous decade. Nonetheless, corporations were still expected to display their loyalty to the new monarch and were usually keen to do so as a way of attempting to preserve their independence. Fidelity was expressed through lavish celebration, addresses of support and the renewal of fee-farm rents.¹⁸ In spite of the palpable strain which characterised urban government in this context, the vast majority of the ceremonies chosen to mark the Restoration operated on an impressive scale.

The basic experience centred on the public reading of the proclamation by the civic elite dressed in their formalities. Some processional element was also required as corporate officers moved from the physical site of their government, most likely the guildhall, to the space assigned for the reading, frequently the market place. Special sermons were organised and money laid aside to provide for popular entertainment through the lighting of bonfires and ringing of bells. Crucially, this basic model was often embroidered with more unique events which rooted celebrations in a distinctly local framework.

For example, the scaffold erected at Worcester was 'encompassed with green, white, and purple' to represent the colours of Charles as prince and king.¹⁹ At Sherborne in Dorset a hundred 'maidens' processed 'hand in hand about the streets' wearing white waistcoats.²⁰ The

proclamation at Hereford saw the various ‘Companies of Trade’ join the corporate officers ‘with their several Ensins and streamers’. A gallery of ‘about 40 foot square’ was specially built, emblazoned with the king’s arms and the arms of the city.²¹ At Winchester, the scaffold was accompanied by ‘a Room built on purpose, somewhat above’ where the ‘Cathedral Singing-men’ and ‘other Musical Gentlemen’ delivered ‘a Solemn Antheme’. After the song had finished, ‘money was liberally thrown about the streets from the Scaffold and Windows’.²² These accounts demonstrate the capacity for a broad range of responses to the basic ceremonial requirement. Clearly, there was no definitive blueprint and ritual orchestrators were left relatively free to decide how best to communicate their ‘loyalty’ on a public stage.

A particularly interesting snapshot of this local autonomy can be found with reference to the ceremonies enacted at Gloucester. This was a town with an entrenched reputation as a centre for parliamentary support typified most directly by its famed resistance to royalist siege in 1643. The corporation had a vested interest in utilising the proclamation as a means of courting a more favourable relationship with central government. Perhaps unsurprisingly then, celebrations were especially extensive.²³ On the day in question, common councilmen arrived at the town hall or ‘Tolsey’ with ‘the masters of the company and all officers belonging to the city’ before processing to the cathedral for dinner and returning ‘in their Gowns’. The mayor, council and sheriffs then moved to a stage placed at the north end of the wheat market, the mayor sat on a special chair ‘with the Kings Arms over his head’ alongside ‘six fair Gentlewomen, each of them holding a garland’. The visibility of the civic elite richly clothed and processing to the physical hub of corporate and ecclesiastical authority underscored both allegiance to the crown and the projected unity and strength of the corporation.²⁴ At nightfall, the sky was lit up with fireworks which ran in a line ‘from the Tolsey to the South end of the Wheat-Market’.²⁵ This description, taken from the newsbook *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, can be corroborated with evidence from Gloucester’s civic records.

The accounts of city chamberlains cite expenditure of £2 6s 8d on ‘5 hundred faggots’ for the bonfires alongside payment for the making of fireworks and ‘to a workman for fitting the conduits with wine’.²⁶ At the restored cathedral, money was spent on the ringers, the ‘singing men’ and for a large ceremonial bonfire in the close.²⁷ Common council minute books also note a substantial outlay on new civic regalia with over £74 spent on ‘the 4 new maces & for altering the scabbard of the best sword ouer & aboue the summe allowed for the old Maces & sword’.²⁸ A statue of Charles II was erected near the market house and the arms of the king, the duke of York and the duke of Gloucester set up ‘at the Southgate’. The choosing of this location, a principal entrance into the town and the site of the famous post-siege memorial, was a deliberate attempt to confirm the advent of a new era in urban government.²⁹

The gate itself had been destroyed during the besieging of the town in 1643 and its replacement adorned with an emotive inscription ‘placed in large characters... round the arch on the outer side’ which read: ‘A city assaulted by man but saved by God ever remember the Fifth of September, 1643, give God the glory’.³⁰ Whilst the old engraving was not removed until 1671, the corporation did remove part of their own civic records from the revolutionary period in an attempt to curate their public memory.³¹ Still, it is hugely significant that a visible memorial to Gloucester’s deliverance from a royalist siege occupied the same space as that which lauded the restored monarchy for over a decade, a fitting metaphor for the continued relevance of older (and potentially problematic) symbols after the spring of 1660.

Broadening our focus, it remains evident that the ceremonial marking of the proclamation could not assuage popular anxieties over the logistics or longevity of the settlement. Indeed, the mayor of Lyme Regis, another town that had resisted royalist siege in the 1640s, implored local preacher Ames Short to publish his sermon delivered that day so ‘that those clouds of fears and doubting, which perhaps do sadden the spirits of many good people, may thereby be dispersed’.³² Although we have reports of bell ringing, salutes, and public

procession, the hedonism of popular revelry was staunchly condemned by Short who compelled his congregation to ‘for ever banish this Bacchanalian custom from this and all other such like days of Solemnity’ and subscribe instead ‘to such a way of rejoycing as may be pleasing to God’.³³ Similarly, an anonymous letter from Newcastle dated 7 May 1660 expressed concern that ‘May-poles, and Playes, and Iuglers, and all things else now pass current; sin now appears with a brazen face’.³⁴ For the authors of these reports, the king’s imminent return represented a dangerous setback to the gains of godly activists.

Interestingly, the reading of the proclamation generated comparable fears of unleashed extremism in towns with a more conformist political and/or religious complexion. Indeed, a letter from the royalist stronghold of Newark recalled that the mayor of nearby Nottingham had seen the proclamation delivered in ‘all the usual places’ to the ‘astonishment of those few Phanaticks in town’. The report published in contemporary newsbook *An Exact Accompt* outlined how the announcement was given by the ‘Deputy Mayor’ who ‘was a Commissioner for Lambert and a King-hater as long as it was in fashion’. Despite the day being otherwise observed with a ‘solemn procession’ through streets ‘strew’d with green Boughs and Flowers’, ‘three or four fear’d Aldermen’ kept their heads covered during the commemorative sermon.³⁵ Examples such as these provide a useful counterpoint to the reports of enthusiastic joy so prevalent in the printed newsbooks. More importantly, they confirm that a range of individuals in England’s towns were fully aware of the ambiguities which plagued the new settlement and the particular challenges that would constitute the broader context of ritual orchestration.

Considering the pervasiveness of these anxieties, it is unsurprising that so much local ceremonial following the Restoration was suffused with defensive and martial imagery. The participation of armed men at formal ritual occasions offered a symbolic and practical defence of existing power structures and presented a striking means of confronting the threat of

disorder.³⁶ Fittingly then, numerous accounts of the ceremonies staged in May 1660 make reference to the ordered involvement of the local militia and the imitation of martial forms by a broader range of civilians.

For example, 500 armed men turned out on proclamation day at Norwich to be led through the streets by the local trained bands. Reports were made of ‘divers Gentlemen trailing pikes with them’, the Foot ‘making a guard’ to watch the procession of ‘about thirty parsons [sic] in their Gownes, then four Trumpets, six Drums, the City Waits, and the Mayors Officers’.³⁷ Although it is not clear from this report published in the newsbook *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, it is likely that these individuals, or at least a proportion of their number, may have been members of the abovementioned volunteers raised to supplement the county trained bands.

These were ‘arranged in troops’ and supplied with officers to drill them. As Joyce Lee Malcolm has emphasised, this was an ‘ingenious scheme’ that enabled the crown to take advantage of a zealous and self-funded body of ‘royalist stalwarts’ independent of the ordinary militia.³⁸ The suggestion that these troops were actively engaging in public procession is a significant new finding, not least as their status as a loyalist group of auxiliary vigilantes posed substantial challenges for those looking to maintain order and downplay tensions in an urban setting. Through the rituals of Restoration, local governors were able to harness the power of these militarised groups and use them to publically negotiate an intensely challenging political context.

Events at Norwich were witnessed by a huge crowd of onlookers. It was estimated that ‘ten thousand [filled] the Cross and all the Market place, besides those that lined the windows’. There was much ‘firing of muskets and Pistols’ in addition to the customary music, drums, bonfires and bells.³⁹ Even if we accept the likelihood of exaggeration in this printed report from *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, the editorial choice to highlight the presence of both militia

and volunteers reveals the value of this imagery in controlling the more unruly elements of the ritual.⁴⁰ The participation of civilians and corporation members styled in martial fashion broadened the scope of the ceremony and tethered the projection of order to the city itself and its distinct institutions.

Similar observations can be made with reference to the rituals staged in towns across the country. Although volunteer troops are not explicitly mentioned in the majority of accounts, county trained bands are repeatedly invoked as facilitators of both ordered jubilation and practical defence. Indeed, the corporation at Winchester processed to their cathedral accompanied by a military guard. Returning to the scaffold to deliver the proclamation, ‘the Musketeers gave a gallent Volley’ and ‘commanded’ silence.⁴¹ Similarly, the militia at Warwick were placed ‘in the end of the four streets about the Cross’ as ‘the great Guns from the Castle thundered in the air’.⁴² Governors at Tewkesbury went so far as to purposefully stage their own proclamation on a day when there ‘were very many to attend the Militia there’. This decision referenced the fact that it was ‘more seasonable at such a time to proclaim his Majesty’.⁴³ The high-visibility of the trained bands was approached as a means of showcasing their reinvigorated role under the lord lieutenants as both a statement of political loyalty and a confirmation of local cohesion.⁴⁴

Of course, the presence of armed men in the ceremonies of Restoration was far from universally stabilising. In light of the ongoing problem of demobilisation, staging the proclamation in towns that also supported a body of professional soldiers presented a particularly challenging predicament.⁴⁵ In a letter written from Kingston upon Hull to General George Monk, Sir Charles Fairfax, military governor of the town, relayed how the day was marked there with ‘very great solemnity’ despite ‘one soldier’ from the garrison who refused to fire his gun alongside the rest. This glitch did not appear to detract from the overall success of the day (‘a scaffold erected, the proclamation read, all of us attending in our best posture’),

although Fairfax ominously predicted that the individual in question ‘may give us the trouble to-morrow to cashier him’.⁴⁶

Nonetheless, the involvement of professional soldiers was still able to provide an alternative model of commemoration outside of a purely corporate response. Colonel Sheffield’s Regiment in Exeter staged their own ceremony at the castle before marching ‘through the city with all signes and tokens of joy’. It is worth emphasising that this report was crafted by royalist journalists who would have had a vested interest in presenting the situation in a positive light. Still, the parading of Old Army regiments to show their subservience to, and acceptance of, the new regime does seem to have been quite deliberate.⁴⁷ Moving through civic space into the town centre, these ex-parliamentarian soldiers participated in the larger celebrations of the locality and, by extension, defined their own presence as one which was, however fleetingly, embedded in projections of a more inclusive urban identity. To the same end, ‘the new raised Militia of the City’ were also placed at prominent positions in the town, leading the corporation through the city streets and trailing pikes ‘to express their great and loyal affections’.⁴⁸

Notwithstanding these symbolic depictions of concord, substantial anxieties remained over the mood of the army itself. The forced proximity of the Old Army with the newly-raised militia was thus exploited to promote an (albeit unstable) image of harmonious consensus which underscored the practical logistics of royal authority and attempted to foster a reassuring vision of order within the locality. In this way, public ritual enabled corporate officers, many of whom were uncertain of their position due to their involvement with the previous regime, to exploit the moment of transition as a means of reinforcing their political status.

This point is neatly reflected in the saturation of much ordinary civilian activity with martial imagery and military forms. At Sherborne in Dorset the ‘maids’ who moved through the streets

hand in hand were explicitly described as ‘marching’, ‘a woman beating the drum before them’.⁴⁹ The corporation members at Hereford moved ‘in good order’ to the market place to hear the news.⁵⁰ At Dursley in Gloucestershire, ‘a number of Maids’ came to dance on a platform the day after the announcement, ‘forming themselves into a Band, constituting a Captain, a Lieutenant and an Ensign’. They marched ‘in rank and file, each carrying a green Beechen bough with drums and trumpets’. A report published in the newsbook *Mercurius Publicus* relayed how they moved to a local hill where they toasted the king’s health before ‘marching back in good order to the Scaffold’ to continue ‘their jollity till midnight’. This performance was repeated the next day by ‘the Young men of the Town’ who similarly ‘framed themselves into a Militia’ to express their joy.⁵¹

Interestingly, the imitation of military forms was also a common tactic employed by early modern rioters who appropriated titles such as ‘captain’, marched in step to the beat of drum and held banners aloft in imitation of soldiers. Historians of social crime have speculated that this was a tactic designed to demonstrate to authorities that the rioters were in fact behaving in an orderly fashion and were not attempting to overthrow the social or political order.⁵² With reference to the public rituals enacted to mark the Restoration, it appears that similar forces were at work in encouraging participants to communicate their ‘loyalty’ to the new regime through this particular performative vocabulary.

Both the involvement of the trained bands and the imitation of martial forms could be harnessed to foster a sense of controlled jubilation. Just as the use of the militia presented a direct line of authority from the figure of the king via the lord lieutenants, the ordered involvement of local residents fashioned into mock regiments forwarded a tacit defence of corporate authority. Such a point also suggests that individual towns were able, and indeed expected, to exercise some degree of autonomy in the interpretation and expression of their ‘loyalty’ despite the ongoing threat of disorder.⁵³ One way of countering this strain was through

the presence of soldiers and civilian troops who derived their authority directly from the monarch. Still, even in the idealised depictions of contemporary print, displays of force were unable to obscure the prevalence of substantial anxieties over the permanence of the settlement and the unchecked enactment of the ritual process. The proclamation was an occasion when this tension might most naturally be made manifest.

The prominence of both armed men and military forms in May 1660 was not simply about control and security. From the perspective of the history of urban ritual, the heavy use of soldiers/imitation of soldierly practice had not been a prominent feature of pre-war experience. This was most likely the result of a general distrust of the army and the prevalence of fears over the essentially ambiguous figure of the soldier.⁵⁴ However, in a post-Restoration context, it became important to utilise military imagery as a means of confirming support for royalist government. This was particularly significant in light of problematic associations between the army and republican and Protectorate rule, and indeed, with the regicide itself. Crucially however, this was not simply a process utilised by the state and enforced upon unwilling corporate governors. Rather, urban authorities were active participants who appropriated the power of martial forms to present a fitting depiction of political loyalty that also emphasised their own authority. The remainder of this article will explore these themes with specific reference to the marking of the coronation.

On 23 April 1661, the king took centre stage in what royalist herald Sir Edward Walker described as an occasion ‘so great as no age has seen the like’.⁵⁵ Charles’ progress to his capital was performed as a triumphal entry, drawing on classical depictions to present the ruler as ‘epic hero’ returning to foster ‘unity, peace and prosperity’.⁵⁶ Ornate arches made of carved wood painted and hung with canvas were built at key sites along the route to chart the narrative of both the king and nation’s history bound to the city of London.⁵⁷ At each of the arches, actors

were placed ‘on high scaffold-stages, statue-like, but sometimes speaking’.⁵⁸ These erections replicated the formation of earlier coronations and further emphasised the importance of carefully adhering to the memory of royal precedent.⁵⁹ Unsurprisingly, the event drew an exceptionally large audience. According to Peter Heylyn, ‘the whole bravery of the nation seemed to be poured into the city and the whole city emptied into some few streets’.⁶⁰

Local authorities were charged with staging a suitably impressive event. As above, the ceremonies ordered to mark the coronation included a number of core features such as corporate procession, the decoration of public space, attendance at a special thanksgiving sermon and the provision of popular entertainment such as the lighting of bonfires and/or the running of conduits with wine. Funding these pursuits would naturally require a substantial outlay. As with the celebration of the proclamation, the elaborate nature of the rituals could place a serious strain on local finances.

For example, the corporation at Oxford spent money on wine and cakes, claret for the conduit, bread for the poor, the setting up of the king’s arms at the council chamber and the altering of the great mace.⁶¹ The day itself was meticulously planned and encompassed involvement from a wide range of individuals (gentry, militia, the local poor, ecclesiastical and secular authorities) who each maintained a stake in proceedings and, by extension, the ‘honour of this Citty’.⁶² Over the following weeks, councillors gravely noted that they had ‘grown into debt by reason of many extraordinary late disbursem[en]ts’.⁶³

In cases such as this, financial strain was exacerbated by the tacit requirement to exceed the outlay of comparable republican events. Indeed, with reference to disbursements noted at Chester in 1661, herald painter and former-mayor Randle Holme II reported that although they ‘were in a happy condition by reason of the enioying of a good & gracious King’, local residents also ‘vnderwent many sore & heauy taxations for Citty affaires & other publicke concernments’.⁶⁴ Nonetheless, expensive ritual and the credit which it could bring were clearly

conceived of as being worth the heavy price tag. Substantial sums of money were set aside to enable the enactment of an impressively varied catalogue of ceremonial pursuits. Once again, there was no set blueprint and urban authorities demonstrated their creativity in administering a diverse range of events across the country.

At Bath ‘four hundred Virgins’ entered the Abbey church to usher the mayor’s wife to her seat before the sermon. The guildhall was decorated for the occasion with ‘four Streamers bearing the Kings Armes, and the Royal Oak [the tree in which Charles II had hidden to escape following the battle of Worcester in 1651] mounted upon the four Pinacles of the Hall’.⁶⁵ In this instance, the corporation worked to graft the image of the king onto the honour of the city through the ordered participation of its inhabitants and the striking embellishment of civic buildings.

The decoration of urban space featured as a central constituent of coronation celebrations elsewhere too. Boughs, rushes and flowers brought the countryside into the town and created a liminal zone cut off from normal ‘workaday relationships’.⁶⁶ Likewise, the running of wine from conduits, the lighting of bonfires and the ringing of bells contributed to the temporary transformation of the city into a stage. At Cambridge ‘the town was strewed with green herbs, the windows hanged with Tapistry, Pictures and Garlands, with much Plate and Jewels’.⁶⁷ The market town of Harleston in Norfolk was ‘in one night contrived into a Wood, (so many great Trees shot up in the morning, where the day before grew not one twig)’. Streets were strewn with flowers and ‘every house’ strived to outdo the rest with their adornments of ‘many and rich Garlands’.⁶⁸ The meaning of such transformation however remained unstable and was open to manipulation by a range of participants.

We find further evidence to this end in the public presentation of symbolic objects linked to the old and new regimes. Indeed, at Wycombe in Buckinghamshire, four poles were set up ‘in four principall places of the Town’, each surrounded by a ‘good store of faggots for

Bonfires'. Onto the first was affixed 'the Armes of the Old Rump', the second and third displayed effigies of Cromwell, and the fourth 'several orders of our Colonel, brought hither by his dog'. These symbols were subjected to ritual humiliation ('drawn through the Town in a dirty Wheelbarrough to the place of execution') before being fixed in place and set alight.⁶⁹ Civic officers at Weymouth provided for four poles 'about 30 foot high' to be 'railed in, with Tar-barrels to every post'. In the middle was raised a flag of the Commonwealth Arms which was set alight to 'A peal of 50 great Guns'.⁷⁰ This spectacle functioned to provide a controlled opportunity to engage with the more problematic elements of the recent past. Crucially, this was not a compulsory element of celebrations but was approached in certain instances as a means of enhancing the projection of popular support for the processes of dramatic redefinition.

The ceremonial destruction of those signs and symbols associated with Cromwellian power echoed the actions of state governors earlier in the year when the corpses of the regicides Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, Thomas Pride and John Bradshaw had been exhumed and publicly displayed as traitors. On 30 January 1661, the bodies of the men were dragged from Westminster to Tyburn on sledges, pulled out of their coffins and hung 'till the sun was set' before being beheaded and partially buried underneath the gallows.⁷¹ Such a visceral display subverted the choreography of royal procession and used it to mock the dead men in an unavoidable statement of the new political ascendancy.⁷² The crowning of Charles II less than three months later supplied fresh opportunity to partake in high-profile symbolic performance.

As such, a number of towns chose to burn effigies associated with the previous regime to enhance projections of concord between locality and centre. At Cambridge, Cromwell's likeness was fixed to a gibbet and set on fire. Although the decision had originally been made to wait until nightfall for the burning to commence, this plan was thwarted when a soldier 'about noon, fired it before the designed time all except the head'. Despite this occurrence, the remnants of the figure were fixed to the gallows where they 'stood all day till night' before

being set alight.⁷³ This example offers a useful reminder of the continued capacity for events to unfold along an unplanned and/or unofficial trajectory. The display of Cromwell's likeness at Cambridge was a provocative act which inspired intense (and potentially uncontrollable) emotion. Nonetheless, it is significant that order was maintained in part through the commitment to formally burn the figure's head later that evening. In this case, the ritual referenced the capacity for both unplanned and carefully orchestrated elements to combine in the commemorative experience of the locality. Meanings remained unstable and there was a persistent potential for subversive and/or transgressive appropriations. Still, corporate authorities demonstrated that they remained interested and able to execute a range of more complex and creative performances.

Perhaps the most remarkable of these was to be found at the Dorset market town of Sherborne. Here, alongside the usual features ('shouts and acclamations, and several volleys; the Conduits ran wine'), an elaborate mock trial was staged in front of a large and vocal audience.⁷⁴ It is worth emphasising here that Sherborne was a town that maintained a reputation for entrenched loyalty to monarchist government. David Underdown categorised it as 'the most solidly royalist of all west-country towns' being 'among the first to take arms for King Charles I'.⁷⁵ Perhaps understandably then, the ceremonies noted at the marking of the coronation were appropriately extensive. The account published in the newsbook *Mercurius Publicus* reported that the streets were so packed that 'thousands of people... were constrained to stay in the fields... The very earth did seem to quake, and the air to tremble at the mighty rending shouts'.⁷⁶ Although we need to be cautious of editorial exaggeration, there is no reason to doubt the particular form of the rituals enacted. Moreover, the very fact that they were translated to print confirms an assumed awareness that local communities would be able to creatively interpret the requirements of their ceremonial role and that readers would be able to accept this as a given.

Most unusually, the account revealed how, towards the end of the day, a pseudo High Court of Justice was enacted and ‘by a formidable Guard was brought a grim Judge or Lord President in a Blood red Roab, and a tie for his head of the same hue’. An ‘Attorney General’ and ‘Solicitor General’ were appointed alongside a jury who presided over the ‘accused’ (two effigies of the regicides John Bradshaw and Oliver Cromwell). In imitation of events in London that January, the figures were ‘endited of High Treason and murdering of the king, commanded to hold up their bloody hands, which for the purpose were besmeared with blood’. After their sentencing, ‘Bradshaw’ and ‘Cromwell’ were ‘dragged to the place of Execution’ and hanged upon two gibbets adorned ‘on both sides’ with ‘the States Arms’. As they swung above the crowds,

they were so hacked and hewed, so gored and shot throw, that in a short time but little remained, besides Cromwells Buff Coat and Bloody scarf, that was worth the burning. Yet would not the people be satisfied till they had made a fire between the Gibbets and burnt all they could get of their Garbage or Garments, and at last tore down the States Arms to help make up their funeral pile.⁷⁷

This account gives rich insight into the extent of performative autonomy in an individual town. Sherborne’s street theatre was genuinely popular in its invitation to participate in the administering of ‘justice’ to ‘the regicides’. The fact that it existed in conjunction with the more sedate daytime events reveals the dynamism of ritual forms within the same location and at the same occasion. Moreover, the complexity of the objects involved and the intricacy of their staging indicates some prior planning by those controlling the evening’s entertainment. The trial and execution at Sherborne engaged with national developments and consolidated urban identities through the creative righting of historic wrongs.

This incident interacted with a broader political framework whilst underscoring the particular vitality of performative experience in the locale, a process that enabled the transition to a new phase of town life through the depiction of symbolic resolution to historic injustices. Similarly, the ordered participation of professional soldiers, trained bands and volunteers allowed urban communities to engage with a complex national situation in a way that could also promote the legitimisation of power in their respective locales. As with the rituals enacted to mark the proclamation of the king's return in May 1660, urban governors of varied religious and political persuasion demonstrated that they were able to approach the requirements of this particular ceremonial moment actively and pragmatically. Further evidence to this end can be found in the saturation of ritual activity in April 1661 with distinctly martial forms.

In addition to the evidence of performative autonomy outlined above, the public ceremonies ordered to mark the coronation utilised a heavy military presence in a range of urban centres. The use of both professional and civilian troops functioned to present an image of harmony between civic and soldierly elements and enabled ritual orchestrators to project notions of stability and prestige in the immediate vicinity. As such, we find multiple accounts of urban governors working to initiate high-visibility markers of symbolic cohesion.

Most often this was supplied in the order for professional soldiers and/or trained bands to attend sermon and process alongside corporate officers. There are also numerous accounts of shared entertainment provided by civic officials for both freemen and troops.⁷⁸ At Melton Mowbray, the militia under the command of Sir George Villiers marched 'in military posture to the Church to hear Divine Service'. After the sermon had ended, Sir Henry Hudson, a local Baronet, 'entertained at his own charge all the persons of Honour and Quality', keeping 'open house' for the 'Trained-bands, and all the Country round about which came in'. A 'Fat Oxe' was roasted in the street with 'every one orderly sharing it'.⁷⁹ The bones of the carcass were

carried away as a symbol of harmony between the different groups 'to treasure up as Reliques'.⁸⁰ In this instance, the militia acted as a crucial intermediary between centre and locality that enabled the focus of the day to be broadened out from a closed corporate environment.

As shown above with reference to the marking of the proclamation in urban space, the use of soldiers to indicate local security would naturally be more problematic in those towns that also supported a body of professional troops. Still, attempts were made to depict cohesion through the processes of public ritual. At Kingston upon Hull, the officers of the garrison and the trained bands came to the mayor's house 'to accompany him to Church with loud Musick'. In addition to these military representatives there also walked 'all the Aldermen in their Scarlet and all that ever had born Office in their Gowns'. The streets were so full with observers 'that there was no more then a narrow lane left' to move through. Following the sermon, the same group marched to the Town Hall 'where was a gallant Dinner provided for all that had born Office, and for all the Officers of the garrison, most of the neighbouring country Gentlemen and Ministers being there also'. Thus, the occasion enabled the joining of a range of authority figures under the physical and ideological umbrella of 'the town'.⁸¹

Involvement from a broader military base at Hull was also noted as the trained bands joined a volunteer troop of horse in the market place 'all in rich Scarffes and other suitable accoutrements'.⁸² Once again, these volunteers may represent the ultra-loyalist auxiliaries raised as a shadow force to the local militia. The orderly participation of various military groups is especially significant as it suggests the capacity for the ritual moment to be harnessed to tame the more problematic and ambiguous elements of the political settlement.⁸³ In this case, the performance of cohesive loyalty between civic and martial factions was especially important owing to the problematic history of the locality.

Specifically, on 23 April 1642 Charles I had been refused entry into Hull by Governor Sir John Hotham following parliamentary command to hold the town and its weapons. This was a devastating humiliation for the then-king and marked a decisive turning point in the escalation of the civil wars. For this reason, the corporation in 1661 had a vested interest in using the rituals of Restoration to present an image of loyalty and stability through the orderly involvement of armed men.⁸⁴ Thus, the local militia and volunteers were compelled to guard ‘a large and stately Scaffold spread over with above sixty of the most considerable persons’. Both groups then ‘discharged their Musquets thrice with great shouts and acclamations’.⁸⁵ Staging the ceremony here effectively presented an opportunity for civilian troops to join in the same physical and ideological space of the town to emphasise both political conformity and the security of the vicinity.

The report of an anonymous eyewitness (most probably a member of the corporation) later published in *Mercurius Publicus* made explicit reference to the commendable deportment of those involved. The day was one of ‘innocent jollity, without any one mischance or disorder’. Regardless of the potential for textual exaggeration, it is telling that the account explicitly justified this point as being due in equal parts to ‘the discretion of the Mayor and Magistracy of the Town, the sobriety of the people and the excellent discipline of Colonel Gilby... and the Officers’.⁸⁶ By referencing the combined esteem of both corporate *and* military authorities, we are afforded further insight into the potential for large-scale public events to function on multiple levels as opportunities to confront instabilities operating in a more immediate framework.

Of course, it remained eminently possible that events might deviate from the planned trajectory and incorporate unintentional or subversive elements. In this instance the presence of soldiers could be exploited as a means of confronting tensions in a controlled manner. Note, for example, how the printed account of the ceremonies staged at Worcester made specific

reference to the stationing of ‘all the trained bands, Horse and foot’ at ‘several places to prevent Insurrections and tumults of seditious fanatics and schismatics, haters of Monarchy and Episcopacy’.⁸⁷ Still, such a display of security could only go so far. The marking of the coronation in this town also prompted the issuing of a pamphlet, ‘a base, scurrilous, seditious and factious Libel’ displayed in prominent public locations. The text, styled as ‘a seasonable memento’, made explicit reference to the then-exiled Charles’ signing of the Covenant in 1650: ‘This day it is said the King shall swear once more/Just contrary to what he sware before[...]/Let him remember, Lord; in mercy grant/That solemnly he sware the Covenant’.⁸⁸

Although we have no information regarding the aftermath of this episode in Worcester, it does provide useful evidence of the continued potential for a range of destabilising responses to materialise within in the same locale. This particular occasion also highlights the persistence of popular anxieties behind the apparent façade of ‘universal acclamation’. Such tensions remained evident in a range of towns and, combined with more general concerns over the practical logistics of large-scale gatherings, ensured that ritual orchestrators were faced with an unstable and potentially dangerous predicament. The heavy prominence of soldiers presented a possible way of countering these fears through the display of actual force. As shown above with reference to the ceremonial staging of May 1660, the saturation of civilian ritual with military forms offered another solution through the shared dramatization of fictive security.

A case in point can be found in the marking of the coronation in Bath. In addition to the procession of ‘four hundred Virgins’ and the decoration of the guildhall outlined above, reference was made to the ordered ‘marching’ of civilians and the ‘Sobriety and temperance’ of the festivities themselves. The day began with the ringing of bells and beating of drums ‘calling to such as would demonstrate their good affections to the King, to shew themselves in Armes’. According to the account of Bath’s mayor, John Ford, a sizeable crowd turned out

constituted of 'all men that had arms fit for that imployment' so 'that we might the better mixt our joys with pious contemplations of Prayers and Thanksgiving'.⁸⁹

The supplementation of a Company of Foot from the neighbouring parish of Weston and 'a troop of Horse being Volunteers' with the locals assembled on the day widened the field of participation in the display of urban security. Indeed, it was 'these forementioned persons in Arms' who lined the processional route as the corporate officers walked to church for the thanksgiving sermon and 'again made a guard' as they returned. The involvement of loyalist auxiliaries, county trained bands and more casual 'armed men' presented an opportunity to tame the more unruly aspects of the dissemination of royal power through a militarised framework. Moreover, the procession of the corporate officers and 'Mrs Maiorresse' and 'her Maiden guards' was described as explicitly mirroring that of the soldiers 'in the like manner'.⁹⁰ The imitation of military forms by urban residents was a performative choice designed to operate as both a demonstration of loyalty to the state and a confirmation of the well-governed and prestigious civic community. By grafting martial imagery onto the figure of the 'ordinary' inhabitant, the rituals of regime change contributed to a larger process of public legitimisation. Significantly, the mayor's account grouped all armed individuals (the volunteer troop of horse, the local militia and the locals that had assembled that morning) under the label of 'the souldiery'. Thus, the civilian 'troops' were once again exploited to present an image of cohesion and security that tethered the invocation of martial symbolism to the town itself.

To similar effect, a group of '250 men with their own Armes' were raised in the centre of Manchester and clothed 'in great gallantrie and rich Scarffes'. These well-dressed volunteers turned out accompanied by the 'Foot Companie', a regiment of the Lancashire Militia commanded by Sergeant Major Sir John Byrom.⁹¹ On the morning of the 23 April, both groups marched to church behind 'fourtie young Boyes, about the age of seven years, all cloathed in white Stuffe, Plumes of Feathers in their Hatts, blew Scarffes, armed with little Swords hanging

in black Belts, and short Pikes shouldered'. Another group of boys 'about twelve yeares of age' marched at the rear 'with Musquets and Pikes, Drums beating, and Colours flieing'.⁹² The militarisation of young children in this instance made a visible statement on the longevity of the regime which rested on the transmission of good order and the symbolic portrayal of a secure political future.

The combination of fine costume and soldierly apparatus clearly emphasised links with the martial culture of gentility. Interestingly, writing with reference to Chester's 'Midsummer Show' in the early modern period, Susannah Crowder identified a shift in the late sixteenth century in the depiction of children as being outside the social order to acting as stylised noble adults. This presentation was portrayed most obviously through rich clothing and ordered procession to emphasise elite status.⁹³ Whilst the marching at Chester sought to underscore the prestige of the town through the depiction of a fledgling aristocratic body, the use of children at Manchester's coronation ceremony was subtly different. This time, by merging symbolic gentility with military paraphernalia, the child actors reflected a broader process of redefinition that enabled ritual organisers to both interact with a wider political context and emphasise the particular honour of the town itself.

Comparable motivations were at work behind the activities noted in Nottingham, our final example of public performance at the Restoration. Here, a special play entitled *Robin Hood and his Crew of Souldiers* was staged in an attempt to present the famous outlaw as a military commander alongside his band of rebellious troops. Written by an anonymous author and later committed to print, the play remodelled a problematic folk hero from a symbol of wilful transgression to a loyal and deferential conformist. The drama itself was set on a parallel medieval coronation day (presumably that of Richard I although this is never specified) and begins with Little John, a soldier, confronting Robin with news that 'the Shieriffe with a band of armed men, are marching to reduce us to loyalty'. A messenger goes on to supply the

requirement to ‘command your armes’ and promise ‘pardon of all past misdemeanors’ on condition of joining ‘forthwith’ to ‘solemnize his happy Coronation’ and offer ‘chearfull and ready submission to his Majesties Laws’. Disobedience would result in ‘the miseries of a sudden destruction’.⁹⁴

The depiction of the outlaws as soldiers in this case referenced contemporary fears over the unchecked potential of the armed forces and, in particular, their association with the previous republican regimes. Upon hearing the offer of the sheriff’s messenger, the character of Little John recalls that ‘he talks of submission to government, and good Laws, as if we were the sons of peace and idleness’. John emphasises instead his battle-hardened status as one that knows ‘the sweets of theft and rogerie, to whom dangers are as pleasant as dried suckets, who have been nurs’d & fed fat with blood and slaughter’. Such sentiments referenced wider fears on the reintegration of the Old Army and the logistics of disbandment. Indeed, John elaborates that ‘I was born for action, but yet I cannot plow nor thresh, except it be mine enemy’.⁹⁵

This troubling predicament is squarely confronted by the messenger who offers a lengthy justification for maintaining loyalty to the new king’s laws, the most persuasive line centring on the point that ‘Laws were not made as you formerly imagine, to enslave the Generous, but Curb the Proud and Violent’. The disobedience of the outlaws thus ‘betrays aboundlesse pride, and desires unfix’d as mad-mens thoughts, and restless as the Seas watry motion’. After the messenger concludes with a particularly hyperbolic account of the new king (‘One who hath suffer’d injuries beyond example, yet of such an unparalleled charity, he pardons them beyond hope’), Robin is prompted to make an instantaneous and involuntary change of heart. His rebellious resolve dissipates and he is left ‘quite another man’, toasting the health of the king and publically professing his ‘loyalty & respect to vertue’.⁹⁶

The staging of the play at Nottingham functioned as an opportunity to confront a problematic aspect of the town’s cultural heritage whilst underscoring the prestige of the

locality in a broader public framework. The militarisation of the Robin Hood legend reflected wider uncertainties over the role of the soldier and the legitimisation of the new settlement. By tethering the depiction of loyalty to the projected cultural identity of the locality, ritual orchestrators thus approached the moment of transition as a means of enhancing the status of the urban community. Whilst there was no set model for marking the coronation in public space, the same motivation lay behind the imitation of military forms at Bath and Manchester. In each case, public ritual intersected with the (albeit unstable) image of the soldier to offer a creative reimagining of the town itself bound up in the fortunes of the new regime.

Through an examination of the ceremonies staged at the proclamation in May 1660 and the coronation in April 1661, it is thus apparent that public ritual continued to occupy a prominent and vital role in a range of urban communities. In addition to substantial evidence of performative creativity and the corporate sponsorship of more unique and standalone events, the centrality of armed men (both professional and civilian) and the imitation of military forms reveals a major line of continuity from those ritual practices that developed as a specific response to the dislocation of the sixteen-forties and sixteen-fifties. By focusing on the participation of ex-parliamentarian soldiers, county trained bands and volunteer troops (alongside the performance of martial vocabularies by a wider populace) we are thus afforded insight into the complex web of motivations behind the orchestration of an appropriate ritual response. This is especially significant when we consider that the first year following the Restoration represented a period in which religious and political policy was in flux and it was not yet clear how the logistics of the new regime would be established. This fluidity cleared the way for participation from a broad range of individuals from committed Presbyterian to vigilante royalist. The involvement of those who might go on to demonstrate a more explicitly problematic relationship with the new regime, for example Short at Lyme Regis, sheds light

on the mutability of the broader interpretive context. Certainly, it is likely that many urban governors would have been less likely to partake in the public rituals discussed above had they known what the religious settlement would be. Nonetheless, rather than a one-dimensional adherence to national directive or a crude indication of partisan support, the urban ceremonies staged at the Restoration reveal the continued potential for public ritual to operate on multiple levels as an explicit reaction to a broader national situation *and* a more practical reflection of local concerns.

The enactment of any large-scale public event continued to threaten security and brought with it the distinct possibility of dislocation. Additionally, the intense scrutiny placed on civic officers and the prevalence of popular doubts over the longevity of the new settlement provoked extreme concern amongst urban authorities. It is remarkable that despite the ambiguities surrounding the figure of the soldier and ongoing fears linked to the Old Army, one of the most effective ways of navigating these uncertainties was through the ordered involvement of civilian troops and manipulation of civilian activity to resemble soldierly forms. Harnessing such imagery presented a practical tool to interact with broader state requirements whilst fostering stability in a distinctly urban setting. In this way, the rituals of Restoration can be seen to confirm the relative autonomy of local governors who approached the moment of regime change actively and pragmatically to promote the security of the vicinity and safeguard their own status in light of an uncertain political future.

¹ J. Sawday, 'Re-writing a revolution: history, symbol, and text in the Restoration', *The Seventeenth Century* vii (1992), 171-4.

² A. Coleby, 'Military-civilian relations on the Solent 1651-1689', *The Historical Journal* xxix (1986), 950.

³ D. J. Appleby, 'Veteran politics in Restoration England, 1660-1670', *The Seventeenth Century* xxviii (2013), 323; J. Childs, *The Army of Charles II* (1976), pp. 8-11; R. Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 129-30, 138-40; J. Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 163-5, 184-5.

⁴ In particular, the figure of the disbanded soldier provoked intense concern. For further discussion on this point see Appleby, 'Veteran politics', 324. For the most recent analysis of the army in the 1650s see H. Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England, 1649-1660* (Oxford, 2013). Here, Reece identifies how the heavy costs of a standing army brought 'financial burden and social disturbance' to communities across the country. Moreover, the figure of the soldier continued to provoke 'fear, uncertainty, and disorder', especially in the months after October 1659. Nonetheless, soldiers had been able to integrate effectively into civic administration and, in many instances, a martial presence remained a 'settled feature of local government' throughout the decade. See Reece, pp. 6-7, 164, 233.

⁵ A. Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 334. The promotion of the militia also revived the Elizabethan ideal of this group as defenders of the realm thereby negating the need for a regular standing army. Further analysis of anti-army, pro-militia ideals in this context can be found in L. Schwoerer, *No Standing Armies! The Anti-Army Ideology in 17th Century England* (1974). See also L. Boynton, *The Elizabethan Militia, 1558-1638* (1967).

⁶ Whilst there have been no targeted analyses of the intersection of public ritual and martial imagery, others have discussed the centrality of the restored militia to the transmission of state authority in the provinces. See C. Hill, *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (1984), p. 283; Hutton, p. 103; Hughes, pp. 334-5; V. L. Stater, *Noble Government: The Stuart Lord Lieutenancy and the Transformation of English Politics* (1994), pp. 76, 86-7; P. R. Seddon, 'The Nottingham militia and the defence of the Restoration, 1660-1670', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire* lxxxvi (1983 for 1982), 86; Appleby, 'Veteran politics', 329; D. J. Appleby, 'The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture', in *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales*, ed. J. Eales and A. Hopper (Hatfield, 2012), p. 118. Interestingly, this finding can be seen to run in parallel to the continuities in religious rhetorical forms in preaching identified by D. J. Appleby

in *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 55-91.

⁷ For example see D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 281-5; K. Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680* (2nd edn., Oxford, 2003), pp. 140-8, 183-227; Peter Borsay, '“All the town's a stage”: urban ritual and ceremony', in *The Transformation of English Provincial Towns 1600-1800*, ed. P. Clark (1984), pp. 232-3.

⁸ A. Keay, *Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (2008), p. 2.

⁹ For further discussion on this point see Keay, pp. 2-8; Sawday, 171-3. K. Sharpe has categorically defined the reign of Charles II as being 'marked by some of the most magnificent ceremonies and rituals of the early modern age'. See his *Rebranding Rule: the Restoration and the Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (2013), pp. 148-52.

¹⁰ B. Weiser, *Charles II and the Politics of Access* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 30, 99-101.

¹¹ Christine Stevenson has recently explored public ritual in urban space following the Restoration. However, this investigation was limited to events in London and is focused primarily on the architectural experience of the city as stage. See C. Stevenson, *The City and the King: Architecture and Politics in Restoration London* (New Haven, 2013), chapters 3-4.

¹² Indeed, the ceremonies noted at Oliver Cromwell's second protectoral inauguration in 1657 were markedly different from comparable royal events. The use of martial imagery in this instance reflected the more prominent role of the military in the maintenance of political power. For specific examples see *Mercurius Politicus*, ccclxxi, 16 July 1657, 7924; *Mercurius Politicus*, ccclxxiv, 6 Aug. 1657, 7958, 8005-6; Gloucestershire Archives, GBR/F4/6, fo. 194; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the Corporations of Southampton and King's Lynn* (London, 1887), p. 183. With reference to the use of martial forms at the ceremonial marking of Richard Cromwell's accession in Sept. 1658 see *Mercurius Politicus*, cdxxxiii, 16 Sept. 1658, 829-30; *The Publick Intelligencer*, cxliii, 20 September 1658, 817-8, 825; Norfolk Record Office, NCR Case 16a/23, fo. 84.

¹³ Hutton, pp. 42, 125-6.

¹⁴ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p. 150; J. Heath, *The Glories and Magnificent Triumphs of the Blessed Restitution of His Sacred Majesty K. Charles II* (1662), pp. 30-1; Stevenson, pp. 78-80.

¹⁵ Hutton, pp. 125-6.

¹⁶ Hutton, pp. 125-6; Norf. Rec. Off., Case 16a/23 fo. 120.

¹⁷ Miller, p. 171; Hutton, p. 126.

¹⁸ Hutton, p. 130.

-
- ¹⁹ M. Atkin, *Worcestershire under Arms: An English County During the Civil Wars* (Barnsley, 2004), p. 154.
- ²⁰ *Mercurius Publicus*, xxi, 24 May 1660, 322.
- ²¹ *Mercurius Publicus*, xxi, 24 May 1660, 323.
- ²² *Mercurius Publicus*, xxi, 24 May 1660, 323-4.
- ²³ B. D. Henning (ed.), *The House of Commons, 1660-90* (3 vols., 1983), i. p. 241.
- ²⁴ It also potentially functioned to emphasise the return to some form of ceremonial normality, especially as this particular performance was redolent of the rituals ordered to mark the commencement of Quarter Sessions and Assizes in important towns.
- ²⁵ *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, xxi, 21 May 1660, 334.
- ²⁶ Glouc. Arch., GBR/F4/6 fo. 399.
- ²⁷ Gloucestershire Cathedral Archives, TR2 fo. 212.
- ²⁸ Glouc. Arch., GBR/F4/6 fo. 370.
- ²⁹ Glouc. Arch., GBR/B3/3 fos. 162, 166.
- ³⁰ Glouc. Arch., GBR/B3/2 fo. 307; J. Washbourn, *Bibliotheca Gloucestrensis: A Collection of Scarce and Curious Tracts* (Gloucester, 1825), p. lxxvi.
- ³¹ The National Archives of the U. K., SP 29/292 fo. 41; M. Atkin and W. Laughlin, *Gloucester and the Civil War: A City under Siege* (Stroud, 1992), p. 155; Glouc. Arch., GBR/B3/3 fo. 503.
- ³² A. Short, *God Save the King: Or, A Sermon Preach'd at Lyme-Regis May 18 1660 at the Solemn Proclamation of his Most Excellent Majesty Charles II* (1660), sig. A4^r; Underdown, p. 272. It is worth noting that Short was one of the Presbyterian ministers who would go on to be ejected from his office following the Act of Uniformity in 1662. See E. Calamy, *The Nonconformist's Memorial*, ed. S. Palmer (3 vols., London, 1802-3), ii, pp. 136-7. Interestingly, royalist journalists deprecated the fact that residents at Lyme (as well as Taunton) continued to celebrate the anniversary of their deliverance from royalist siege. The clash of symbolism here was very clear to contemporaries. See R. L'Estrange, *Toleration Discuss'd* (1663), p. 70; Appleby, 'Post-conflict culture', p. 123.
- ³³ Short, pp. 70-2; G. Ironsyde, *A Sermon Preached at Dorchester in the County of Dorcet, at the Proclaiming of His Sacred Majesty Charles the II. May 15. 1660* (London, 1660), pp. 29-30; Underdown, p. 274.
- ³⁴ H. Jessey, *The Lords Loud Call to England* (London, 1660), p. 24; W. Carew Hazlitt, *Faiths and Folklore: A Dictionary of National Beliefs, Superstitions and Popular Customs, Past and Current, with their Classical and Foreign Analogues, Described and Illustrated* (London, 1905), p. 405; Underdown, pp. 274-5.
- ³⁵ *An Exact Accompt, Communicating the Chief Transactions of the Three Nations*, xcix, 15 June 1660, 974.

³⁶ The use of county militia and volunteer troops was central to the consolidation of royal power in the months following the Restoration. See J. L. Malcolm, 'Charles II and the reconstruction of royal power', *The Historical Journal* xxxv (1992), 307, 309-14.

³⁷ *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, xxi, 21 May 1660, 331; P. Browne, *The History of Norwich from the Earliest Records to the Present Time* (Norwich, 1814), p. 39.

³⁸ Malcolm, 312.

³⁹ *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, xxi, 21 May 1660, 331; Browne, p. 39.

⁴⁰ Indeed, if such events were to get out of control, it would have been very possible that violence might have erupted between ex-royalists and ex-parliamentarians. For further discussion on this point see Appleby, 'Veteran politics', 323, 325-6.

⁴¹ B. C. Turner, '“The return of the church”: cathedral and close, 1660-1662', *Winchester Cathedral Record* xxix (1960), 17; C. B. Estabrook, 'Ritual, space, and authority in seventeenth-century English cathedral cities', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary* xxxii (2002), 616, 619.

⁴² *Mercurius Publicus*, xx, 17 May 1660, 316-7.

⁴³ *Mercurius Publicus*, xxi, 24 May 1660, 323.

⁴⁴ Stater, pp. 78, 86-7; Seddon, 'The Nottingham militia', 86; P. R. Seddon, 'A Restoration militia and the defence of the shire: the Nottinghamshire militia 1600-c.1670', *The Historian* xlvii (1995), 23; Appleby, 'Veteran politics', 329; Appleby, 'Post-conflict culture', p. 118; P. Withington, 'Citizens, soldiers and urban culture in Restoration England', *English Historical Review* cxxiii (2008), 592, 606-7, 609.

⁴⁵ This might also have been explicitly provocative, not least because the Old Army probably considered that it could easily overpower the civilian troops in the trained bands.

⁴⁶ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of F. W. Leyborne-Popham, Esq. of Littlecote, Co. Wilts.* (Norwich, 1899), p. 182; Andrew J. Hopper, 'Fairfax, Charles (1597–1673)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004; online edn.)

<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9078?docPos=2>> [accessed 3 Aug. 2016].

⁴⁷ See, for example, the account of the parade at Blackheath on 29 May 1660 in Appleby, 'Veteran politics', 323, 325-6. Edward Hyde, the earl of Clarendon, gave a more realistic appraisal of the soldiers' mood at the parade as being 'drawn thither to a Service They were not delighted in'. See [E. Hyde], *The Continuation of the Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon* (3 vols., Oxford, 1759), ii. p. 18.

⁴⁸ *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, xxi, 21 May 1660, 352-3.

⁴⁹ *Mercurius Publicus*, xxi, 24 May 1660, 322.

⁵⁰ *Mercurius Publicus*, xxi, 24 May 1660, 323.

⁵¹ *Mercurius Publicus*, xxii, 31 May 1660, 344-5.

⁵² For example, the case of ‘Captain’ Ann Carter, the leader of Maldon grain rioters in 1629. For further discussion on this point see J. Walter, *Crowds and Popular Politics in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2006), p. 49; Wrightson, p. 186.

⁵³ Withington, 587-610. The potential for this tension to erupt into actual disorder is discussed here with reference to a riot between soldiers and civilians at the funeral of Lady Strafford in York, 1686.

⁵⁴ J. R. Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 44-5; W. Coster, ‘Fear and friction in urban communities during the English Civil War’, in *Fear in Early Modern Society*, ed. W. G. Naphy and P. Roberts, (Manchester, 1997), p. 113.

⁵⁵ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p. 153; E. Walker, *A Circumstantial Account of the Preparations for the Coronation of his Majesty King Charles the Second* (1820), p. 67.

⁵⁶ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p. 154.

⁵⁷ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p. 158.

⁵⁸ Stevenson, p. 95.

⁵⁹ David Moore Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642* (1971), p. 75; K. Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (2010), pp. 93, 98, 234-5, 515.

⁶⁰ Peter Heylyn, *A Sermon Preached in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter in Westminster* (1661), p. 44.

⁶¹ Oxfordshire History Centre, C/FC/1/A2/3 fo. 272.

⁶² Oxf. Hist. Cent., C/FC/1/A2/3, fo. 288v.

⁶³ Oxf. Hist. Cent., C/FC/1/A2/3, fo. 289. Despite this heavy expense the corporation agreed to purchase a pair of fine gold gloves and present the king with £150 in gold from the treasury on his visit to the town two months later ‘as a Testimony of the Dutifull Affections of the Cittizens’. See Oxf. Hist. Cent., C/FC/1/A2/3, fo. 272r; Weiser, *Politics of access*, p. 30.

⁶⁴ British Library, Harleian MS. 2125 fo. 162.

⁶⁵ W. Smith, *Of the Celebration of the King’s Coronation-Day, in the Famous City of Bathe* (1661), pp. 4-5.

⁶⁶ D. Ezzy, G. Easthope and V. Morgan, ‘Ritual dynamics: mayor making in early modern Norwich’, *Journal of Historical Sociology* xxii (2009), 400.

⁶⁷ *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, xviii, 6 May 1661, 272.

⁶⁸ *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, xviii, 6 May 1661, 266-7.

⁶⁹ *Mercurius Publicus*, xvii, 2 May 1661, 261-2.

⁷⁰ *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, xix, 13 May 1661, 303.

⁷¹ Sawday, 87; *Mercurius Publicus*, iv, 31 Jan. 1661, 64.

⁷² N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford, 2002), p. 55; M. Stoye, 'Remembering the English Civil Wars', in *The Memory of Catastrophe*, ed. P. Gray and O. Kendrick (Manchester, 2004), p. 23.

⁷³ *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, xviii, 6 May 1661, 272.

⁷⁴ Underdown, p. 271; *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, xxi, 21 May 1660, 333.

⁷⁵ Underdown, p. 271.

⁷⁶ *Mercurius Publicus*, xxi, 24 May 1660, 329-30.

⁷⁷ *Mercurius Publicus*, xxi, 24 May 1660, 329-331. Significantly, the heavy use of blood imagery was also noted in 30 Jan. sermons preached after the Restoration. See Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day*, p. 117.

⁷⁸ For example see *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, xviii, 6 May 1661, 266, 268, 272

⁷⁹ *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, xviii, 6 May 1661, 267-8.

⁸⁰ *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, xviii, 6 May 1661, 267-8; Of course, it is worth emphasising that the rank and file of the militia who Hudson opened his house for were most likely members of the respectable middling sort and not common soldiers *per se*.

⁸¹ *Mercurius Publicus*, xvii, 2 May 1661, 263-4.

⁸² *Mercurius Publicus*, xvii, 2 May 1661, 263-4.

⁸³ Moreover, the fact that these volunteer troops had to be raised at all betrayed the crown's distrust of the regular militia. For further discussion on this point see Malcolm, 312. Both groups provoked considerable anxieties linked most immediately to the practical logistics of defence in the localities. The rituals of restoration can be seen to have presented a short-term solution to these challenges by attempting to project an image of harmonious interaction between both groups framed within the wider culture of the urban centre.

⁸⁴ J. Symons, *Hullinia: Or, Selections from Local History* (Kingston upon Hull, 1827), pp. 15-23. That the coronation itself happened to fall on the anniversary of this particular event may have intensified the need to remodel an appropriate civic identity through the ritual process.

⁸⁵ *Mercurius Publicus*, xvii, 2 May 1661, 263-4.

⁸⁶ *Mercurius Publicus*, xvii, 2 May 1661, 263-4.

⁸⁷ [H. Townshend], *Diary of Henry Townshend of Elmley Lovett, 1640-1663*, ed. J. W. Willis Bund (2 vols., 1920), i. p. 71.

⁸⁸ [Townshend], *Diary*, i. p. 71.

⁸⁹ J. Ford, *A Narrative of the Manner of Celebrating his Majesties Most Glorious and Joyfull Coronation in the City of Bath* (1661).

⁹⁰ [W. Smith], *Of the Celebration of the King's Celebration-Day in the Famous City of Bathe: A True Narrative in a Letter Sent from Thence to Dr Charleton, Physician to his Majestie* (1661), pp. 3-7.

⁹¹ W. Heawood, *The Manner and Solemnitie of the Coronation of his Most Gracious Majestie King Charles the Second at Manchester* (1863), pp. 3-4.

⁹² Heawood, p. 6.

⁹³ S. Crowder, 'Children, costume, and identity in the Chester midsummer show', *Early Theatre* xx (2007), 16-7.

⁹⁴ Anon., *Robin Hood and his Crew of Souldiers. A Comedy acted at Nottingham on the Day of his Sacred Majesties Coronation* (1661), sig. A2.

⁹⁵ Anon., *Robin Hood and his Crew of Souldiers*, sig. A3.

⁹⁶ Anon., *Robin Hood and his Crew of Souldiers*, sigs B1-B2^r.