

Matthew Neufield. *The Civil Wars After 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013. xiv + 284 + 5 illus. \$99.00. Review by TY M. REESE, THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA.

While it is clear that the British Civil Wars have not been forgotten, the place of the conflict's public memory within the settlement period and beyond has not been fully and directly studied. Neufield addresses this by producing an engaging work that convincingly argues that the public memory of the Civil War in the post-1660 period was less about the war itself and rather more about creating distance from the Puritan vision that played such an important role in what occurred. For the restored regime, public memory was more about the present and future than the past.

Neufield utilizes a narrowly defined analysis of how a small political nation used its changing memory of the Civil Wars to remove itself from the Puritan inclination that caused all of the troubles. For the regime, public memory helped them create a "politically and religiously exclusive Restoration" settlement (2). The work utilizes six chronologically defined chapters to explore how public memory and its use evolved the further that the political nation got from the actual events. This allows Neufield to explore how, over time, the political nation utilized these memories to suppress Puritanism and what it represented through the Civil Wars and to work to return England to an idealized pre-Civil War past. The work begins by demonstrating how, in the immediate Restoration period, the political nation utilized state-sanctioned histories to illustrate how the Puritans challenged the structures of English society, especially church and state, and why they must be re-established. Early on, Neufield clarifies that he is not exploring a unified movement, although in many works such as this it becomes easy for the reader to imply that a majority consensus existed, but rather the different ways the political nation utilized public memory. In the 1660s, the official histories were not chronicles of events, rather they explored the Puritan challenge and its widespread and disruptive consequences. The newly restored monarchy used public memory in this early period to justify its return and to remind people what occurred when challenged. The other sources

that Neufield relies upon for this early period were the petitions of Civil War soldiers. These petitions related past experiences to current circumstances and played a role in legitimizing the Restoration. As Neufield moves away from the immediate settlement to the end of the reign of Charles II, he returns to historical writing and shows how writers used the past to shape the future. Especially important here was the possibility that the Duke of York might become king. In this period, writing on the Civil Wars flourished, particularly those that strived to construct a Whiggish narrative. This occurred through the loosening of pre-publication censorship that allowed for this increase in volume while demonstrating the growing distance between the past and the present. All of this leads to the publication of John Walker's *The Suffering of the Clergy* in 1714. Here, Neufield argues that this work demonstrated the struggle between Anglicanism and Puritanism, especially through victimization, while reinforcing the importance of the Restoration's religious settlement. The work concludes with an examination of the sermons delivered on publicly important days, especially those of May 29th. Many of these sermons reinforced the importance of the Anglican settlement and utilized "divine intervention" (14) to demonstrate the legitimacy of the Restoration.

Throughout the work, Neufield pays particular attention to the creation of an Anglican public memory that justified the settlement through an early vilification of the Puritans and that then established the legitimacy of the regime as it moved forward. While, early on, Neufield defines his political nation as being very small, there exists a tension through the use of the term public memory as the sources utilized do not always seem very public. At times, it is not clear whether these sources are more important, through the creative process and what they represented or through the role in creating public memory; the readers of these works is never really clear. While ex-soldiers from both sides created petitions, and it is important that Neufield stresses that these are the most unique sources that he utilizes, the public did not read them. Neither did the public, defined in a broad sense, read the histories and other sources that define this examination of public memory. At times, this public memory was more clearly an attempt by the restored regime, and its high church supporters, to justify their position of power. This is but a minor squabble with a work that does

demonstrate how, after the Civil Wars, a small group within England utilized public memory, and their control over it, to define the present and future. It provides great insight into the strategies used by the regime, which in the distant past was overthrown, to overcome challenges while developing opportunities within a post-war England.

Stephen Taylor and Grant Tapsell, eds. *The Nature of English Revolution Revisited: Essays in Honour of John Morrill*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 2013. xi + 298 pp. \$115. Review by MARC SCHWARZ, UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The appearance of a set of essays in honor of Professor John Morrill is both highly appropriate and very welcome. Morrill is one of the foremost contemporary historians of early modern England whose work has spanned local history, studies of Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution, and considerations of the Revolution within the context of the British Isles as the “War of Three Kingdoms.” To say that his contribution has been highly influential is hardly an exaggeration.

These essays span the period from the reign of Charles I through the Restoration, and they provide a number of insights. The first is by Professor Tim Harris and deals with the ways in which Charles tried to keep in touch with his subjects and explain his policies. Harris points out that, unlike modern perceptions, he was extremely active, but, before the civil war, these efforts were fruitless until he received the help of men like Hyde and Falkland, who portrayed him as a constitutional and moderate monarch.

In other essays, Tim Wales describes the social responsibilities displayed toward the poor by local communities during the revolution, and Ethan Shagan intriguingly reveals the efforts of political and religious groups to portray themselves as moderates rather than extremists. This seems to be the pattern in most crises and it is useful to see it applied to the English revolutionary period. There is also a valuable discussion by Philip Baker on the Levellers and the franchise demonstrating that the civilian Levellers favored a franchise restricted to those with property and, more importantly, that they based these views on their experience with the voting as practiced among local