

‘The Insane Enthusiasm of the Time’: Remembering the Regicides in Eighteenth and  
Nineteenth-Century Britain and North America

Edward Vallance, University of Roehampton<sup>1</sup>

This is the author accepted manuscript version of chapter 10 of *Radical voices, radical ways: articulating and disseminating radicalism in seventeenth- and eighteenth- century Britain*, eds. L. Curelly and N. Smith (Manchester University Press, 2016),

<https://manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk/9781526106193/>

Through the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion passed in 1660, the restored monarchy sought not only “to bury all seeds of future discords” but also to suppress ‘all remembrance of the former.’<sup>2</sup> As George Southcombe and Grant Tapsell have recently put it, remembering itself became an act of rebellion.<sup>3</sup> However, the complete erasure of the memory of the civil wars and revolution was impossible. This was nowhere clearer than in the punishment of the regicides, men implicated (directly or indirectly) in the trial and execution of Charles I. In all thirteen were executed for their part in the King’s death. Two others, Isaac Dorislaus and John Lisle were killed by royalist assassins. Posthumous vengeance was wreaked on the corpses of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton and John Bradshaw.<sup>4</sup> A sense of national guilt for the sin of regicide was encouraged by keeping the 30<sup>th</sup> January, the date of Charles I’s execution, as a day of fasting and ‘humiliation’.<sup>5</sup> Histories and collective biographies detailing the wicked lives of the ‘king killers’ and graphic political prints, vividly depicting the gruesome punishments reserved for traitors, ensured that this event would not be forgotten.<sup>6</sup> On into the eighteenth century, the regicide was employed by loyalist writers and artists to smear English radicals and to outline the dangerous consequences of arguments for political reform.<sup>7</sup>

However, as Andrew Lacey has noted, there was a paradox at the heart of the solemn commemoration of Charles I's execution – the cult of the royal martyr simultaneously 'kept alive the names and principles of those 'bloodthirsty men' whom the Office sought to excoriate. The State Prayers ensured that each year the nation was reminded of the fact of rebellion and regicide, and that it was possible to "turn the world upside down"<sup>8</sup> As Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith have reminded us, the history of civil wars and interregnum could be invoked both to legitimate radical action and to warn of its consequences.<sup>9</sup> In this way, the attempt to contain the radical potential of remembrance was always fraught with the danger that such efforts might instead stimulate its resurgence. Even ostensibly uncontroversial observances of the solemnities of January 30 ensured at least that the regicide could not simply be forgotten. Repetition, as Patrick H. Hutton has argued, is vital to the incorporation of historic moments in collective memory.<sup>10</sup> While symbolic repetition could also take on a critical aspect (witness the alleged celebrations of the 'Calves Head Club'), ceremony that remained staunchly orthodox could also sustain more controversial invocations and recreations of the regicide.<sup>11</sup>

The persistence of the memory of the regicide was more, though, than a consequence of its official commemoration. Much recent historiography is critical of the notion of a clearly definable early modern English 'radicalism' and of the idea of a singular English radical tradition.<sup>12</sup> However, as problematic as those concepts are, positive representations of the regicide were arguably also sustained by what Morton and Smith have identified as fundamental continuities in the content and contexts of radical writing across the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>13</sup> In the case of the recuperation of the lives of the King's judges the common strands were the assertion of the right of resistance, a core element of Whig political thought, and the connections between English religious dissent and the period of the civil war and Interregnum. While the dominant narrative was that the execution of the regicides was an

act both of justice and divine retribution, an alternative interpretation developed in which the King's judges were not murderers but martyrs themselves. *Speeches and Prayers of some of the late King's Judges* appeared in December 1660. Emerging out of radical post-Restoration print networks, the pamphlet's presentation of the King's judges as men who died bravely and unrepentantly had an enduring influence on later presentations of the regicides.<sup>14</sup> Further weight was added to this radical reading of the regicide by the publication of Edmund Ludlow's *Memoirs* in the 1690s.<sup>15</sup> While Ludlow's editor, usually identified as the free-thinker John Toland, may have stripped away the religious significance attached to the regicides' deaths in the original manuscript, the positive presentation of these men was clear in the published text.<sup>16</sup> Later editions of Ludlow also included material from other regicides, notably Charles I's prosecutor, John Cook.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, while the *Memoirs* only implied the justice of the King's execution, Catharine Macaulay's history of the event, drawn from Ludlow, made the righteousness of 1649 explicit.<sup>18</sup> Some Whig politicians were even prepared to defend not just the revolution of 1688, but also the regicide, as a legitimate act of resistance against royal tyranny (a highly charged comparison given contemporary concern with the excesses of George III's government). Charles James Fox, in his incomplete, posthumously published history of the reign of James II, declared the execution of Charles I an 'exemplary act of substantial justice.'<sup>19</sup>

## I

The regicide, then, remained deeply divisive, enduring as a trigger for political and religious controversy across the eighteenth-century. This chapter explores the contested memory of three regicides, John Dixwell, William Goffe and Edward Whalley, who all escaped to New England in the 1660s and spent the remainder of their lives in exile. As will be shown, historical presentations of these men in the eighteenth-century split along political lines. However, in the case of the loyalist historian, biographer and antiquary Mark Noble, his

predictably hostile depiction of the regicides was tempered by expressions of sympathy for the fate of the New England exiles in particular. In this way, it will be argued, Noble's works represent a significant loyalist contribution to the debate over the politics of sensibility in the late eighteenth-century. His treatment of Goffe and Whalley as men subject to powerful delusions resonated both with loyalist arguments about the radical imagination and with contemporary cases of treason in which insanity pleas were integral to the defendants' acquittal. This emphasis upon sympathy and sensibility was also a feature of the literary treatments of these regicides in the early nineteenth century. It will be argued that the literary interest in the story of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley was the product of the synergy between the story of their lives in exile and the Romantic aesthetic. The Romantic fascination with the passions and extreme emotion in particular supported the reconceptualisation of regicide not as a mortal sin or capital crime but as an act of madness warranting understanding. While that reconfiguring of treason opened the way for narratives of the lives of the King's judges which moved beyond either hagiography or total condemnation, it also diminished the political significance of regicide, turning it instead into a sentimental melodrama.

As will be shown later, the fate of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley was long shrouded in mystery. The research of Philip Major and Jason Peacey, amongst others, has now revealed much about the flight and subsequent American exile of these regicides. Edward Whalley, cousin of Oliver Cromwell, Major-General and Cromwellian peer, and his son-in-law and fellow Major-General William Goffe, an MP in the Protectoral Parliaments, sailed from Gravesend to Boston 12 May 1660. The two men knew that they would receive a warm welcome there, having already been sent an invitation from the reverend John Davenport to come to New England. When they landed in Massachusetts ten weeks later, a loyalist informer, the appropriately named John Crown, reported that the two regicides were received as 'men dropt down from heaven'.<sup>20</sup> Goffe and Whalley initially settled in Cambridge, and

for a short time they appear to have enjoyed relative freedom in their exile, attending sermons and participating in local debates. However, royal agents were soon sent out to arrest them, necessitating their movement in 1661 to New Haven, Connecticut. During this period the two men had to seek refuge from their pursuers in what later became known as ‘The Judges’ Cave’ atop West Rock – a hollow created between several massive boulders that Goffe and Whalley made their home for (depending on the account) anywhere from one month to three years. Finally, the two regicides moved to remote Hadley, Massachusetts, where they were given sanctuary in Reverend John Russell’s house. William Goffe continued to write letters to his wife in England and from these it appears that Edward Whalley died around 1675. Goffe’s last letter was sent in April 1679 and it is usually assumed that he died in that same year.

Their fellow regicide, John Dixwell, appears to have enjoyed a slightly more comfortable exile, largely as a result of the Restoration authorities never having realised that he had escaped to North America: Dixwell had initially fled to Hanau in Germany with other regicides after the Restoration and it was wrongly assumed that he had remained there. At some point in the early 1660s, however, he sailed to America and by 1665 he was in Hadley with Goffe and Whalley. His stay with his fellow regicides appears to have been brief and Dixwell eventually settled in New Haven under the assumed name of James Davids. Here he married twice, first to Joanna Ling in 1673, who died soon after they were wed, and then in 1677 to Bathsheba How, with whom he had three children. Although Dixwell’s exile was certainly less confined than that of Goffe and Whalley, he nonetheless led in the words of one contemporary a ‘modest and obscure life’. Dixwell died in March 1689, too soon to receive news of the revolution of 1688 from radical associates in England such as John Wildman who counselled him to return to England.<sup>21</sup>

Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley's experiences in exile remained largely unknown, at least outside of local folk memory, until the late eighteenth century. *The History of the King-Killers, or the Fanatic Martyrology*, a work published in 1720 which attempted to find a dead regicide for every day of the year, said only of Dixwell that he 'fled to save his scandalous Life, and what became of him afterwards, when or where he dy'd is not known.'<sup>22</sup> *A Brief Account of the Martyrdom of Charles I* published in 1756 stated that Goffe and Whalley had both fled to Lucerne after the Restoration with Goffe then 'wandering about in foreign parts many years after like a vagabond.'<sup>23</sup> Other English accounts of the regicide, such as *England's Black Tribunal* (first published in 1680) were more interested in creating martyrologies of Royalist 'sufferers' than in rehearsing the lives of the regicides.<sup>24</sup> The neglect of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley was a result not only of a lack of information or interest in the King's judges but also of the continuing political sensitivity of the regicide as a topic. Authors who stressed the justice of 1649 faced considerable public opprobrium: Macaulay's later volumes, tackling the regicide and the English republic, were markedly less well-received than those covering the early 1640s.<sup>25</sup> The controversial nature of the regicide was also reflected in the content of many 30 January sermons, especially after the Revolution of 1688. While some preachers did court controversy, most preferred to devote themselves to promoting abstract religious and political principles (the power of providence, the duty of obedience) rather than engage with historical events.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, while the office for 30 January was the most well-observed of the annual Parliamentary politico-religious holidays, this was more a result of the fit of this fast with the Parliamentary calendar than the strength of the cult of the royal martyr.<sup>27</sup> Even more politically sympathetic histories of the Commonwealth, such as the biography of Oliver Cromwell usually attributed to the General Baptist minister Isaac Kimber, preferred to skirt around the King's trial and execution rather than explore it in detail. Kimber largely conceded that the regicide represented a terrible blot on his character:

To do his character justice two actions [Kimber said] sully it in general, namely, cutting off the king, and setting himself up as head of the common-wealth; in the first he dipped his hands in a cold murder on the person of his sovereign; and in the second he darkened all the glory of his gallantry, and the great things he had done in the field, shewing that it was all with a secret aim to gratify his private ambition.<sup>28</sup>

Though Kimber's biography was much expanded in later editions, the regicide was still treated as a shameful episode which it was the biographer's duty to minimise Cromwell's role in rather than to justify.<sup>29</sup> Kimber's biography reflected the general unease of dissenting historians in tackling the regicide, a discomfort which was understandable given the connections still being drawn between nonconformity and republicanism by their High-Church critics.<sup>30</sup>

## II

This reticence about discussing the regicide was, however, less evident in a North American context, especially in the decade immediately prior to the American Revolution.<sup>31</sup> In part, this difference in the case of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley was a result of the greater availability of relevant source material in America. Thomas Hutchinson's *History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay*, published in 1764, employed original papers, including Goffe's diary and letters, to construct an account of the regicides' North American exile. As Hutchinson himself declared, 'the story of these persons has never yet been published to the world.'<sup>32</sup> Yet, it was the perceived relevance of the regicides' experiences to contemporary political struggles which made their story worth telling. Hutchinson was a political loyalist who would be forced into exile at the American Revolution.<sup>33</sup> He had little interest in celebrating the regicides' political ideals and he presented their religious outlook as too excessive to be fit for the tastes of an eighteenth-century audience.<sup>34</sup> Hutchinson recounted the tale of Dixwell,

Goffe and Whalley only, he said, as an ‘entertainment to the curious’.<sup>35</sup> However, Mark Sargent has persuasively suggested that Hutchinson’s treatment of their ‘miserable’ lives was meant to hint at something more: to offer a warning of the dire consequences of insurrection in a history published at the height of the Stamp Act crisis.<sup>36</sup>

The greater interest in the history of the regicides exiled to New England was also, arguably, a consequence of their persistent presence in public memory. Hutchinson had claimed that the tale of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley had previously ‘never been known in New England’ prior to the publication of his history.<sup>37</sup> However, as A. F. Young noted, within four years the names Goffe and Whalley were being used as postscripts to insurrectionary letters in the *Boston Gazette*. These pseudonyms were part of a wider trend identified by Young of opponents of the British colonial authorities employing the memory of the English civil war in support of their own acts of resistance against royal power.<sup>38</sup> The use of the names Goffe and Whalley might have been a radical appropriation of Hutchinson’s *History* but it seems more likely that the use of these appellations was a product of already established local folk traditions concerning the three regicides.

These traditions were later recorded in the most extensive and influential treatment of the story of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley – Ezra Stiles’s *A history of three of the Judges of Charles I* published in Hartford in 1794. Stiles’ approach in this text was certainly unusual and not, in the eyes of some critics, entirely successful.<sup>39</sup> His book combined archival research, topographical surveys (the work included maps of the regicides’ escape route), oral history and radical political polemic. The last one hundred pages or so of Stiles’ account took the story of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley as the starting point for a prophetic and utopian vision of the imminent downfall of monarchy across the world: the ‘Scottish martyrs’, Thomas Muir, Thomas Fyshe Palmer and Joseph Gerrald, transported for sedition in 1793, were compared to Cromwell, Fairfax and Whalley; the Jacobin clubs were described as ‘the

salvation of France' and 'bulwarks of liberty'; and the oppression of monarchy would be replaced by the freedom of annual parliaments elected on the basis of universal male suffrage.<sup>40</sup>

Although Stiles was not alone in urging the positive commemoration of the three regicides – in 1792, the Whig chief justice of South Carolina, Adaenus Burke, had called for a monument to Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley to honour their struggle against royal tyranny – the conclusion to his book clearly placed him well beyond the mainstream of contemporary American political opinion.<sup>41</sup> In terms of its subsequent influence, more important than the revolutionary tirade that closed the book, though, were the oral traditions concerning the judges that Stiles gathered and preserved. The tales Stiles collected were various - Goffe in disguise beating a braggart fencing master with no more than a shield made of cheese and an old broom<sup>42</sup>; Dixwell evading the clutches of Governor Andros, the epitome of Stuart absolutism in North America<sup>43</sup> - but in all of these stories, the regicides were presented as heroic defenders of freedom, righters of wrongs, and enemies of the over-bearing and prideful, whether a royal governor or a local fencing master. They were also portrayed as men with a seemingly supernatural ability to cheat death, as shown by a number of popular stories of them surviving well into the 1690s.<sup>44</sup> Here Stiles connected myths about Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley to those surrounding other regicides such as John Bradshaw, President of the High Court of Justice. One account had Bradshaw, not dying in 1659 in England and then suffering the ignominy of posthumous disinterment, but escaping post-Restoration to the Caribbean.<sup>45</sup> (This story appears to have had considerable currency. According to reports in the English press, the revolutionary epitaph to Bradshaw engraved on a canon in Martha Bay, Jamaica was 'pasted up in the Houses of North America' during the revolutionary war.)<sup>46</sup>

By far the most enduring of these stories, though, was that of the ‘Angel of Hadley’. According to this legend, relegated to a footnote by Hutchinson but placed centre-stage by Stiles, the people of Hadley, Massachusetts had come under a surprise Indian attack in 1675 while the townspeople were at prayer. Thrown into disarray by the assault, they had threatened to succumb to the marauders only for an old man, dressed in strange, antique clothing, suddenly to appear and rally them against their foe. With the attack thwarted, the elderly figure vanished as miraculously as he had appeared, never to be seen again. Both Hutchinson and Stiles accepted that the so-called ‘Angel of Hadley’ was, in fact, none other than the former Major-General William Goffe.<sup>47</sup>

As noted by G. Harrison Oriens, the myth of the ‘Angel of Hadley’ had been identified in American literary magazines as a potentially fruitful source for authors of fiction as early as 1815.<sup>48</sup> Seven years later, the leading historical novelist of the age, Sir Walter Scott, influenced by Stiles’ account, incorporated the legend into his *Peveril of the Peak*.<sup>49</sup> Aside from Scott, the story was retold by John McHenry, (*The Spectre of the Forest*, 1823), James Fenimore Cooper (*The Wept of Wish-ton-Wish*, 1829), Delia Bacon (‘The Regicides’, published in her *Tales of the Puritans*, 1831) and Nathaniel Hawthorne (‘The Grey Champion’, published in his *Twice Told-Tales*, 1837). Besides prose treatments, Robert Southey in his unfinished *Oliver Newman* (published 1845) and Ebenezer Elliott, ‘the corn-law rhymer’, in his *Kerhonah*, (1835) also produced poetic dramas based on the story. Sargent has calculated that overall, between the publication of *Peveril of the Peak* and the outbreak of the American civil war, there were more than a dozen literary productions featuring the story.<sup>50</sup>

What provoked this flurry of literary interest in Goffe, Dixwell and Whalley? Certainly, a direct political connection, as has been inferred by Sargent as being behind the

histories of Hutchinson and Stiles, seems hard to sustain. The political outlooks of these nineteenth century authors appear too disparate to identify a common ideological thread – what, after all, connects the Tory Scott to the popular radical Elliott?<sup>51</sup> Southey had passed through a radical phase as a young man and had written a poem in honour of the republican and regicide Henry Marten but by the time he came to compose *Oliver Newman* he was an avowed conservative in both politics and religion.<sup>52</sup> In broader terms, there was more than a passing similarity between Scott’s sentiment (as articulated by the Presbyterian Major Bridgenorth) that ‘perhaps his [Goffe’s] voice may be heard in the field once more, should England need one of her noblest hearts’<sup>53</sup> and Hawthorne’s ‘Grey Champion’ who embodies the ‘hereditary spirit’ of New England and could reappear whenever tyranny threatened.<sup>54</sup> Both authors return us to the popular champion encapsulated in the stories collected by Stiles. However, they did not in any sense support the Jacobin political vision he had subsequently built upon these tales, nor was it the case that regicide was becoming any less of a sensitive political topic in the early nineteenth-century. Letters to the loyalist periodical *John Bull* might contain complaints that the solemnities of January 30 were no longer being widely observed but its news pages remained filled with stories of the threats posed by blood-thirsty regicides to the July Monarchy in France and the danger presented by their radical equivalents in England.<sup>55</sup> Positive reflections on the regicide from contemporary radicals seem to have been equally rare.<sup>56</sup> Largely, they appear to have been the preserve of a small number of English republicans, such as the London Corresponding Society member and printer Daniel Eaton and the Chartist book illustrator and poet William Linton.<sup>57</sup>

Instead, the fit between the story of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley and the Romantic sensibility seems to offer the main explanation for the growth in interest in these three regicides. Their history combined central elements of the Romantic aesthetic: the supernatural (the myth of the Angel of Hadley), Gothic horror (the regicide itself and then

Goffe and Whalley's captivity in Hadley) untamed nature (the judges' cave), exoticism (encounters with Native Americans), a fascination with religious 'enthusiasm' (Goffe's millenarian expectation) and powerful emotional content (the impact on Goffe's wife in England as revealed in his letters).<sup>58</sup> In some literary representations, such as McHenry's *Spectre of the Forest*, the supernatural and Gothic elements were heightened further by the intertwining of the story of the regicides with accounts of the Salem witch trials.<sup>59</sup> In others, such as Delia Bacon's 'The Regicides', the masculine republicanism of Stiles' history was subverted by making the hero of the story Goffe's wife.<sup>60</sup>

### III

The Romantic engagement with the story of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley required that its literary audience sympathise with the plight of these regicides if not with the political actions which had placed them in this situation. However, while many of these authors were reliant on Stiles for their source material (or upon other histories which were themselves based on Stiles' account), his history had presented Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley as figures due heroic adoration rather than sympathy.<sup>61</sup> The first empathetic treatment of the regicides can be found not in Stiles but in one of his own sources, Mark Noble's *Memoirs of the Protectorate-House of Cromwell*, first published in 1784.<sup>62</sup> While Noble claimed in the preface to his work that his history was free from 'party prejudice', it was nonetheless, as contemporary critics noted, clearly hostile to anything that smacked of puritanical 'enthusiasm' or 'fanaticism'.<sup>63</sup> As Stiles also observed, in the first edition of this work, Noble was unaware that Cromwell's kinsman Edward Whalley and his son-in-law William Goffe had fled to New England.<sup>64</sup> Even so, Noble's appraisal of Whalley, while denouncing his religious outlook as 'wild and enthusiastic', also applauded his 'valor, and military knowledge' and stated that he had carried out his public offices with 'honesty' and 'propriety'.<sup>65</sup>

These sympathetic aspects of Whalley's personality were drawn out further in the second and third editions of Noble's *Memoirs*, both published in 1787. Noble here offered a detailed narrative of Goffe and Whalley's exile which was clearly drawn very closely from that offered in Hutchinson's *History*. Noble, however, put a sentimental spin upon Hutchinson's materials, especially the letters he had reprinted from Goffe and his wife. Noble's *Memoirs* urged sympathy for Frances Goffe: 'whatever might be the criminality of them respecting the king's violent death, humanity will strongly plead in commiseration of her undeserved and most acute misfortunes.'<sup>66</sup> Yet, Noble demanded his readers empathise not only with Goffe's abandoned spouse but also with the regicides themselves. The hardships experienced by Goffe and Whalley must, Noble said,

hurt the feelings of any, how much soever they may dislike their political sentiments, and they must pity the condition of two gentlemen, who had held the rank of nobles, and possessed very great power, being obliged for many years to live in constant fear, often in a cavern, and almost constantly confined to a private wretched apartment, depending upon precarious remittances and benefactions, deprived of the comforts of associating with their families, friends, and almost debarred human converse.<sup>67</sup>

Noble's emphasis here on the emotional toll exacted on the regicides by separation from their families seem to presage later loyalist representations of sensibility, notably Edmund Burke's vision of the family unit as the centre of human feeling.<sup>68</sup>

This sympathetic treatment of Goffe and Whalley was maintained and expanded in Noble's *The Lives of the English Regicides* (1798).<sup>69</sup> Noble's work was a clear piece of loyalist history, dedicated to the regicides of France as warning of the grisly fate that would soon befall them.<sup>70</sup> Nonetheless, Noble was also keen to distinguish his book from earlier hostile treatments of the regicide which had privileged condemnation over explanation and

factual accuracy. (Although, as critical reviewers noted at the time, Noble's claim that he would separate 'the man from the crime' was spurious given that the work was clearly directed at the 'rigid condemnation of regicidal doctrines'.<sup>71</sup>)

Despite its obvious bias, Noble's *Lives of the English Regicides* did attempt to make its readers find sympathy for those of the King's judges who suffered for sincerely held, if erroneous, beliefs. This came through clearly in Noble's biography of Whalley:

they had hid themselves in a wild solitude, where they lived very many years literally buried alive in a cave; and when they died their wretched remains were deposited in the cellar of a house in which they sometimes ventured to inhabit, or rather to secrete themselves. Even royalty itself must feel commiseration for the humiliating and apprehensive torture in which they lingered out their existence, in a vain and wild visionary expectation that god would manifest his approbation of their cause

Whalley was, Noble said, a 'wild enthusiast' but he had never been given to any of those 'private wickednesses' which disgraced the lives of other regicides: 'he was under powerful delusions, and neither the dreadful corrections of himself, the constant detestation of his vast crime could make him see the enormity of it'.<sup>72</sup>

Noble's biography of Whalley represented an important development of that offered in his memoirs of the Cromwell family in that it clearly suggested the regicide's actions were the product of a form of insanity. This argument was made explicit in his account of John Carew. Noble suggested that in another era Carew's fate (he was executed in October 1660) might have been avoided: 'In times of peace and domestic harmony such a character would have been judged religiously mad, and shut up in a place proper for the reception of such unhappy creatures, and with due care he might have been restored to reason; if not, he would have been prevented outraging the dearest rights of society.'<sup>73</sup>

While ostensibly sympathetic, Noble's treatment of Goffe and Whalley also performed a number of other functions: it continued the presentation of religious dissent as the source of political extremism; by demonstrating the miserable lives of those who evaded justice, it also showed that providential judgment was inescapable; and by imagining the sympathetic feelings of monarchy for Goffe and Whalley's plight, Noble engaged with contemporary sentimentalised representations of royalty (especially the 'murdered' kings Charles I and Louis XVI).<sup>74</sup> In this way, Noble's presentation of the regicides provided a response to Macaulay's view that the execution of the King's judges demonstrated a lack of 'sympathising tenderness' on the part of Charles II.<sup>75</sup> Yet Noble's reading of regicidal actions as a form of insanity also resonated with contemporary British regicide cases and with loyalist treatments of the radical political imagination in general. As John Barrell has demonstrated, in the late eighteenth century, the radical political imagination came to be characterised as 'deranged' or 'perverted'. In the context of discussions of treason, the idea of 'imagining' the monarch's death moved away from older understandings meaning to design or plan and came to be associated with being the product of such 'wicked' or 'evil' imaginations. Regicide became an act borne of warped imagining.<sup>76</sup>

It was seemingly just such an act of madness which led Margaret Nicholson to attempt to stab George III on 2 August 1786 as the King alighted from his carriage at St. James' Palace. The King himself viewed this feeble attempt on his life (her weapon was a flimsy dessert knife) as the product of insanity. Nicholson was brought before the Privy Council and on the evidence of two physicians judged to be mad. She was committed to Bethlem Hospital and remained there for the rest of her life, dying in 1828.<sup>77</sup> A similar but more legally significant case was that of James Hadfield, who fired a pistol at George III at the Drury Lane Theatre on 15 May 1800. Hadfield, influenced by a millenarian cult, had become convinced that the death of the King would usher in the second coming of Christ.

Placed on trial for treason, Hadfield's defence lawyer, Thomas Erskine successfully argued for a reinterpretation of insanity from being 'lost to all sense' (which Hadfield's ability to plan the assassination seemed to speak against) to the idea that the individual was suffering from an over-powering delusion (his millenarian beliefs.) Erskine, backed by medical evidence that Hadfield's war injuries had caused brain damage, secured his client's acquittal, with the result that Hadfield was not executed but, like Nicholson, spent the rest of his life in Bethlem Hospital.<sup>78</sup>

These cases had already inspired British Romantic literary efforts: while still an undergraduate at Oxford, Percy Bysshe Shelley, with Thomas Jefferson Hogg, had printed a set of poems ostensibly produced in Bedlam by Margaret Nicholson.<sup>79</sup> Behind the cover of a hoax publication – Nicholson was still alive when these supposed 'posthumous fragments' were published – lay some deeply politically subversive poetry.<sup>80</sup> The lines 'kings are but dust – the last eventful day/Will level all and make them lose their sway;' offered a similar image to Stiles' vision of a final 'war of kings', but the political threat conveyed in this prophecy was mitigated by the sense of this as a revelation to which only 'enthusiast ears' were attuned.<sup>81</sup>

This combination of regicide and madness was also a feature of some of the British fictional works built on the story of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley. In Ebenezer Elliott's *Kerhonah* John Dixwell is portrayed as being mentally tortured by his direct role in the King's death (Elliott recasts Dixwell as not only being Charles' judge but also his executioner).<sup>82</sup> In aiding the Indian chief Kerhonah, Dixwell sees a chance for redemption: 'My deed that shall be! – they though late, may yet Snatch my redemption from relenting fate, And win a smile severe from seraph lips. Perchance a sufferer's tear, where all is spotless, Shed o'er the record of my many crimes, May wash them out.'<sup>83</sup> Southey's *Oliver Newman* has as its eponymous hero the son of William Goffe, who travels to New England in

search of his father. Although Southey portrays Goffe's son as a sympathetic character – a pious Puritan but one whose faith is not inflexible or fanatical – his regicide father is painted as an unbending zealot, one who endures a 'living martyrdom' in the belief that God will call him again to 'fight the battles of the good old cause'. While Southey had deliberately drawn Oliver as a figure who would adjust his principles when they were proved wrong, William's 'malady' was presented as too 'deep-rooted' to be shaken from him.<sup>84</sup> Nonetheless, Southey clearly wanted his audience to pity the deluded regicide as well as identify with Oliver.<sup>85</sup> However, as in Noble's histories, sympathising with the fate of the regicides did not involve endorsing either their political or religious views, or the act of regicide itself. Even Scott's original rendering of the Angel of Hadley story, seemingly an unqualified tale of Puritan heroism, was delivered through an unreliable narrator, Major Bridgenorth, whose judgment was elsewhere described in the novel as being impaired by the 'insane enthusiasm of the time'.<sup>86</sup>

#### IV

The first significant treatments of the exiled regicides in New England were the products of politically motivated historians, the loyalists Hutchinson and Noble, and the radical Stiles. While the histories of Hutchinson and Stiles were undoubtedly the most significant in uncovering the detail of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley's exile in New Haven and Hadley, it was Noble whose account of the regicides had the greatest affinity with the Romantic literary representations of these figures in the nineteenth-century. Noble's work represents an interesting historical intervention in the debate over the politics of sensibility which scholars now see as a central part of literary discourse in the 1790s.<sup>87</sup> While encouraging his readers to make an emotional connection with radical figures, Noble nonetheless placed himself firmly in the Burkeian camp by emphasising the deleterious impact of Goffe and Whalley's actions on the appropriate object of loyal sentiment - the

family. Not only had the regicides slain the nation's 'father', Charles I, but they had also broken apart their own households, abandoning wives and daughters by fleeing into exile. So, though Noble lingered over the emotional strain on Frances Goffe to elicit sympathy from his audience, he also did so to provide a clear warning of the affective cost of misdirected passions, however sincerely held they might be.

British authors and poets of the nineteenth-century, like Noble, cast the three regicides as figures whose plight could be empathised with, even if the King's execution itself continued to be portrayed as a national tragedy rather than an act of justice. By presenting the regicides' fate as, like their eighteenth-century equivalents Nicholson and Hadfield, a product of a sincerely-held delusion, these authors encouraged a sympathetic, emotional engagement with their lives. Yet at the same time, by presenting the regicide as an act of madness, these writers ultimately diminished its political threat. For British authors, the geographical distance of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley's exile also afforded an equivalent intellectual distance from the terrible act of 1649. Like the liminal, phantom presence of the King's judges in 30 January sermons, the cave and basement hiding-places of Goffe and Whalley were apt metaphors for the dark recesses of the radical imagination in which the barely suppressed memory of the regicide still lurked.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank the editors of this volume, as well as Prof. Ian Haywood and Dr. John Seed for their comments on this chapter, and seminar and conference participants in Mulhouse and Roehampton for their feedback on an earlier version.

<sup>2</sup> 'Charles II, 1660: An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion.', *Statutes of the Realm: volume 5: 1628-80* (1819), pp. 226-234, [www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47259](http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47259), date accessed: 12 September 2013

---

<sup>3</sup> G. Southcombe and G. Tapsell, *Restoration Politics, Religion and Culture: Britain and Ireland, 1660-1714* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010), p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Howard Nenner, 'Regicides (act. 1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), hereafter *ODNB*; Nenner, 'The Trial of the Regicides: Retribution and Treason in 1660' in Nenner ed., *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain: Essays Presented to Lois Green Schwoerer* (Woodbridge: University of Rochester Press, 1997), ch. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), esp. pp. 136-46; Pasi Ihalainen, *Protestant Nations Redefined: Changing Perceptions of National identity in the Rhetoric of the English, Dutch and Swedish Public Churches, 1685-1772*, (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), esp. pp. 31-49.

<sup>6</sup> On the visual aspects of anti-regicide literature see Lloyd Bowen, 'Reviling Regicides: The King Killers in Popular Culture, 1649-62' *Cromwelliana: The Journal of the Cromwell Association*, Series 2, 8 (2011), 36-51, at 46-7.

<sup>7</sup> John Seed, *Dissenting Histories: Religious Division and the Politics of Memory in Eighteenth-century England* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), pp. 157-8.

<sup>8</sup> Lacey, *Cult of King Charles*, p. 143.

<sup>9</sup> T. Morton and N. Smith, 'Introduction' in Morton and Smith (eds.) *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650-1850: From Revolution to Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 1-26 at p. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Patrick H. Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory* (Hanover, New Hampshire: Univ of Vermont, 1993), pp. xx-xxi

<sup>11</sup> N. Smith, 'Radicalism and repetition' in Morton and Smith (eds.), *Radicalism*, pp. 45-64 at pp. 62-3. The Calves Head Club has tended to be seen as a creation of Tory propaganda

---

rather than a republican reality, M. Orihel, ‘ “Traacherous Memories”: The Calves Head Club in the Age of Anne’, *The Historian*, 73:3 (2011), pp. 435-62

<sup>12</sup> See, for example, A. Hessayon and D. Finnegan, ‘Introduction: Reappraising Early Modern Radicals and Radicalism’, in Hessayon and Finnegan (eds.), *Varieties of Seventeenth and Early-Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 1-29.

<sup>13</sup> Morton and Smith, ‘Introduction’, pp. 8-13. I have made a similar argument about the political continuities of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English radicalism sustaining the memory of the Leveller John Lilburne, Edward Vallance, ‘Reborn John? The Eighteenth-Century Afterlife of John Lilburne’, *History Workshop Journal*, 74 (2012), pp. 1-26

<sup>14</sup> On this pamphlet see J. B. Williams [J. G. Muddiman], ‘The forged ‘speeches and prayers’ of the Regicides’ *Notes & Queries*, 11 series, vii (1913), 301-2, 341-2, 383, 442, 502-3; viii (1913), 22-3, 81, 122-4, 164-5, 202-3, 242-3, 361-2; Richard Greaves, *Deliver Us From Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-3* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 218-9; Matthew Jenkinson, *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2010), pp. 38-42. For recognition of its 17<sup>th</sup> century influence see *Regicides No Saints Nor Martyrs: Freely Expostulated With the Publishers of Ludlow’s Third Volume* (London, 1700), pp. 63-4.

<sup>15</sup> Edmund Ludlow, *A Voyce from the Watch Tower Part Five: 1660-1662*, ed. A. B. Worden (Camden Fourth Series, Vol. 21, London, 1978); Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London: Allen Lane, 2001), chs 2-4; Justin Champion, *Republican learning: John Toland and the crisis of Christian culture, 1696-1722*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), ch.4

<sup>16</sup> Worden, *Roundhead Reputations*, pp.52-4, 83-4.

---

<sup>17</sup> Edmund Ludlow, *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Esq: ... with a Collection of Original Papers, Serving to Confirm and Illustrate many important Passages contained in the Memoirs. To which is now added, The Case of King Charles the First* (London, 1751)

<sup>18</sup> Catharine Macaulay, *The History of England From the Accession of James I to that of the Brunswick Line Vol IV* (London, 1769), pp. 396-421; Vol VI published in 1781 recounts the deaths of the regicides, pp. 12-26, 112-15.

<sup>19</sup> Charles James Fox, *A History of the early part of the reign of James the Second; with an introductory chapter* (London, 1808), p. 14 and for the regicide in general, pp. 14-18; see also William Godwin, *History of the Commonwealth of England, from its Commencement to the Restoration of Charles the Second, Volume 2* (London, 1826), pp. 688-90.

<sup>20</sup> Philip Major, “‘A Poor Exile Stranger’: William Goffe in New England”, in Major (ed.), *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its aftermath, 1640-1690* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), ch. 9, p. 156.

<sup>21</sup> Jason Peacey, ‘John Dixwell’, *ODNB*; Peacey, ‘“The good old cause for which I suffer”’: The life of a Regicide in Exile’, in Major (ed.) *Literatures of exile*, ch. 10, quotation at p. 169. For more discussions of the lives of these three regicides in exile see Mary-Peale Schofield, ‘The Three Judges of New Haven’, *History Today*, 12 (1962), 346-53; C. Durston, ‘William Goffe’ and ‘Edward Whalley’, *ODNB*. The story of the regicides’ flight to New England remains a source of popular historical interest, see Don Jordan and Michael Walsh, *The King’s Revenge: Charles II and the Greatest Manhunt in British History* (London: Little, Brown and Co., 2012); Christopher Pagliuco, *The Great Escape of Edward Whalley and William Goffe: Smuggled Through Connecticut* (Charleston SC: The History Press, 2012).

<sup>22</sup> *The History of King- Killers, or, the Fanatick Martyrology, containing the Lives of Three Hundred Sixty Five Hellish Saints of that Crew* (London, 1720), vol. 2, p. 22 (but organised by date – see October 7)

---

<sup>23</sup> *A brief account of the martyrdom of Charles I*, (London, 1756), p. 7 (Whalley) pp. 13-14 (Goffe). Of Dixwell (p. 26) it simply says that he went overseas.

<sup>24</sup> *England's Black Tribunal* (7<sup>th</sup> edn, London 1744), pp. 52-184 are devoted to cataloguing the sufferings of Royalists.

<sup>25</sup> Bridget Hill, *The Republican Virago: The Life and Times of Catharine Macaulay, Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 33

<sup>26</sup> Lacey, *Cult of King Charles*, p. 249; Isahailan, *Protestant Nations*, pp. 38-9, 45-9; Seed, *Dissenting Histories*, pp. 90-3.

<sup>27</sup> James Caudle, 'Preaching in Parliament: patronage, publicity and politics in Britain, 1701-60', in L. A. Ferrell and P. McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, literature and history 1600-1750* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), ch. 11, pp. 240-1.

<sup>28</sup>[Isaac Kimber], *The Life of Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of the Commonwealth* (first edn, 1724) preface.

<sup>29</sup> See fourth edition 1741, pp. 107-9. For a similar approach see William Harris, *An Historical and Critical Account of the life of Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1762), p. 208.

<sup>30</sup> Seed, *Dissenting Histories*, pp. 48-50, 100-2

<sup>31</sup> H. Trevor Colbourn, *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965), pp. 60-68.

<sup>32</sup> T. Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony (Province) of Massachusetts Bay*, (2 vols, Boston, 1764, 1767), i., p. 214

<sup>33</sup> William Pencak, 'Thomas Hutchinson', *ODNB*;

<sup>34</sup> Hutchinson, *History*, i., p. 217, talking of the content of Goffe's letters to his wife.

<sup>35</sup> Hutchinson, *History*, i, p. 214

---

<sup>36</sup> Hutchinson, *History*, i, p. 215 ‘Their lives were miserable and constant burdens’; M. L. Sargent, ‘Thomas Hutchinson, Ezra Stiles and the Legend of the Regicides,’ *William and Mary Quarterly*, 49 (1992), 431-448 at 433; Hutchinson’s house (and papers) were destroyed by a mob inspired by seditious sermonising Colbourn, *Lamp of Experience*, p. 63.

<sup>37</sup> Hutchinson, *History*, i. p. 214.

<sup>38</sup>A. F. Young, ‘English Plebeian Culture and Eighteenth-Century American Radicalism’ in M and J. Jacob, (eds.), *The Origins of Anglo-American Radicalism* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1984), ch. 11, p. 199; Peter Karsten, *Patriot-Heroes in England and America: Political Symbolism and Changing Values over Three Centuries* (London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978)

<sup>39</sup> E. S. Morgan, *The Gentle Puritan: A life of Ezra Stiles, 1727-1795* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), p. 458; ‘The Cave of the Regicides’, *Blackwood’s Magazine*, LXI (March 1847), pp. 333-49, at p. 333.

<sup>40</sup> E. Stiles, *A history of three of the Judges of King Charles I* (Hartford, 1794), pp. 272, 284-5, 289

<sup>41</sup> Morgan, *Gentle Puritan*, p. 458.

<sup>42</sup> Stiles, *History of the Judges*, p. 33.

<sup>43</sup> Stiles, *History of the Judges*, pp. 130-1; A story revived by Nathaniel Hawthorne in his ‘The Grey Champion’, in *Twice Told Tales* (Halifax, 1853 edn.), pp 16-26 at pp. 24-5.

<sup>44</sup> Stiles, *History of the Judges*, p. 344 – on the rumour that one ‘Theophilus Wale’ who died when 104 was really Edward Whalley. This legend continued to be given credence in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, see R. P. Robins, ‘Edward Whalley, the Regicide’, *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 1 (1877), 55-66.

<sup>45</sup> Stiles, *History of the Judges*, p. 107; a similar story re-appeared in the *Leak Times* (3 December 1892), see Sean Kelsey, ‘John Bradshaw’, *ODNB*. John Cook was also rumoured

---

to have avoided death by escaping to Staten Island. Stiles, *History of the Judges*, p. 353, although here Stiles was clear that the written record showed that Cook had been executed.

<sup>46</sup> *Public Advertiser*, (1 June 1780), issue 14242; *Courier and Evening Gazette*, (22 September 1797), issue 1602. For a report of similar invocations of the English regicides in a European context see *St James' Chronicle*, (16-18 August, 1791), issue 4742

<sup>47</sup> Stiles, *History of the Judges*, p. 29; Hutchinson, *History*, i, p. 219.

<sup>48</sup> G. Harrison Oriens, 'Literary Origins of the Angel of Hadley', *American Literature*, 4 (1932), 257-69 at 257.

<sup>49</sup> George Dekker, 'Sir Walter Scott, the Angel of Hadley and American Historical Fiction', *Journal of American Studies*, 17: 2 (1983), 211-227 at 214.

<sup>50</sup> M. L. Sargent, 'The Witches of Salem, the Angel of Hadley and the Friends of Philadelphia', *American Studies*, 34:1 (1993), 105-120 at 107.

<sup>51</sup> Scott made his condemnation of the regicides clear in his role as editor of the nineteenth-century edition of Somers' tracts, see *A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts ... (2<sup>nd</sup> end., revised and edited by Walter Scott), vol. 5*, (London, 1811) p. 214 for his comments on John Cook's *King Charles His Case*.

<sup>52</sup> W. A. Speck, *Robert Southey, Entire Man of Letters* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), p. 70.

<sup>53</sup> Walter Scott, *Peeveril of the Peak* (4 vols., Paris, 1823 edn.), ii, pp. 30-39 at p. 39

<sup>54</sup> Quoted in Dekker, 'Historical Romance', p. 222; Hawthorne, 'Grey Champion', p. 26

<sup>55</sup> For France *John Bull*, (23 May 1831), p. 165, issue 545; for connecting supporters of political reform with regicide *John Bull*, (4 June 1842), p. 272, issue 1121; for reports of the decline of observation of 30 January, *John Bull*, (2 June 1839), p. 258, issue 964.

---

<sup>56</sup> For an example, see the use of the regicide in arguing for an inquiry into the Peterloo massacre of 1819, *Bell's Life in London and Sporting Chronicle*, (18 March, 1832), issue 521.

<sup>57</sup> Eaton produced an edition of John Cook's *Monarchy no creature of God's making* in 1794 with a four page editor's addendum linking Cook to the Painite radicalism of the 1790s.

Linton, like Southey, produced a poem on Henry Marten, *Claribel and Other Poems* (London, 1865), pp. 67-74 and see Sarah Barber, *A Revolutionary Rogue: Henry Marten and the English Republic* (Stroud: Sutton, 2000), pp. 168-9. I thank Ian Haywood for bringing Linton's poetry to my attention.

<sup>58</sup> On the connections between the regicides' story and Romanticism in an American context see Phillip Gould, *Covenant and Republic: Historical Romance and the Politics of Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), ch. 3-5 and V. C. Hopkins, *Prodigal Puritan: A Life of Delia Bacon* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 1959), pp. 39-40

<sup>59</sup>Sargent, 'Witches of Salem', 109-116

<sup>60</sup>Gould, *Covenant and Republic*, p. 120.

<sup>61</sup> Robert Southey, *Oliver Newman: A New England Tale (unfinished) with other poetical remains*, (London, 1845), p. 83 revealed that his inspiration was reviewing Abiel Holmes, *A Chronological History of America*, (2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1805), a history which recounted in volume 1 the story of the regicides from a combination of Hutchinson and Stiles, pp. 424-5. For Bacon see Hopkins, *Prodigal Puritan*, p. 43. On Scott's possible use of Stiles see Dekker, 'Historical Romance', pp. 214-15 and for Fenimore-Cooper *ibid.*, p. 219.

<sup>62</sup> Stiles, *History of the Judges*, pp. 8, 11-13, 182, 355

<sup>63</sup> Mark, Noble, *Memoirs of the protectorate-house of Cromwell* (2 vols, Birmingham 1784,) i, p. vi – while noting Oliver Cromwell's care for the nation's liberty, Noble describes him as

---

a ‘flaming, puritanic bigot’ in religion, *ibid.*, p. 137; William Richards, *A review of the Memoirs of the Protectoral-house of Cromwell* (Lynn, 1787), pp. 69, 72, 74.

<sup>64</sup> Stiles, *History of the Judges*, p. 11; Noble, *Memoirs of the protectorate- house*, ii, p. 184.

<sup>65</sup> Noble, *Memoirs of the protectorate-house*, ii, pp. 184-5.

<sup>66</sup> M. Noble, *Memoirs of the protectoral-house of Cromwell* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn., 2 vols., London, 1787), i, p. 425; The letter was taken from Hutchinson, *History*, i, pp. 532-3

<sup>67</sup> Noble, *Memoirs*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., ii, p. 151.

<sup>68</sup> Chris Jones, *Radical Sensibility: Literature and ideas in the 1790s* (Routledge: London, 1993), pp. 85-6. See Burke’s comments on Louis XVI, ‘As a man, it became him to feel for his wife and his children, and the faithful guards of his person, that were massacred in cold blood about him; as a prince, it became him to feel for the strange and frightful transformation of his civilized subjects.’ *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), p. 111.

<sup>69</sup> Mark Noble, *The Lives of the English Regicides, and other Commissioners of the Pretended High Court of Justice*, (2 vols, London, 1798)

<sup>70</sup> Noble, *Lives of the Regicides*, i, p. iv.

<sup>71</sup> Noble, *Lives of the Regicides*, i, p. ix. *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, 84 (1798), p. 596.

Noble’s work was also error-strewn, Noble, *Lives of the English Regicides*, i., p. 162, date of Cromwell’s death wrong; pp. 230-1, completely fallacious story about 7<sup>th</sup> Lord Fairfax of Cameron; p. 303, confuses Sir James Harrington with the author of *Oceana*.

<sup>72</sup> Noble, *Lives of the Regicides*, ii, pp. 328-9.

<sup>73</sup> Noble, *Lives of the Regicides*, i, pp. 134-5.

<sup>74</sup> On which, see John Barrell, *Imagining the King’s Death: Figurative Treason, Fantasies of Regicide 1793-1796* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 68-79.

<sup>75</sup> Macaulay, *History*, vi, p. 21

---

<sup>76</sup> Barrell, *Imagining the King's Death*, pp. 22-3, 30-3.

<sup>77</sup> Joel Peter Egen, 'Margaret Nicholson', *ODNB* and for a detailed discussion of public reaction to the case and Nicholson's treatment, Steven Poole, *The Politics of Regicide in England, 1760-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), ch. 4; There were other, similar cases in the 1790s, see John Barrell's, *Imagining the King's Death*, ch. 15.

<sup>78</sup> Joel Peter Egen, 'James Hadfield', *ODNB*

<sup>79</sup> [P. B. Shelley], *Posthumous Fragments of Margaret Nicholson; Being Poems Found Amongst the Papers of that Noted Female Who Attempted the Life of the King in 1786*, edited by John Fitzvictor (Oxford, 1810).

<sup>80</sup> See *Shelley and His Circle 1773-1822*, ed. Kenneth N. Cameron, 1 (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 34-8

<sup>81</sup> [Shelley], *Posthumous Fragments*, pp. 9-10

<sup>82</sup> E. Elliott, *Kerhonah, the Vernal Walk, Win Hill, and Other Poems* (London, 1835), p. 13

<sup>83</sup> Elliott, *Kerhonah*, p. 30.

<sup>84</sup> Southey, *Oliver Newman*, p. 51 and for Southey's description of Oliver's religion, p. 87.

<sup>85</sup> For a later example of a politically unsympathetic narrator empathising with the plight of the regicides see 'Cave of the Regicides', pp. 348-9.

<sup>86</sup> Scott, *Pevevil of the Peak*, iv, p. 137; Dekker, 'Historical Fiction', p. 221. As Dekker notes, American authors were able to accommodate 17<sup>th</sup> century Puritanism into a heroic narrative with greater ease, see Hawthorne, 'Grey Champion', p. 21. Joel Hawes, of whose strict Independent church Delia Bacon was a member, saw American democracy as the unequivocal legacy of the Pilgrim fathers: Hawes, *A Tribute to the Memory of the Pilgrims, and A Vindication of the Congregational Churches of New-England* (Hartford, 1830), pp. 62-3; Hopkins, *Prodigal Puritan*, p. 25 but see also Gould, *Covenant and Republic*, ch. 4.

---

<sup>87</sup> An overview of recent scholarship in this area is provided by Eliza O'Brian,

'Sentimentalism and 1790s Radical Novels', *Literature Compass*, 7:11 (2010), pp. 990-98

<sup>88</sup> Seed, *Dissenting Histories*, neatly describes them as having a 'wraith-like' presence, p. 89.