

Renaissance and Reformation Renaissance et Réforme



The English Regicide and Patriarchalism: Representing Commonwealth Ideology and Practice in the Early 1650s

Cesare Cuttica

Volume 36, Number 2, Spring 2013

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1091140ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v36i2.20170>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Cuttica, C. (2013). The English Regicide and Patriarchalism: Representing Commonwealth Ideology and Practice in the Early 1650s. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 36(2), 131–164. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v36i2.20170>

Article abstract

Cet article examine un ensemble particulier de réactions polémiques à l'assassinat du roi Charles Ier Stuart (1649), datant du début des années 1650. Le discours politique que cet ensemble présente est défini ici comme un absolutisme patriarcaliste. En se penchant sur l'oeuvre de Claudius Salmasius (1649), de Robert Filmer (1652), et sur le discours de John Milton en relation avec ces deux premiers penseurs, on traitera des trois points suivants. Pourquoi le paradigme du patriarcalisme a-t-il été utilisé à ce moment historique, pour défendre la monarchie et lutter contre le Commonwealth ? Quel discours, images et stratégies rhétoriques Salmasius et Filmer ont-ils utilisés ? Avec quels phénomènes ont-ils identifié les bases théoriques et les implications pratiques du nouveau régime ? En répondant à ces questions, cette étude vise deux objectifs. Premièrement, on mettra en lumière les séries de débats qui ont marqué les affrontements entre Salmasius, Milton et Filmer, afin de montrer que, dans le langage théorique du dix-septième siècle, une proportion du conflit politique portait sur des questions de représentation de la patrie et de la paternité. Deuxièmement, on avancera que les attaques patriarcalistes sur le Commonwealth ont servi à élaborer une critique acerbe du gouvernement républicain et en général, des idées républicaines. En bref, une analyse textuelle approfondie permet d'établir comment, à cette époque, les divers discours du patriarcalisme et du républicanisme étaient considérés comme deux courants antithétiques de pensée politique, religieuse, éthique et civique. Tout en mettant en lumière les éléments significatifs de cette opposition, souvent prise pour acquise, cet article propose que le patriarcalisme est important, en ce qu'il montre la réalité des correspondances entre deux domaines d'activité en apparence éloignés.

The English Regicide and Patriarchalism: Representing Commonwealth Ideology and Practice in the Early 1650s*

CESARE CUTTICA

Université Paris 8 — Vincennes

Cet article examine un ensemble particulier de réactions polémiques à l'assassinat du roi Charles Ier Stuart (1649), datant du début des années 1650. Le discours politique que cet ensemble présente est défini ici comme un absolutisme patriarcaliste. En se penchant sur l'œuvre de Claudius Salmasius (1649), de Robert Filmer (1652), et sur le discours de John Milton en relation avec ces deux premiers penseurs, on traitera des trois points suivants. Pourquoi le paradigme du patriarcalisme a-t-il été utilisé à ce moment historique, pour défendre la monarchie et lutter contre le Commonwealth ? Quel discours, images et stratégies rhétoriques Salmasius et Filmer ont-ils utilisés ? Avec quels phénomènes ont-ils identifié les bases théoriques et les implications pratiques du nouveau régime ? En répondant à ces questions, cette étude vise deux objectifs. Premièrement, on mettra en lumière les séries de débats qui ont marqué les affrontements entre Salmasius, Milton et Filmer, afin de montrer que, dans le langage théorique du dix-septième siècle, une proportion du conflit politique portait sur des questions de représentation de la patrie et de la paternité. Deuxièmement, on avancera que les attaques patriarcalistes sur le Commonwealth ont servi à élaborer une critique acerbe du gouvernement républicain et en général, des idées républicaines. En bref, une analyse textuelle approfondie permet d'établir comment, à cette époque, les divers discours du patriarcalisme et du républicanisme étaient considérés comme deux courants antithétiques de pensée politique, religieuse, éthique et civique. Tout en mettant en lumière les éléments significatifs de cette opposition, souvent prise pour acquise, cet article propose que le patriarcalisme est important, en ce qu'il montre la réalité des correspondances entre deux domaines d'activité en apparence éloignés.

The year 1649 saw the murder of a king, Charles I, and the foundation of a republic in England.¹ The royal killing sent shock waves through Europe, provoking a flurry of polemical literature (pamphlets, newspapers, treatises, ballads) on the event and its consequences.² Among this series of publications were the writings of many mourning royalists as well as sundry jubilant pro-republican tracts.³ Within the first camp, two important reactions came from writers whose ideas are here labelled “patriarchalist absolutism.”⁴ By looking at the works of Claudius Salmasius (1588–1653) and Sir Robert Filmer (1588–1653), who sided against John Milton, this paper examines how these reactions were articulated both before and after the decisive military royalist defeat at Worcester (1651). It asks what languages, images, and rhetorical strategies Salmasius and Filmer used, and why they deemed patriarchalism a suitable weapon to employ against the Commonwealth.

The focus on patriarchalism does not imply that this was the *only* language in the writings of Salmasius and Filmer: it was, in fact, one of the many different available languages they drew upon, including arguments taken from natural law theory, ancient Greek and Roman sources, Hebrew commentaries, and Biblical accounts. Moreover, absolutists certainly had no monopoly on patriarchalism, whose rhetoric and contents were used and subverted by republicans, à la Milton, for their own purposes. The latter were anti-patriarchalists on a (high) political level, but social conservatives and paternalists in the household, as can be seen in Cromwell’s attitude to rule as well as in the republicans’ ostensible treatment of women.⁵ Nor was patriarchalist political thought an exclusively English affair, having its counterpart in France—in the 1590s and 1610s, when the monarch was identified as a symbol of national unity in reaction to the murders of French kings Henry III (1589) and Henry IV (1610). Authors such as Pierre de Belloy, François Le Jay, and Jean Bédé juxtaposed king and nation so as to avoid the fatherly ruler being likened to a subject; instead, they made him the father of the fatherland, and they accused of parricide those who opposed absolute government, calling them unpatriotic hotheads. This model—which made the king the object of primary loyalty—was vociferously formulated in a deeply divided France, where the goal of absolutists had been to instill in the collective imagery the idea that “monarchical allegiance and national feeling” were intertwined.⁶ In fusing fatherhood and fatherland, Adamic origins and absolute power, Salmasius and Filmer took heed of this theoretical strategy.⁷

Given the highly divisive context in which Salmasius and Filmer wrote, we have grounds for distrusting their representations of what the “new republicans” were up to. And yet it is worth paying attention to how they saw the theoretical pillars and practical implications of the new regime. They identified its ideological hallmarks with a variety of political positions and actions, theological agendas, ethical priorities and ideas: parricide, military rule, ancient constitutionalism, the principle of consent, parliamentary sovereignty, religious sectarianism, political chaos, and moral anarchy. Using this knowledge, we can discern three major clusters of debate informing patriarchalist criticism of the Commonwealth and of Milton’s response in its defense. It will thus emerge that, in trying to make sense of post-1649 England, Salmasius and Filmer were profoundly at odds with Milton regarding the nature of the polity and its government; the status of linguistic accuracy and masculine values under opposite political systems; and the issue of patriotism and national identity.

Highlighting the centrality of patriarchalism as a distinct doctrine within the absolutist canon,⁸ the following pages show that in the realm of seventeenth-century theoretical disputes a key portion of political conflict centred on the issue of the representation of fatherland and fatherhood.⁹ The political use of fatherhood (and masculinity), as well as relentless attention to patriotic vocabulary, reflects the process of image-construction undertaken during the long Stuart reign by both monarchists and their adversaries. For the former, fatherhood—through the hereditary mechanism—was non-negotiable and guaranteed continuity to the body politic; sons/subjects had a duty to support their parent(s)/kings. This image, of the king as the father of the country, was central to royal propaganda.¹⁰ In fact, patriarchalists like Salmasius and Filmer re-appropriated the powerful republican motif of the good citizen’s public self-sacrifice: they turned it to the advantage of the supreme monarch to whom the people’s sacrifice was now due, as towards a father. The rhetorical apparatus of paternal images provided by their discourse rendered the sacrifice less violent and more acceptable (more plausible and more appealing) in that it belonged to the emotionally, culturally, and socially safer sphere of the family. A father was (at least, ideally) no usurper or conqueror; he was no Cromwell. The patriarchalist narrative of politics then transposed the republican virtues of *pietas* and *caritas* from the family into the realm of the monarch.

By playing with the richly allusive discourses of fatherhood and parricide as much as with the practical issues of people’s allegiance to a fatherly

(masculine) king, and with increasingly oppositional patriotic claims in the 1650s, Salmasius and Filmer showed that they understood the centrality of patriarchalism and patriotism at times of crisis. Their view of the absolute monarch as *pater patriae* reveals that, despite the unprecedented events of the 1640s, the same problems, arguments, and agendas occupied a significant part of political discussion and theory throughout the century. At stake in the conflicts of seventeenth-century England was the identity of the nation.¹¹ Fatherhood and fatherland had mattered during the Jacobean and early Caroline patriarchalist attacks against claims that Parliament was the true representative of the people and the cornerstone of liberties.¹² Equally, they were to be taken on board in the unsettled 1680s, where the purchase of patriarchal ideas became widespread to tackle the hereditary troubles caused by the impending succession of James, Duke of York, and where the Exclusion Crisis debates and Tory-Whig reactions put Filmer's discourse front and centre in ways that explain just why John Locke wanted to refute him so directly.¹³

By illustrating what the opinions of Salmasius and Filmer on the Commonwealth add to the absolutists' scathing critique of republican government and principles, we hope to make a small but meaningful contribution to the study of English political thought in the 1650s; finally, we will offer some further considerations on the amply investigated clash between Salmasius and Milton.¹⁴

Salmasius on the Commonwealth's military tyranny and independency

A widely-respected classical scholar, Salmasius turned to political matters in *Defensio regia pro Carolo I* (1649) where he condemned the killing of Charles I and mounted a strong attack on the new republican regime.¹⁵ The *Defensio's* first edition came out anonymously, although it was no secret who the author was.¹⁶ From the start, it prompted vehement controversy: the future Charles II was said to have paid for the cost of the printing and to have given Salmasius £100, which the latter categorically denied. In particular, Salmasius defended himself from Milton's accusations of having been bribed.¹⁷ Giving tit for tat, the Frenchman retorted that Milton had made £4,000 out of a response, *Pro populo anglicano defensio* (1651), to his own work.¹⁸ Smears aside, Salmasius's *Defensio* was issued in November 1649. By the following January, three or four editions

already circulated; by February 1650, 2,400 copies had been sold.¹⁹ Likewise, Milton's *Pro populo anglicano defensio*—which was commissioned by the Council of State on January 8, 1651—became a best-seller not only in England but also around Europe, and this despite the many attempts by European monarchs to prevent its circulation.²⁰ At times the two books were released together so that readers could study their antithetical doctrines in combination with each other.²¹

While much is known about the author of *Pro populo anglicano defensio*,²² certainly less studied is the “raving sophist” against whose “mad and most spiteful rage” Milton wrote “to defend the excellent deeds of my [his] fellow countrymen.”²³ Targeted by the republican poet as a witless and talentless “crier and a hair-splitter,” an “empty windbag of man,”²⁴ Salmasius and his political ideas are often referred to but not much examined.²⁵ The following pages attempt to do just that.

The first salvo Salmasius fired off was directed at those who had committed the execrable “parricide”²⁶ of Charles I, the outcome of which had seen the creation of a polity dominated by soldiers instead of a free state.²⁷ In his *pars construens*, Salmasius embraced the patriarchalist approach with the aim of showing that regicide was the most heinous of crimes in so far as it fragmented fatherly authority that had originally been placed in one hand by God. In the *pars destruens*, Salmasius painted the regicides as both unpatriotic and hypocritical for having thrown “their miserable fatherland in an infamous servitude.” Fickle and power-thirsty minds created a “Republic in a Monarchy and a Monarchy in a Republic.” This was why they called themselves Independents: aspiring to destroy monarchy *tout court*, they wanted everything to be dependent on them and nobody else.²⁸ Salmasius was here at pains to unmask his targets as complete liars who had generated an ochlocracy; that is, a government not of the people (as claimed) but of the mob.²⁹ This change had been motivated not by the “zeal” of providing “a better shape to the State,” but only by the desire of these “parricides” and “plague of the fatherland” to exploit the people and satisfy “their ambition.”³⁰ Cromwell and his acolytes gave the impression of having erected a “republican” government and deceived the English into believing that they would have “some sort of equality” as well as “a true and sweet freedom.”³¹ Indeed, there was no democracy, but a tyranny of 40 petty tyrants, a much worse regime than the despotic one of the notorious Thirty Tyrants in ancient

Athens; there was no aristocracy either, as instead of the first and great ones, power was in the hands of murderous bandits. From a bunch of “worthless men” (“faquins”³²), “sovereign authority” had passed on to Cromwell, “a man of the dregs [“lie”].” The kernel of Salmasius’s argument was that republics like the English Commonwealth succeeded in their anti-monarchical pursuits only through violence.³³

Far from monarchical order, republics had no head in either state or church: each individual was authorized to judge on his own regarding political and religious matters. In consequence, England was now at the mercy of the “oppressive tyranny of a maniple of factious soldiers” whose only creed was to have multiple religions.³⁴ The latter circumstance saw England transformed into a sanctuary for sects: in this regard, Salmasius adhered to the widespread early modern French opinion whereby heresy and republican government were strictly linked, which in turn stemmed from the assumption that the Reform had unleashed all forms of disorder in both politics and religion.³⁵ This was manifest in the Independents’ rivalry with another “sect” (the Levellers)³⁶ whose goal was to render both men and things equal. Moreover, in manifold affairs (from recruiting mercenaries to accepting all kinds of superstitions), the new governors of England (“Insular Christians”) imitated pagan Rome and modern Turkey. Yet Salmasius held them worse than Romans and Turks; these at least, despite destroying the person of the king, had preserved kingship.³⁷ While the new English “Prophets from Hell” boldly asserted that their actions should encourage all the peoples of the world to dismantle kingly government altogether, Salmasius called for the kings of Europe to launch an attack on the Commonwealth so as to restore the legitimate heir to the throne.³⁸

Moving from this dark picture of post-1649 reality to the realm of theory, Salmasius tackled the philosophical justifications of the regicide.³⁹ He singled out the Romanists (Jesuits) as much as the Reformed thinkers as the major exponents of the modern doctrines of resistance. He distinguished those who gave the Pope “a sovereign Empire [. . .] to depose kings,” and armed the people so as to stir up anti-monarchical rebellion, and those who assigned this power directly to the people as original holders of it, making kings mere delegates. The former group conceded to the Pope the authority to give the crown to whom-ever he chose, while the latter group admitted no monarch at all (which was the case under everyone’s eyes at that time in England).⁴⁰ Against these views, Salmasius explained that kings were “absolute, independent, sovereign, exempt

from all authority” and could not “be judged.”⁴¹ By the same token, he defined an absolute monarchy as a government “dependent on the will of one person,” who was responsible to God only. This doctrine was meant to contrast “the frenzied [“phrenetiques”] of England” who confused everything by arguing that “each state without distinction is popular.”⁴² Above all, Salmasius imputed to these English “Visionaries” (“Illuminez”)⁴³ the act of having set up an unprecedented form of government: “a Military Republic.”⁴⁴ He accused the English Commonwealth—a perfect example of the “decadence of Republics”⁴⁵—of pretending to be governed by “doctors and intellectuals,”⁴⁶ when de facto it was in the hands of “the army rabble” (“soldatesque”) and their republican “captains,” who had erased all “public liberty.”⁴⁷ In this respect, he wanted to show that England was now an “odd Republic, where it is permitted neither to think what one wants nor to say what one thinks.”⁴⁸

Salmasius’s accusations against the Commonwealth, of having built “a *military tyranny*,”⁴⁹ need to be read within the historical process of a transformation toward military power (what in historiography is generally referred to as the “military-fiscal” state).⁵⁰ The Republic was the “first” government in England to embrace wholly and benefit from the changes happening in the military, which helped the regime obtain important successes in Ireland, Scotland, and then against the Dutch. As a result, its ideological bedrock was amply shaped by the military factor, so much so that republican authors gave great attention to it as the foundational element of modern state power.⁵¹ Salmasius was aware of this: he stressed that arms and laws went together, being integral to royal power. The one without the other would cease to exist:⁵² the king had to be the head of the army. This arrangement—which in Salmasius’s narrative became a reversal of traditional republican discourse—prevented the recruitment of mercenaries as troops of the country. Kingly control of the military was also essential in order to preserve internal peace: indeed, once the republicans had deprived the king of such control, rebellion had begun.⁵³

In substance, Salmasius attacked the doctrines of Aristotle, Livy, and Machiavelli, who had defended the interplay of political liberty and military glory. He contested the Republic’s pride in its own distinctively radical, popular, and militaristic character by breaking the republican link between soldier and citizen, which was too dangerous for the safety of people and monarch(s) alike.⁵⁴ He also rejected republican arguments whereby patriotism was best enshrined in a militia of citizens ready to die for their country. In reaction to this

tenet, he proposed a model of power where the Adamic component projected a different kind of patriotism: one that foregrounded the king as father of the nation for whom children-subjects would sacrifice themselves. Thus, Salmasius fully endorsed the patriarchalist concept that power was originally fatherly. Kings were “fathers of the fatherland” and “[r]oyal rule” corresponded to “the sovereignty of a paterfamilias,” which constituted a “Whole *Kingship*.”⁵⁵ The father was to the household what the king was to the state. Hence the murder of Charles I was a parricide.⁵⁶

More specifically, Salmasius dismissed all comparisons of Charles to Nero, or between the English Parliament and the Roman Senate, claiming that the Roman tyrant had behaved in ways that could not be attributed to Charles.⁵⁷ Moreover, while the Roman Senate was a legitimate body formed of virtuous people who had deserved their position, the English assembly was composed of thieves and members of the lowest part of the populace. In reality, it was more appropriate to compare Nero with the new Commonwealthmen, for just as the Roman ruler had killed his mother, the Cromwellian bandits had murdered “the father of the fatherland” (which was worse).⁵⁸ The parricides were, therefore, the “new Neros.”⁵⁹ Their murderous act was like a plant whose seeds could be found in the opinions of the likes of John Bradshaw, president of the High Court of Justice, for whom the monarch was no more than the “chief magistrate in a popular state.”⁶⁰

By and large, Salmasius’s patriarchalist language reflected the urgency to react to the king’s execution—which, in “symbolic terms,” could “be described as the death of the patriarch.”⁶¹ That fatherhood was an important political motif of dispute is further confirmed by Milton’s comment according to which, through “the ravings of his professional tongue,” the “troublesome grammarian” Salmasius had given himself the “mighty task [. . .] to defend a father [Charles I] to his son [Charles II].” Moreover, Milton responded to the accusations of parricide by stating that, through his “parricidal barbarism,” Salmasius had killed the grammarian Aristarchus with his “impropriety of speech.”⁶² The republican stalwart also argued that the French theorist had used the term “parricide” too loosely and incorrectly.⁶³ Indeed, linguistic disputes and gendered critiques of patriarchalism were closely intertwined in the controversies opposing the distinguished classical scholar Salmasius and the refined poet Milton. Interestingly, these two aspects were also connected to the important theme of patriotism. We will now look at how this happened.

Salmasius versus Milton: heated words, political thought, nationhood⁶⁴

Salmasius had inveighed against the crimes of republicans in philology; Milton, however, discredited his patriarchalist adversary's linguistic competence and intellectual refinement.⁶⁵ Milton's reaction to the appearance of the *Defensio* was one of harsh disdain towards somebody who had betrayed the humanist values expounded by people like Erasmus and George Buchanan. By extension, Milton coupled philological decline with monarchical government:⁶⁶ such deterioration, he observed, had been exacerbated when Charles I's son had resorted to a Continental writer to defend his cause. This demonstrated how badly language fared under monarchy to the extent that no able English royalist could be found to fulfill this role. The same lack of civilized manners in the literary sphere among kingly supporters was mirrored in the latter's cruelty and deceitful actions against Commonwealthmen, of which the royalist assassinations of the envoy to the Netherlands, Isaac Dorislaus (1649), and the ambassador Anthony Ascham (1650) in Spain were the most tragic manifestations. By contrast, the argument went, Charles had received an open trial. In republican parlance, this proved that kingship was tantamount to violent "blindness and illusion," whereas the new form of government represented openness and truth.⁶⁷

However accurate this might be in theory, in practice the republican Milton fired ungallant *ad personam* remarks against Salmasius, who was not just an incompetent scholar but also a "foreigner" who meddled in English affairs.⁶⁸ Playing with the term "Gallus" ("French"), Milton called his opponent a "cocklike" and "effeminate Frenchman"⁶⁹ (with whom it was worthless to debate political matters) in order to depict him both as a "rooster" and as one of the "Galli," namely "the castrated priests of Cybele known for their wild ranting and ravaging."⁷⁰ In the first instance, Salmasius was associated with an aesthetically unpleasant bird, while in the second his masculinity was cast in doubt (he was turned into the Ovidian nymph Salmacis).⁷¹ In Milton's character assassination, the husband Salmasius was said to be victim to a nagging and domineering Xanthippe-like wife, which questioned his "credibility as a spokesman for patriarchalism."⁷² Milton often attacked Salmasius under the belt by exaggerating his vanity and personal foibles,⁷³ and used vituperative metaphors to describe the French author as a hermaphrodite who begot both children and books "in questionable ways."⁷⁴ Fatherhood and scholarship were indeed part and parcel

of the republican's rhetorical strategy aimed at tarnishing his rival's reputation and cause.

In his anti-patriarchalist tirade against Salmasius, Milton also proved to be ultra-patriotic as well as aggressively supportive of English politics: the "good citizens" of England did not "need to defend their acts by the example of any foreigners at all" for "[t]hey have their native laws [. . .] which are the best [. . .] in all the world." It was enough that they imitate "their ancestors" who, by not giving in to "the unrestrained powers of kings," had never ceased to be free and "self-sufficient."⁷⁵ Against the "foreigner" Salmasius, who was "a complete stranger to our [English] affairs," Milton tellingly depicted himself as "a native" who was better qualified to judge the events leading up to and following the regicide⁷⁶—or, in Milton's vocabulary, the tyrannicide.⁷⁷ In line with this, *Pro populo anglicano defensio* made "nationalistic [. . .] references to the ancient constitution" in order to praise the heroic "Patriots" who had saved England and delivered it from the tyranny of the Stuart king.⁷⁸ If the Levellers had identified the patriot with the soldier engaged in the battle to affirm common rights and liberties, in 1660 Milton was to define "our old Patriots [. . .] the first Assertors of our religious and civil rights," and to defend the MPs of the Rump Parliament who had justly abolished monarchy. Equally, in *The Readie and Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* (1660) Milton singled out those "chosen Patriots" who—having unwaveringly committed themselves to the Commonwealth—ought to be "rightly call'd the true keepers of our libertie."⁷⁹ The Miltonian conclusion was that monarchy and patriotism were incompatible. Only his "most outstanding fellow countrymen" who had freed England of a king "who had crushed the law and beaten down religion" could be reputed as true "preservers of their fatherland." In tune with this, Milton accused Salmasius of having been "hired for a price by exiles from our country" who were "enemies to our native land."⁸⁰ Instead, those savagely labelled by the French scholar as "traitors, robbers, cut-throats, parricides, fanatics" had not—in Milton's republican eyes—been "spurred on by ambition or a desire to take possession of the rights of others, or by sedition or any wicked lusts, not by madness or fury"; rather, they had been "burning with love of freedom, religion, justice, honor and finally love of your [their] native land."⁸¹

Following the positive associations of leading statesmen with *patres patriae* made in the ancient Roman historical, moral, and political tradition by authors such as Livy, Seneca, and Cicero, and also referring to the patriarchs of

ancient Israel, in his *Second Defence* (1654, written in reply to the Frenchman Pierre du Moulin) Milton was to describe Cromwell as “the father of your [his] country.”⁸² This shows that Milton adopted tropes and revised images belonging to the patriarchalist discourse in order to make it serve his and the new Commonwealth’s ends. Thus, patriarchalism was not the exclusive dominion of absolutist and anti-republican propaganda; republicans, too, promoted their cause by representing their leaders as fathers who cared for and loved the sacred *patria*. Patriarchalism and patriotism were flexible paradigms appealing to rival factions and thinkers in the cauldron of political controversies and theoretical debates in the long seventeenth century.⁸³

In the aftermath of the regicide, the fatherland for Milton received its identity through the collective agency of valorous patriots and not, as patriarchalists claimed, through the monogenetic paternity of the king. Accordingly, Milton ridiculed Salmasius for “still” being “in darkness since” he did “not distinguish a father’s right from a king’s.” The republican theorist derided his target’s pretense that, by calling “kings fathers of their country,” people would be “persuaded [. . .] at once by this metaphor”: in fact, it was absurd to assume that what was true of a father was also true of a king. These two figures were “very different things”: a father had a paternal relation to his offspring that a king could not have towards his people. It was the people who made a king. It evidently followed that “[n]ature gave a father to people,” but “the people themselves gave themselves a king: so people do not exist because of a king, but a king exists because of the people.” At work to dismantle the theoretical bedrock of patriarchalist absolutism, Milton stated that people should not “endure a father who is a tyrant.” Therefore, in getting rid of Charles, who had been “not a father of his country, but its destroyer,” the English people had acted with justice and righteousness.⁸⁴ Likewise, “to line a king to a head of the household” was pure nonsense, for whereas “a father certainly deserves the rule of his family, all of whom he either begot or supports: with a king there is nothing of this kind, but most clearly everything is the opposite.”⁸⁵ Milton had no doubt that “in the very beginning of nations, paternal and hereditary government very soon gave way to virtue and the people’s rights”: *this* was “the origin of royal power, and the most natural reason and cause.”⁸⁶

Only two years later, these Miltonian ideas found a strenuous opponent in Sir Robert Filmer. The latter not only launched a pro-Salmasius attack on the

republican author, but he also presented another vein of post-regicidal patriarchalist absolutism.

Filmer versus Milton: arbitrary power versus popular government

Filmer,⁸⁷ author of the much-vituperated *Patriarcha* (published in 1680), is better known than his French counterpart as he had the “privilege” of being designated their major butt by late-seventeenth-century thinkers of the calibre of John Locke, Algernon Sidney, and James Tyrrell. A well-connected Kentish gentleman whose intellectual interests extended further than the realm of political debates, Filmer’s activity as a polemicist engaged in the politics of the day took a prolific turn towards the end of his life. One result was the ambitious *Observations Concerning The Originall of Government Upon Mr Hobbs Leviathan, Mr Milton against Salmasius, H. Grotius De Jure Belli*, published in February 1652.⁸⁸

Besides attacking Hobbes, Filmer seized the opportunity to have his say in the dispute between Salmasius and Milton by confirming that language mattered a great deal in the battle between patriarchalists and republicans: Sir Robert pointed out that even “the learnedest” could not agree on the meaning of the “familiar” terms “king” and “people.” If for Salmasius a king was “he who hath the supreme power of the kingdom, and is accountable to none but God, and may do what he please, and is free from the laws,” for Milton such a definition amounted to tyranny. In principle, Filmer would have shared the latter’s opinion if only he had explained how it was possible for a king to have “a supreme power without being freed from human laws.”⁸⁹ Despite failing to define kingship, Milton had confidently argued that monarchical power derived from the people and that the ruler was obliged to apply the laws of the country rather than “his own.” Regal power was thus only possible “in the courts of the kingdom.” As a result, Filmer inferred, Milton had stripped the monarch “of all power whatsoever” and confined him to “a condition below the meanest of his subjects.”⁹⁰

Uncertainty surrounding the concept of kingship mirrored—more dangerously—the lack of a definition of “people.” Aristotle had been unable to formulate a precise notion of who so-called “free citizens” were; for Filmer, a citizen might be considered free in one country, and not in another. Moreover,

by asserting that democracy was “a corrupted sort of government” and that a great number of men being by nature “servants” were unfit to rule, Aristotle had clearly restricted the degree to which it was possible to refer to somebody as part of the people. The same occurred in the 1640s and 1650s where political thinkers always talked “big of the people,” when in reality they had in mind only “a few representers” of the whole. And such “representers” did not correspond to the entire people either. It was “the major part of these” that was assumed to be “the whole people.”⁹¹ Likewise, following this trend of further quantitative reduction of who the people were, Milton himself—Filmer cogently maintained—had not allowed this “major part” to be seen as the people, but had limited the latter to the “sounder and better part only.” The republican had assigned the task of establishing what a tyrant was to “the uprighter sort of” magistrates. It ensued that “the sounder,” “the better,” and “the uprighter” were all indiscriminately identified with the people, leaving all attempts at clarification blurred.⁹² Filmer’s shrewd criticism hit the nail on the head: Milton’s people were only the godly minority for whom he ultimately spoke and whose interests he defended. On this series of anti-republican points, the English patriarchalist was in perfect agreement with Salmasius.⁹³

Filmer’s resolve to make the new regime shine in all its monstrosity was further carried out in *Observations Upon Aristotles Politiques* (May 1652). Here he attacked its representative system for failing to adequately fulfill the people’s will. In spite of his targets’ affirmation to the contrary,⁹⁴ Filmer found it obvious that only a minority of people were represented through the assembly while the multitude remained voiceless. Moreover, due to the constant changing of opinions among them, polities like the Commonwealth were affected by “an interrupted succession of a multitude of short-lived governments,” so that nobody could really be said to live under one single power.⁹⁵ The antidote to this disease now affecting the English body politic was hereditary monarchy whose rule of the right of succession provided stability. In Filmer’s political demonology, popular government fared dreadfully because in it “the whole people is a thing so uncertain and changeable that it alters every moment.”⁹⁶ Worse still, hypocrisy—Filmer astutely pointed out in a move similar to Salmasius’s—was a revealing trait of the supporters of “popularity,” who despite claiming to fight for the freedom of all men, allowed the keeping of servants and slaves in their own households. Such an arrangement betrayed “the true way of popular voting.”⁹⁷

Up to this point, Filmer's arguments were forcefully absolutist but not particularly unusual. They became so when—with the recent turbulent events in mind—he declared that it would be inconceivable “for any government at all to be in the world without an *arbitrary* power.” As he succinctly put it in what can be taken as the epitome of his voluntaristic theory: “[i]t is not power except it be *arbitrary*.”⁹⁸ And no doubt such a power was concentrated in the *lex loquens* and *legibus solutus* king, who guided the nation efficiently and safely. The will of the ruler ruled; his might protected the subjects and, in turn, the latter had to recognize in him the sole source of power. As Filmer reiterated in his attack on Grotius, “the law [. . .] is nothing else but the will of him that hath the power of the supreme father.”⁹⁹ It therefore followed that the republican regime wielded no legitimate legislative authority.

As if he had not been outspoken enough, Filmer retorted to Milton's remark whereby “tyranny” corresponded to “one man” governing “arbitrarily” that it was “far greater tyranny for a multitude of men to govern without being accountable or bound by laws.”¹⁰⁰ This was precisely the type of chaotic scenario now in place under the new regime, whose artificers failed to acknowledge that to make laws entailed the sole discretion of the legislator. Filmer's language speaks volumes: Milton's “definition of a king” showed his complete blindness to the affairs of government. In what was a defense of his idea that the king was the eye of the kingdom, Filmer rejected Milton's principle that the people had entrusted the ruler with the power “to see that nothing be done against law.” Of this assertion an ironic Sir Robert observed that, while all men possessed “the faculty of seeing by nature,” the monarch was only given such a faculty as “the gift of the people.” The arbitrary essence of his power was thus confined to his ability to “wink if he will”: the rest was strictly under the people's controlling gaze. In reaction to such untenable opinions (“of late highly magnified”¹⁰¹), Filmer proclaimed that at first fathers and kings “were all one,” so that now every monarch “hath a paternal empire.” This gave the authority of kings an exclusive superiority and made them punishable only by God's judgment.¹⁰² This “Filmerian” monarchy established an agency capable of enforcing laws and creating a just balance of interests belonging to different groups, which were always at loggerheads in republics. In contrast to the latter, monarchies guaranteed speed, “secrecy,” flexibility, and unity, especially with regard to the decision-making process.¹⁰³ In a word, they were more humane: for Filmer, monarchical trust in one man was better than republican trust in many.

The conflict between Milton and Filmer was also shaped by their polar interpretations of England's past and, most importantly, by divergent representations of the country's identity. While for Milton England's forefathers had "founded this commonwealth with no less good sense and freedom than did the Romans once or the most excellent of the Greeks," providing in this way a model for their mid-seventeenth-century republican heirs,¹⁰⁴ Filmer saw all contemporary claims that English glory derived from imitation of classical examples as not only illusionary because of their denying any role to Adam, but also as profoundly pernicious in that they overlooked the endless crimes committed in Rome under popular (i.e., republican) governments.¹⁰⁵ In this uncompromisingly polemical climate, Milton's reliance on the paradigm of the ancient constitution gave primacy to the law, whereas Filmer's account of absolute monarchy portrayed a fresco whose main character was the will of the king. In the former case, the identity of England was Gothic and, consequently, its government was based on popular sovereignty, self-governing assemblies, and the immemorial status of parliamentary rule.¹⁰⁶ By contrast, in the Filmerian case the accent was placed on the language of chronological (genetic) as well as political Adamic superiority of patriarchs, and then kings, over the whole body politic (conceived of as a large family). To Milton's *res publica* Filmer opposed his *res patrum*. In this debate the English nation assumed radically different images of what it had been, was, and ought to be.

Milton had decried all governments where power was absolute. What is more, Filmer commented, he had associated them with tyranny, that is a polity where the ruler disregarded both "law" and "the common good," and reigned "only for himself and his faction" instead of looking after "his people's profit." Filmer responded to the first consideration (law) by arguing that it was sometimes indispensable to derogate from established laws when these were too rigid: the highest form of tyranny "in the world" occurred when there was "no equity to abate the rigour of" laws ("summum jus is summa injuria"). Therefore, Filmer declared that "[i]t is the chief happiness of a kingdom, and their [subjects'] chief liberty, not to be governed by the laws only." The truth was that in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1649) Milton had himself condemned the strict observation of "gibberish laws" as "the badges of ancient slavery." His doctrine, however, had then gone too far by dint of asserting that the predecessors of a people could not bind their successors through their decisions. For Sir Robert such a view left the door open to "constant anarchy."¹⁰⁷ To

put it briefly: where the republican Milton rejected slavery to kingly rule, the patriarchalist Filmer abhorred servitude to inflexible legislation.¹⁰⁸

As for his reaction to Milton's second point (common good), Filmer observed that it was "impossible" for a government to have as its chief goal "the destruction of a people," exactly "as tyranny is supposed" to do. To rule over people without pursuing their benefit was for Filmer an absurdity: the despot would not survive without the servant being preserved. Equally, the well-being of subjects was fundamental for monarchs. Otherwise, there would be no government at all. Even though there might be "vicious" kings, one could not conclude with Milton that absolute monarchy "is or can be in its own nature ill" simply because "the governor is so." Only "anarchy" of the kind then in place in England could "totally destroy a nation." Moreover, tyranny had not been referred to in the Bible nor had the Hebrew language a word to convey its meaning. Historically, Filmer added sharply, tyrants were deemed to be those who had obtained government in an "ill" manner (like the regicides) rather than those who exercised it alone (like Charles I). But at the time he was writing, the term "tyrant" was indiscriminately used to describe "every man [...] thought to govern ill, or to be an ill man." The likes of Milton made criticism of kingly power completely acceptable, whereas it was all the more urgent to acknowledge that "[t]o speak evil, or to revile a supreme judge" was akin to judging he who "hath no superior on earth to judge him."¹⁰⁹ Failure to put a remedy to this trend had led to the royal killing and to the incumbent general confusion in government. Confusion was indeed a keyword of Salmasius's and Filmer's patriarchalist vocabulary.

Fanaticism and confusion in post-regicidal politics and religion

At work to identify those responsible for the "revolution" that had overthrown England,¹¹⁰ Salmasius regarded the "Loathsome Lawyer of the English parricides" John Cook ("Cok")¹¹¹ as he whose "deception" had fortified "the fanatical founders of the modern Republic." More specifically, Salmasius put the parricide on the army whose "conspiracies" had purged the Commons of their best elements for trying to save the monarchy. But what about the role of the Presbyterians?¹¹² Could they be deemed as guilty as the Independents?¹¹³ Salmasius's answer was negative, but this did not mean that they had not

contributed to abolish the monarchy. They bore a huge responsibility: compared to a play, the Presbyterians could be said to have performed the first four acts, with the Independents playing the most tragic fifth and sixth acts. There had been a crescendo whose climax on stage had occurred with the theatrical murder of Charles I. Therefore, the former could legitimately be held as culpable.¹¹⁴ The Stuart king had been moved from the Presbyterian prison to the Independent jail. In this journey of squalor, the former mined the foundations of royal authority, while the latter laid those of tyranny. Like disciples performing better than their masters, the Independents had finished off a job that had already been commenced by the Presbyterians. By and large, though, Salmasius reputed the Independents as worse than the Presbyterians in that they had voiced opinions that advocated open rebellion against monarchical authority.¹¹⁵ They had set up a godly government; a government of self-appointed saints which was essentially incompatible with kingship. For them, Salmasius insisted, kingly authority was evil and had to be annihilated because it delayed the coming of Christ. Monarchs were thereby seen as enslavers of the true Church, and as such had to be exterminated.¹¹⁶ In some respects, Salmasius's anti-Independence position resembled those of the Dutch Calvinist ministers, who supported the Orangist cause, deplored the execution of Charles, and severely condemned religious "licence" engendered by the change of regime.¹¹⁷

In his criticism of what he considered the Commonwealth's confusion-ridden ideology, Salmasius viewed the radicals of the 1640s as the heirs of the Elizabethan Puritans ("Puritains").¹¹⁸ He referred to the "*separatists*"—whose doctrines, according to him, derived partly from the strict "Brownists" ("*Brunists*")¹¹⁹ and partly from the more relaxed "Robinsonians" ("*Robinsoniens*")¹²⁰—to the "*Nonconformists*" and to the "*Conformists*" as troublemakers in both politics and religion.¹²¹ In his mapping out the radical landmarks of the English religious landscape, Salmasius turned to King James VI and I not just as a theoretical ally, but, significantly, with a hint of disapproval toward the king who should have chased the Puritans out of the country by deporting them to faraway places like Virginia. His failure to do so had enabled them to contaminate people's minds with tenets that expressed a pervasive hatred of monarchy. They had thus managed to spread their poisonous notion of parricide within the body politic, affecting people's conscience too. They had carried out this perfidious mission by resorting to a refrain made

of three words meant to embody the essence of their values: “purity,” “sanctity,” and “innocence.”¹²²

Salmasius proclaimed that England had fallen prey to the same disruptive storms of fanaticism that had hit Münster and New England.¹²³ In particular, he scorned what he saw as the anarchic liberty of conscience promoted by the sectaries, for whom there were no differences of gender, age, condition, and role in their despicable worshipping of God. In their disorderly churches a king and a servant were equal. They made secular people and even women (e.g., the dissident Puritan prophet in America, Anne Hutchinson)¹²⁴ preach the Gospel as if they were priests, and went as far as to allow them “to discuss articles of faith.”¹²⁵ Moreover, Salmasius charged that the Independents were hypocrites who concealed behind the veil of charity all forms of sins, including those of a sexual nature (with promiscuity and bestiality centre stage in his account of the sects’ behaviour). They were “saints against the grain [“au rebours”],” guilty of all immoral acts (including “impurity,” “profanation,” and “infamy”) to the extent that even paradise would look like a place to avoid, should it be occupied by people like them.¹²⁶ In tracing the sectarian presence around the world, Salmasius insisted that these “devilish products” had emerged in New England, from where they had moved to Holland and, subsequently, to England, “after having spread in all of these places seeds of impiety against God, sedition against Magistrates, revolt against Kings.”¹²⁷ Not content with these execrable acts, they presently claimed to have God on their side, so as to disguise behind the smokescreen of sanctity their true anti-monarchical designs: to kill six more monarchs (those of France, Spain, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, and then either the German Emperor or the Turk).¹²⁸

Likewise, in Filmer’s anti-Commonwealth narrative the step from political anarchy to religious confusion was also very short: Milton’s advocacy of people’s freedom to select the form of government they pleased led straight to “the liberty of the people’s choosing their religion,” which allowed men to be “of any religion, or of no religion.” As ancient Greece and Rome became “as famous for their polytheism, or multitudes of gods, as of governors,” having imagined “aristocracy and democracy” both “in heaven” and “on earth,” so centuries later an identically deleterious scenario affected the Low Countries and Venice.¹²⁹ From these two nations the same wave of disruption had now broken on England’s shores with catastrophic consequences for monarchical state-building. Filmer was aware of a twofold process: as for religion, the republican revolution had

reacted “against Laudian formality in the shape of radical anti-formalism”; in respect of politics, it had gone “against counter-reformation monarchical state-building in the shape of no monarchy at all.” And this process involved more than just the state, as it touched “the soul” too. Therefore, Filmer counterattacked republican notions of citizens’ self-government in both the polity and the interior forum by relying on the patriarchalist model of fatherly care and Adamic power, juxtaposing household and body politic. He endeavoured to stop the republican avalanche of “a self-governing civic community” where monarchy meant the search for divisive private interests.¹³⁰ In other words, patriarchalism was a direct response and a challenge to the republican idea that the (moral) fibre of monarchy was crippled by self-interest.¹³¹ It articulated an alternative tale of morality centred on the absolute power of the father-king whose goal was the attainment of the public good. The logic behind this patriarchalist construct was simple: a father would never abandon his offspring nor would he be selfish in his deeds. These arguments essayed to break the republican equation of monarchy to tyranny. To do so, Filmer portrayed the king not only as superior because of his divine investment, hereditary principle, and political abilities, but also as more reliable because of his paternal duty.¹³² By fusing laws, state, and king through the paternal-genetic frame, patriarchalism rejected the opinion whereby the first two were separated from the third, which had proved crucial to the regicide and the foundation of the republic.¹³³

The backbone of Salmasius’s discourse was an attack on the Commonwealth as a haven of religious radicalism and a cradle of faceless tyrannical politics deprived of the humane mechanism of governance guaranteed by a single-person command. If it was exactly this opinion that provoked the ire of Milton, for whom there did not exist “anyone of any race (except for Salmasius alone)” of “such a servile spirit as to maintain that all the inhuman crimes of tyrants were the rights of kings,”¹³⁴ it was, in turn, Milton’s view of tyranny that prompted Filmer to resort to one final patriarchalist locus of debate connected with gender.

Among the two most recurrent names in English literary texts were those of Lucius Junius Brutus, the liberator of Rome from the tyranny of the Tarquins, and of Lucrece whose rape at the hands of Tarquinus Sextus (son of the tyrant Tarquinus Superbus) had provoked the revolt that had eventually led to the abolition of the monarchy.¹³⁵ Interestingly, if Brutus became the republican

hero whose successful opposition to the oppressive regime of the Tarquins served as cardinal inspiration for early modern anti-monarchical struggles,¹³⁶ Lucrece came to symbolize the outspoken criticism of all kingly moral excesses. Thus, following Andrew Hadfield's idea that "the republican case is based on the actions of a woman,"¹³⁷ it can be maintained that (male) Filmerian patriarchalism provided a model of both government and ethic that was antagonistic to the (female) republican paradigm of power and public conduct. Considering Lucrece's pivotal role in many (republican) plays in the Elizabethan period, including Shakespeare's narrative poem *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594), Hadfield interpreted her counselling the king in order to prevent him from becoming tyrannical as evidence of the fact that, once this moderate way of acting failed, it was necessary to adopt "more drastic—that is, republican—measures." And since "the real establishment of the republic" in ancient Rome had happened "through the words of Lucrece,"¹³⁸ it can be suggested that Filmer's dismissal of Lucrece as somebody who "had a greater desire to be thought chaste than to be chaste"¹³⁹ constituted an unmistakable patriarchalist reaction to the commonwealth rhetoric set forth by Elizabethan and Jacobean authors (Marlowe, Spenser, and Jonson among them) as well as by their 1650s counterparts to glorify the republican polity and its moral codes.

Conclusion

That in the 1650s the English Commonwealth should be seen as a catastrophe by thinkers whose ideological cornerstone was absolutism is not surprising.¹⁴⁰ How absolutists mounted their assault on those responsible, though, is less obvious—as is their view of the post-regicidal ideological panorama.

We have, therefore, focused on patriarchalist arguments as an important set of polemical responses to the events of 1649. Claudius Salmasius, who wrote specifically on the regicide and in its traumatic wake, and Robert Filmer, who composed his tracts after the final military rout undergone by the Royalists on September 3, 1651, at the battle of Worcester, together articulated a forthright attack on the Commonwealth as that most unpatriotic of regimes whose erection had been the result of the heinous parricide of the father of the fatherland.¹⁴¹ Patriarchalism enabled them to praise the sovereignty of a supreme king, and to portray the murder that had torn down the monarchy as

the ultimate embodiment of republican ideas and practice whose pedigree was Roman and Venetian. Along with rejecting the “usurpicide” theory, whereby Charles I was the last in a long series of usurpers going back to 1066,¹⁴² the patriarchalist absolutisms of Salmasius and Filmer emphasized the actual moral collapse engendered in republics by religious confusion and masqueraded as freedom of conscience.¹⁴³ The same themes—some of which had originated in France in the 1580s and 1590s during the patriarchalist-absolutists’ campaign against the anti-patriotic Jesuits—were to return in the post-plots season of the early 1680s; here, the vocabulary of patriotism and parricide occupied a prominent place in debates that concerned not only the upper echelons of the republic of letters, but the world of polemics and petitions in the country at large. Those who unearthed patriarchalist absolutism launched a similar attack upon the self-styled “Representatives” of the people who had ruined the nation in the 1640s, had tyrannically ruled in the 1650s, and were once again ready to strike against the monarchy in the 1680s.¹⁴⁴

Secondly, we have underlined how Salmasius and Filmer identified the essence of the English Commonwealth principally with military tyranny, religious sectarianism, and literary decadence; and how they saw the anti-monarchists as propagators of popular power, unworkable representative authority, and ethical degradation. For both men, the presence of Milton was writ large. In contrast to the regicides, who viewed the 1649 victory as “one product of a military outcome widely attributed to the hand of God,” and who thus believed in divine providence’s active intervention in earthly politics,¹⁴⁵ Salmasius and Filmer placed the fatherly ruler at the centre of their political world with God as a (sort of) supervisor presiding from a distance. Republicans, on the other hand, characterized the realm of politics as terrain on which the pivotal goal was the realization of the monarchy of God. Far from this design, patriarchalist absolutists assigned to kings the task of managing the life of fallible men in the here and now. Their discourse excluded the apocalyptic and providential tone informing the language of people like Milton. Salmasius and Filmer focused on “the city of man” (*the* most absolute of all), while English republicans aimed to have God on their side and to create *His* city.¹⁴⁶ Incompatibility lay at the heart not only of their conceptions of power, but also of their visions of life in the polity.

Besides providing a distinct account of what the new republican regime was taken to mean and stand for by some of its adversaries, the foregoing pages reveal that the patriarchalist paradigm was central to the ways in which early modern political discourse in England (and Europe) was conceived and shaped. With its focus on fatherhood, allegiance to the fatherland, parricide, and hereditary government, patriarchalism was considered by some a strong piece of theoretical artillery with which to raid the ideological fortress of the Commonwealth. Patriarchalism not only depicted the regicides as exponents of political theories and ethical values totally incompatible with stability, efficiency, and order in the public sphere; it also gave a persuasive image of the monarch as true father of the country, whose primary goal was to protect his people from both internal and external confusion, violence, and tyranny. Indeed, the prince was the kernel of national cohesion and the source of national identity.

The importance and specificity of patriarchalism in the 1650s involve multiple ramifications in both theory and practice. "Theory" encompassed the domains of political thought, linguistics, philology, ethics, theology, and gender; while "practice" concerned military rule, constitutional arrangements, legislation, toleration, national identity, and religious organization. Patriarchalism showed the reality of correspondences between apparently disconnected fields of activity.

The works of Salmasius and Filmer offer a clear illustration of the conflict between absolutist and republican ideas of liberty and sovereignty that informed European parlance in the long seventeenth century. Above all, they testify to the fact that, for all his mocking, Milton knew all too well the political weight of patriarchalist absolutism at a time of crisis of the monarchy. He was not alone: 30 years later, under a renewed crisis, Algernon Sidney and John Locke took up the cause.

Notes

- * I would like to thank Martin Dzelzainis, Ken Goodwin, Gaby Mahlberg, Jason Peacey, Johann Sommerville, and the two anonymous referees of this journal for their helpful comments on my article.
1. See John Morrill, ed., *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London: Collins & Brown, 1992); Sean Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of*

- the English Commonwealth 1649–1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997); Jason Peacey, ed., *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001); Blair Worden, “Republicanism, Regicide and Republic: The English Experience,” in *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, ed. Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), vol. 1, pp. 307–27.
2. See Cicely Veronica Wedgwood, “European Reaction to the Death of Charles I,” in *From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation*, ed. Charles H. Carter (London: Jonathan Cape, 1966), pp. 401–19, pp. 405–06; Richard Bonney, “The European Reaction to the Trial and Execution of Charles I,” in *The Regicides*, ed. Peacey, pp. 247–79; “Poétique de la catastrophe? Représentations du régicide aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles en Europe,” special issue, *Etudes Epistémè* 20 (2011).
 3. See Blair Worden, “English Republicanism,” in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700*, ed. J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 443–75; David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Jerome De Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004); Jonathan Scott, *Commonwealth Principles: Republican Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Jason McElligott and David L. Smith, eds., *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010). It should be remembered that quite a few republicans disapproved of the regicide: thus, Algernon Sidney absented himself from Parliament at the time; Henry Neville only joined it as a recruiter after 1649; James Harrington attended on the king until shortly before his execution.
 4. Patriarchalism maintained the political supremacy of monarchs since they held the same authority as Adam, to whom God had assigned absolute power over all creatures. From the progenitor of mankind, power had passed to kings through the ancient patriarchs; see Gordon Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975). The theory of absolutism implies that “the ruler in any state holds sovereign authority, cannot be actively resisted, can change existing constitutional arrangements in a case of necessity (though he ought otherwise to maintain them), and should be obeyed by his subjects provided that his commands are not contrary to those of God and nature” (Johann P. Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England 1603–1640* [1986; London: Longman, 1999], p. 228). See also James Daly, “The

- Idea of Absolute Monarchy in Seventeenth-Century England,” *Historical Journal* 21 (1978), pp. 227–50; Cesare Cuttica and Glenn Burgess, eds., *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012).
5. This was to be clearly illustrated by the late seventeenth-century Tory and proto-feminist Mary Astell (1666–1731) when she accused the likes of Milton and Locke to be hypocrites who, while proclaiming the imperative necessity of natural and original equality among men and their consent to enter political society, admitted women’s subordination in their own households. As she put it: once married, a woman “Elects a Monarch for Life” so that, despite all the cries against tyranny and “Arbitrary Power” on the throne, “not *Milton* himself would cry up Liberty to poor *Female Slaves*, or plead for the Lawfulness of Resisting a Private Tyranny” (Mary Astell, *Some Reflections upon Marriage Occasioned by the Duke and Dutchess of Mazarine’s Case; Which is Also Considered* [1700; London, 1703], pp. 31, 27). On these issues see Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988).
 6. Myriam Yardeni, *La Conscience Nationale en France Pendant les Guerres de Religion (1559–1598)* (Paris and Louvain: Editions Naewelaerts, 1971), p. 23.
 7. Cesare Cuttica, “Anti-Jesuit Patriotic Absolutism: Robert Filmer and French Ideas (ca. 1580–1630),” *Renaissance Studies* 25 (2011), pp. 559–79.
 8. For an illustration of the variety of absolutist positions in seventeenth-century England and Europe see Linda Levy Peck, “Beyond the Pale: John Cusacke and the Language of Absolutism in Early Stuart Britain,” *Historical Journal* 41 (1998), pp. 121–49.
 9. As Gaby Mahlberg puts it, “the concern with patriarchalism provides a continuity in the political debates [of seventeenth-century England] that has often been overlooked in a historiography focusing on ever smaller periods of time”; see Gaby Mahlberg, “Republicanism as Anti-patriarchalism in Henry Neville’s *The Isle of Pines* (1668),” in *Liberty, Authority, Formality. Political Ideas and Culture, 1600–1900*, ed. John Morrow and Jonathan Scott (Exeter: Imprint Academic, 2008), pp. 131–52, p. 143.
 10. One of Van Dyck’s earliest portraits (“the great peece”) represented Charles I as head of his family and of his people, presiding over both spheres with might and confidence; see Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow and New York: Pearson-Longman, 2005), p. 158.
 11. Derek Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603–1660: Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth* (London: Arnold, 1999), p. 29.

12. Derek Hirst, *The Representative of the People? Voters and Voting in England under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 192–93.
13. See Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis: 1677–1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678–81* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
14. See Mario Turchetti, “Tyrrannicide or regicide? The ‘Assassination’ of Charles I in the Controversy between Milton and Salmasius, with a Comparative Analysis of the Two Trials (1649 and 1660),” *Etudes Epistémè* 15 (2009), pp. 101–16. See notes below (16, 17, 19, 21, 65, 70, and 73) for further bibliographical references.
15. Born in Burgundy, Salmasius studied in Paris, where he formed a close friendship with Isaac Casaubon, and in Heidelberg, where he embraced Protestantism. Salmasius obtained the professorship once held by the famous scholar Joseph Scaliger at Leiden. He wrote various works, the most important of which was a treatise on usury, *De Usuris Liber* (1638), in which he justified a moderate interest rate for the borrowing of money. From a theological viewpoint, Salmasius tended towards Presbyterianism in his early life but later inclined to moderate Episcopacy; see Christopher Baker, *Absolutism and the Scientific Revolution, 1600–1720: a Biographical Dictionary* (Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press, 2002), pp. 335–36.
16. See Francis F. Madan, “A Revised Bibliography of Salmasius’s *Defensio Regia* and Milton’s *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*,” *The Library*, 5th series, 9 (1954), pp. 101–21.
17. On the implausibility of this rumour see W. McNeill, “Milton and Salmasius, 1649,” *English Historical Review* 80 (1965), pp. 107–08. In alluding to this fact, Milton’s tone was incensed: “no free man in any free state, much less in the renowned university of the great Dutch republic, could have written books so slavish in spirit and design that they seem rather to emanate from some slave factory or auction block” (cited in Norbrook, p. 210).
18. Madan, “A Revised Bibliography,” p. 103, n. 3.
19. On its publication, see Francis F. Madan, “Milton, Salmasius, and Dugard,” *The Library*, 4th Series, 4 (1923), pp. 119–45, pp. 112–13; Madan, “A Revised Bibliography,” pp. 101–03; Leo Miller, “In Defense of Milton’s *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*,” *Renaissance Studies* 4 (1990), pp. 300–28, p. 313, n. 13. The English private publisher Dugard got into trouble with the new regime for producing Salmasius’s writing (Jason Peacey, “Reporting a Revolution: A Failed Propaganda Campaign,” in *The Regicides*, ed. Peacey, pp. 161–80, p. 175).

20. See Martin Dzelzainis, "Introduction," in *Milton: Political Writings*, ed. Martin Dzelzainis (1991; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. ix–xxv. The Rump and the Council of State acknowledged the threat of royalist publications such as *Mercurius Elencticus* and *Mercurius Pragmaticus* as well as of political texts like Salmasius's that reported on the trial and execution of King Charles (Peacey, "Reporting a Revolution," p. 174).
21. Salmasius composed a reply to Milton, but did not finish it before his death. It was his son who published it in 1660; see Leo Miller, "Milton, Salmasius and Hammond: The History of an Insult," *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 9 (1973), pp. 108–15.
22. See Dzelzainis, "Introduction," pp. xxx–xxxii. See also *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. D. M. Wolfe (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), vol. 4, pp. 1650–55, 2 parts.
23. John Milton, *A Defence of the People of England*, in *Milton: Political Writings*, ed. Dzelzainis; "Preface," ch. 12, pp. 49–254, and ch. 12, p. 251 (hereafter, the *Defence* will be referred to as Milton).
24. Milton, "Preface," p. 65 and ch. 1, p. 67.
25. It is mainly students of Milton who neglect to examine Salmasius's work.
26. In France the term was widely employed, especially at the time of the Jesuits Pierre Barrière's (1593) and Jean Chastel's (1594) attempts on Henry IV's life (Hélène Duccini, *Fair Voir, Faire Croire. L'opinion publique sous Louis XIII* [Seysse: Champ Vallon, 2003], pp. 74, 90). Parricide was equated to the murder of the *père de la patrie*.
27. Claude de Saumaise, *Apologie Royale pour Charles I., Roy d'Angleterre* (Paris, 1650), "Preface," pp. 1–29, p. 1 (all references to Salmasius's treatise are to this edition; translations are mine). This opinion was shared by people like Nedham and the Levellers (Scott, *Commonwealth Principles*, p. 253). Hereafter, the *Apologie* will be referred to as Saumaise.
28. Saumaise, "Preface," pp. 7, 8. To undermine Charles's authority the regicides had relied on the Roman-law idea of treason; see D. Alan Orr, "The Juristic Foundation of Regicide," in *The Regicides*, ed. Peacey, pp. 117–37, p. 133. See also Sarah Barber, "Belshazzar's Feast: Regicides, Republicanism and the Metaphor of Balance," in *The Regicides*, ed. Peacey, pp. 94–116.
29. Saumaise, "Preface," p. 10.
30. Saumaise, "Preface," pp. 12, 10, 13, 11.
31. Saumaise, "Preface," p. 16.

32. A “faquin” was a dummy used as a lance-target by jousting medieval knights on horseback (*Larousse. Dictionnaire de la Langue Française, Lexis* [Paris: Larousse, 1989], p. 725). However, it also indicated a “contemptible, vain, dishonest and stupid” person; see *Le Trésor de la Langue Française Informatisé*, accessed 17 March 2012, <http://atilf.atilf.fr/>.
33. Saumaise, “Preface,” pp. 15, 16–17.
34. Saumaise, ch. 9, pp. 579, 580–81.
35. See Yves Durand, *Les Républiques au temps des monarchies* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1973), pp. 67–71.
36. Saumaise, ch. 8, p. 532. On the Levellers and the regicide see Andrew Sharp, “The Levellers and the End of Charles I,” in *The Regicides*, ed. Peacey, pp. 181–201.
37. Saumaise, “Preface,” pp. 20–21.
38. Saumaise, “Preface,” pp. 24, 25–26.
39. On the link between regicide and republicanism see Martin Dzelzainis, “Anti-Monarchism in English Republicanism,” in *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, ed. van Gelderen and Skinner, vol. 1, pp. 27–41, pp. 35–41.
40. Saumaise, ch. 5, pp. 238–39.
41. Saumaise, ch. 6, pp. 314, 315; ch. 7, pp. 383–84. Kings reigned alone (ch. 7, p. 377).
42. Saumaise, ch. 6, pp. 315, 316–17.
43. Saumaise, ch. 6, p. 317.
44. Saumaise, ch. 6, p. 324.
45. Saumaise, ch. 6, p. 370.
46. Saumaise, ch. 7, p. 453.
47. Saumaise, ch. 6, pp. 321–22.
48. Saumaise, ch. 7, p. 453.
49. Saumaise, ch. 7, p. 454.
50. See Brian M. Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Michael J. Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England c. 1550–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
51. Scott, *Commonwealth Principles*, p. 67.
52. Saumaise, ch. 9, p. 590. This idea was popular within “Tacitist” royalist circles in the 1640s; see David Scott, “Counsel and Cabal in the King’s Party, 1642–1646,” in *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, ed. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 112–35, p. 132.

53. Saumaise, ch. 9, pp. 617–18; see also pp. 596–97, 600, 590.
54. Jonathan Scott, “The English Republican Imagination,” in *Revolution and Restoration*, ed. Morrill, pp. 35–54, p. 44. On the importance of “militarism” for the republic see also Kelsey, pp. 216–17.
55. Saumaise, “Preface,” ch. 1, pp. 30–31 and ch. 8, pp. 460–62, respectively.
56. Saumaise, ch. 5, pp. 246, 248, 250–51.
57. Charles I was praised throughout. The final portion of the book is a hagiographic portrayal (see Saumaise, ch. 12, pp. 730–840).
58. Comparing Nero to Charles, Milton subscribed to the rumour that the latter had poisoned his father, James, with Buckingham’s aid (Milton, ch. 5, p. 176).
59. Saumaise, ch. 5, pp. 291–92.
60. See Orr, pp. 130–31.
61. Patricia Crawford, “The Challenges to Patriarchalism: How did the Revolution affect Women?” in *Revolution and Restoration*, ed. Morrill, pp. 112–28, p. 127. Patriarchalism is a particularly strong instance of the interplay of gender and political theory in the period analyzed: see Susan Wiseman, “‘Adam, the father of all flesh’: Porno-Political Rhetoric and Political Theory in and after the English Civil War,” in *Pamphlets Wars: Prose in the English Revolution*, ed. James Holstun (London: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 134–57; Sharon Achinstein, “Women on Top in the Pamphlet Literature of the English Revolution,” *Women’s Studies* 24 (1994), pp. 131–63; Margaret Sommerville, *Sex and Subjection: Attitudes to Women in Early-Modern Society* (London: Arnold, 1995); Belinda Roberts Peters, *Marriage in Seventeenth-Century English Political Thought* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
62. Milton, “Preface,” pp. 54, 55, 57, 56.
63. See Milton, ch. 3, p. 122.
64. In the words of Johann Sommerville, “a strong sense of nationhood was a major theme in the literature of all three kingdoms which James and Charles tried to rule”; see Johann P. Sommerville, “An Emergent Britain? Literature and National Identity in Early Stuart England,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, ed. David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 459–86, p. 461.
65. James C. Brown argued (unconvincingly) that to place Salmasius’s political ideas in relation to absolutist thought is “no easy task given that his *Apologie royale* [...] hardly fits in with other strains of absolutism that arose in England such as the patriarchal theory of Robert Filmer or the elaborate constructivism of

- Thomas Hobbes.” Likewise, according to Brown, it would be erroneous to associate Salmasius with other Continental supporters of the theory of the divine right of kings. Instead, his political work should be approached through the prism of philology in that he dealt with it as a grammarian; see James C. Brown, “Revealed Law in Salmasius,” in *Milton, Rights and Liberties*, ed. Christophe Tournu and Neil Forsyth (Bern and Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007), pp. 183–92, p. 183.
66. Norbrook, p. 210. For references to Milton’s attack on Salmasius’s lack of sensitivity to classical language and his poor “monarchist imagination” see pp. 422, 470.
 67. Norbrook, pp. 209–11, 214.
 68. Milton, “Preface,” p. 53.
 69. Milton, ch. 5, p. 153 and ch. 8, p. 198, respectively.
 70. Michele Valerie Ronnick, “Milton’s Vituperative Technique: Claude Saumaise and Martial’s *Olus* in the *Defensio Prima*,” *Notes and Queries* 40 (1993), pp. 314–15, p. 314. See also Michele Valerie Ronnick, “Salmacis and Salmasius: ‘Pro Populo Anglicano *Defensio Secunda*’ 1.38.8.11,” *Notes and Queries* 42 (1995), pp. 32–35, p. 32.
 71. Milton, “Preface,” pp. 57–58.
 72. Dzelzainis, “Introduction,” p. xx. In a similar vein, Milton had accused Charles I of submitting to his wife and, therefore, of not being a truly patriarchal figure (Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010], p. 401).
 73. Leo Miller, “Milton, Salmasius and Vapulandum: Who Should Be Flogged?” *Milton Quarterly* 9 (1975), pp. 70–74.
 74. Ronnick, “Salmacis and Salmasius,” p. 35.
 75. Milton, ch. 12, p. 250.
 76. On the theory of the regicide see John B. Sanderson, “*But the People’s Creatures*”: *The Philosophical Basis of the English Civil War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), esp. pp. 142–74.
 77. Milton, ch. 1, p. 69.
 78. Scott, *Commonwealth Principles*, p. 240. Sean Kelsey pointed out that “patriotic nationalism” was a key feature of the new regime (Kelsey, p. 106). He also underscored that the “anglicism” informing republican culture in the 1640s and 1650s extended to linguistics where “nationalism” played a crucial role (p. 212).
 79. See Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 51, 52.
 80. Milton, “Preface,” pp. 51, 54, 59.

81. Milton, ch. 12, p. 252.
82. See John Milton, *The Prose Works of John Milton*, With a Biographical Introduction by Rufus Wilmot Griswold, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: John W. Moore, 1847), vol. 2. Chapter: *The Second Defence of the People of England, Against an Anonymous Libel Entitled "the Royal Blood Crying to Heaven For Vengeance On the English Parricides*.
83. See Glenn Burgess, "Patriotism in English Political Thought, 1530–1660," in "*Patria*" und "*Patrioten*" vor dem Patriotismus, ed. Robert von Friedeburg (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005), pp. 215–41.
84. Milton, ch. 1, pp. 68–69.
85. Milton, ch. 5, p. 153; see also ch. 7, pp. 194–95.
86. Milton, ch. 7, p. 195.
87. On Filmer see Peter Laslett, "Introduction," in *Patriarcha and Other Political Works*, ed. Peter Laslett (Oxford: Blackwell, 1949), pp. 1–43; Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought*; James Daly, *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1979); Johann P. Sommerville, "Introduction," in *Robert Filmer: Patriarcha and Other Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. vii–xxxvii; Cesare Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588–1653) and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth-Century Political Thought* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012).
88. Robert Filmer, *Observations Concerning The Originall of Government, Upon Mr Hobs Leviathan, Mr Milton against Salmasius, H. Grotius De Jure Belli*, in *Patriarcha*, ed. Sommerville, pp. 184–234 (hereafter OG).
89. OG, "Observations on Mr Milton against Salmasius," pp. 197–208, p. 197. On Milton's "precocious . . . hostility to monarchy" see Scott, *Commonwealth Principles*, pp. 237–38.
90. OG, p. 198.
91. OG, pp. 198–99.
92. OG, p. 199. See also pp. 202–03.
93. It has been suggested that Salmasius was "more democratic than Milton," for he considered the people as formed of everyone but the king, whereas Milton had a restricted notion of who constituted the people (William J. Grace, "Milton, Salmasius, and the Natural Law," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24 [1963], pp. 323–36, p. 332).

94. The Levellers were among those who focused on “issues of participation, representation and accountability, both local and central.” This way of proceeding was meant to reduce the risk of authorities becoming tyrannical and, at the same time, to widen active public control and guarantee popular engagement in the political process, thanks to the role of the representatives of the people. Decentralization and subordination of the representatives to the represented were key clauses of the *Agreements of the People* (1647–49); see Scott, *Commonwealth Principles*, pp. 73–74. It is important to notice that, despite their consolidated anti-monarchism by the time of the Putney Debates, the Levellers (notably, Lilburne) went from a strong attack on kingship and Charles I (1647) to defending monarchy (1648–49) as preferable to military dictatorship. In consequence, they were accused of having become royalists (Sharp, pp. 185–86, 188–89).
95. Robert Filmer, “Observations Upon Aristotles Politiques Touching Forms of Government,” in *Patriarcha*, ed. Sommerville, pp. 235–81, p. 255 (hereafter OA).
96. OA, p. 261; see also p. 277.
97. OA, pp. 264, 262–71.
98. OA, p. 201 (italics added).
99. OG, “Observations upon H. Grotius *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*,” pp. 208–34, p. 226.
100. OG, “Observations on Mr Milton against Salmasius,” p. 201.
101. OA, p. 275.
102. OG, “Observations on Mr Milton against Salmasius,” pp. 203–04.
103. OA, p. 274.
104. Milton, ch. 8, p. 215.
105. Filmer made this point in *Patriarcha* too; see Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha or The Naturall Power of Kinges Defended against the Unnatural Liberty of the People*, in *Patriarcha*, ed. Sommerville, pp. 1–68, e.g., pp. 27–28, hereafter PT.
106. This does not mean, however, that Milton was averse to the idea of change (Scott, *Commonwealth Principles*, pp. 201–02).
107. OG, “Observations on Mr Milton against Salmasius,” pp. 206, 207.
108. See Milton, “Preface,” p. 51 and PT, pp. 45–46.
109. OG, “Observations on Mr Milton against Salmasius,” pp. 206–07.
110. Saumaise, ch. 10, pp. 630–32; see ch. 10, pp. 633–42 for a detailed description of the events leading up to the regicide.
111. Saumaise, ch. 9, pp. 565–66. Cook (bap. 1608–1660) was the regicide radical lawyer and Independent who acted as the first Solicitor General of the English Commonwealth, leading the prosecution trial against Charles I. Cook had also

- represented John Lilburne (1646) and Edmund Ludlow (1650), and was the author of the republican *Monarchy no creature of Gods making* (1651). Cook, who was to turn into Lilburne's prosecutor (1650), had read Henry Ainsworth's separatist works. He was executed as a regicide in 1660 (*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Cook, John," <http://www.oxforddnb.com>; henceforth ODNB).
112. On the Presbyterians in this historical phase see Elliot Vernon, "The Quarrel of the Covenant: The London Presbyterians and the Regicide," in *The Regicides*, ed. Peacey, pp. 202–24. The Presbyterians resorted to resistance theory in order to justify the Civil War and oppose the army. Their ministers were, in fact, against the regicide as much as the republican government. The theoretical kernel of their doctrine was the Covenant; they were in favour of "a mixed constitution and a godly commonwealth" (pp. 218–19).
 113. I am not entirely persuaded by Richard Bonney's interpretation that "[f]or Saumaise, it was the Independents' voracious appetite for power, not their republican principles, which had motivated the English revolution" (Bonney, p. 262). It was both.
 114. Saumaise, ch. 10, pp. 642–44.
 115. Saumaise, ch. 10, pp. 649–52.
 116. Saumaise, ch. 10, p. 652.
 117. Bonney, p. 259. Bonney maintained that Salmasius aimed at rallying "international Calvinism behind the claim of Charles II" and did so by promoting the Stuart cause jointly in France and the Netherlands. French Huguenots disapproved of the regicide and supported Salmasius's views, condemning instead the opinions of Milton whose works were burned at Toulouse and Paris in 1651 (pp. 262–63).
 118. Saumaise, ch. 10, pp. 655, 659.
 119. The term referred to Robert Browne (1550?–1633), the first prominent separatist leader in England.
 120. This label indicated the pastor of the English Church at Leyden John Robinson (1575/76?–1625), author of *A Just and Necessary Apologie of Certain Christians [...] called Brownists or Barrowists*, originally written in Latin (1619) and translated into English in 1625. A stout anti-Arminian and a critic of Anabaptism, Robinson rejected the name "Brownist" for his congregation (see ODNB, "Robinson, John").
 121. Saumaise, ch. 10, p. 654.
 122. Saumaise, ch. 10, pp. 655–57.
 123. Saumaise, ch. 10, p. 667. Münster was the location of the Anabaptists' rebellion led by John of Leiden (1534).

124. See Saumaise, ch. 10, pp. 659–60 and 666–67, respectively. As for this sectarian, see *ODNB*, “Hutchinson [née Marbury], Anne,” who had died in 1643.
125. Saumaise, ch. 10, p. 671; see also pp. 669–71.
126. Saumaise, ch. 10, pp. 675–76.
127. Saumaise, ch. 10, pp. 678–79.
128. On the widespread conviction (including ambassadorial preoccupations) that the Commonwealth—in its aggressively Protestant foreign policy agenda—wanted to destroy all remaining monarchies, see Steven Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650–1668* (1996; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 22–23.
129. *OG*, “Observations on Mr Milton against Salmasius,” pp. 207–08. Filmer’s scathing opinion of the Dutch and Venetian governments emerged in its full scale in *OA*.
130. Jonathan Scott, *England’s Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 229–30, 231.
131. See Scott, *England’s Troubles*, esp. pp. 297ff.
132. Practical reality across Europe, however, belied Filmer’s position in that more and more rulers had turned their monarchies into tyrannies (Scott, *England’s Troubles*, p. 303).
133. Orr, p. 127.
134. Milton, ch. 2, p. 78.
135. Nedham portrayed Charles II as a “young Tarquin” (Sharpe, p. 419).
136. This was so to the extent that the widely popular Huguenot defense of resistance theory, the *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*, had been composed by one self-defined “Stephanus Junius Brutus.”
137. Andrew Hadfield, “Republicanism in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Britain,” in *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500–1800*, ed. David Armitage (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 111–28, pp. 119–20.
138. Hadfield, pp. 123–24.
139. *OA*, p. 259.
140. Of course, there were many (e.g., “old Parliamentarians”) who opposed republicanism and the regicide but were no absolutists in that they favoured mixed monarchy and the fundamental laws, attacked Pride’s Purge, and were even prepared to reach an agreement with Charles (see Sanderson, pp. 167–74). As for the anti-patriarchalist and supporter of popular sovereignty Henry Parker (the artificer of

“parliamentary absolutism”), his reaction to the institution of the Commonwealth was one of positive acceptance, to the extent that he became an army faithful (see Michael Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public’s “Privado”* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995], pp. 160–79, 80–90).

141. However, while Salmasius produced a panegyric on Charles I, Filmer never set out a royalist defense of the Stuart dynasty.
142. Sanderson, p. 223, fn. 33. This theory relied on the “ascending power” doctrine shared by many regicides, and it objected to hereditary monarchy (pp. 15–21, 142–61).
143. On pre-1649 royalist support for freedom of conscience see Rachel Foxley, “Royalists and the New Model Army in 1647,” in *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, ed. McElligott and Smith, pp. 155–74.
144. See Mark Goldie, “Edmund Bohun and ‘Jus Gentium’ in the Revolution Debate,” *Historical Journal* 20 (1977), pp. 569–86.
145. Scott, *Commonwealth Principles*, p. 42.
146. See Milton, “Preface,” pp. 52, 53 (e.g., “under the leadership of God”).