# Cromwelliana 1993



The Cromwell Association

#### The Cromwell Association

President: Vice Presidents: Dr JOHN MORRILL, DPhil, FRHistS Baron FOOT of Buckland Monachorum

Right Hon MICHAEL FOOT, PC

Dr MAURICE ASHLEY, CBE, DPhil, DLitt Professor IVAN ROOTS, MA, FSA, FRHistS Professor AUSTIN WOOLRYCH, MA, DLitt, FBA Dr GERALD AYLMER, MA, DPhil, FBA, FRHistS

Miss HILARY PLATT, BA

Mr TREWIN COPPLESTONE, FRGS

Chairman:

Dr PETER GAUNT, PhD, FRHistS

Honorary Secretary:

Miss PAT BARNES

Cosswell Cottage, Northedge, Tupton, Chesterfield, S42 6AY

Honorary Treasurer.

Mr JOHN WESTMACOTT

1 Salisbury Close, Wokingham, Berkshire, RG11 4AJ

THE CROMWELL ASSOCIATION was founded in 1935 by the late Rt Hon Isaac Foot and others to commemorate Oliver Cromwell, the great Puritan stateman, and to encourage the study of the history of his times, his achievements and influence. It is neither political nor sectarian, its aims being essentially historical. The Association seeks to advance its aims in a variety of ways which have included:

- a. the erection of commemorative tablets (e.g. at Naseby, Dunbar, Worcester, Preston, etc) (From time to time appeals are made for funds to pay for projects of this sort);
- b. helping to establish the Cromwell Museum in the Old Grammar School at Huntingdon;
- c. holding two annual meetings, one the now traditional Memorial Service by the statue outside the Houses of Parliament, the other a business meeting at which the Council presents a report on its year's work for discussion by members. At both, an Address is given by a distinguished Cromwellian;
- d. producing an annual publication, Cromwelliana, which is free to members;
- e. awarding an annual prize for an essay on a Cromwellian theme;
- f. maintaining a small reference library for the use of members;
- g. supporting the formation of local groups of paid-up members of the Association meeting for study or social purposes;
- h. acting as a "lobby" at both national and local levels whenever aspects or items of our Cromwellian heritage appear to be endangered.

All enquiries about the library should be addressed to: Mr M BYRD, 12 Milton Road, Maldon, Essex, CM 9 6BT

Press Liaison Officer: Mr BARRY DENTON, FRHistS 10 Melrose Avenue, off Bants Lane, Northampton, NN5 5PB

# **CROMWELLIANA 1993**

# edited by Peter Gaunt

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*

#### **CONTENTS**

Cromwell Day 1992. Oliver Cromwell and the Godly Reformation. By Dr Barry Coward.	2
Oliver Cromwell and the Battle of Gainsborough, July 1643. By John West.	9
Oliver Cromwell and the English Experience of Manœuvre Warfare 1645-1651. Part One. By Jonathan R Moore.	15
The Diagnosis of Oliver Cromwell's Fatal Illness. By Dr C H Davidson.	27
Revolution and Restoration: The Effect on the Lives of Ordinary Women. By Dr Sarah Jones.	33
After the Restoration Culture Became Politics: John Milton and Paradise Lost. By John Newland.	47
Cromwellian Britain VI. Ince Castle, Cornwall. By Dr Stephen Roberts.	50
Select Bibliography of Publications. By Dr Peter Gaunt.	54
Video Review. By Dr Les Prince.	62
Book Reviews. By Jane Mills, Dr Peter Gaunt & Professor Ivan Roots.	65

ISBN 0-905729-04-8

#### CROMWELL DAY 1992

# OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE GODLY REFORMATION

by Barry Coward

Dr Peter Gaunt, the chairman of The Cromwell Association, has given me only two instructions regarding this address. One, that I speak for no more than twenty minutes, and, two, that I deliver an address that is broadly in favour of Oliver Cromwell. I may have some difficulty in obeying the first instruction, but I have no difficulty whatsoever in following the second. There are two aspects of Cromwell's political career that I find remarkable, compelling and attractive, and I would like to make these two aspects the centrepieces of my address about the man we are meeting to commemorate today.

The first of the two is that Cromwell had an unselfish ideal a vision - of what he would have liked his country to become, and the second is that Cromwell remained committed to attempting to making that ideal a reality despite awesome difficulties. Indeed I think his commitment to making that ideal a reality increased as time went on and that he still held it firmly on the day he died 334 years ago today. And I admire both those aspects of Cromwell's career, not because I share the Cromwellian ideal (in fact, I only sympathise with parts of it; some aspects of it I am quite uneasy about, which is neither here nor there). What I admire is the fact that Cromwell both before and after he became Lord Protector had a vision of what he would have liked Britain to become and that he pursued that vision because he thought that it was essential to achieve it for the good of the country. He did not pursue it either as a smokescreen behind which he sought power for himself or because he was pressed into doing so by fear of the army. It is time, I think, that the image of Oliver Cromwell as a self-seeking, power-hungry politician, who presided over a regime that slowly drifted back towards old-style monarchical, traditional rule, and one that was only kept from becoming a monarchy in name as well as in reality in 1657 by the fear of army retaliation, is finally laid to rest as a fairy tale, a legend without any basis of support.

Of all the components of that legend, the image of Cromwell as a self-seeking, Machiavellian politician is the one that is still most firmly held by many people. The smear made by the Leveller Richard Overton that

you shall scarce speak to Crumwell about any thing but he

has received a lot of support during the centuries since it was first made in 1649. But in fact that charge that Cromwell clothed selfish ambition in the guise of pious principles is unfair. This is not to say that Cromwell was a political innocent. Indeed only in the first few months of his political apprenticeship in the first session of the Long Parliament did he appear to be a babe in the political wood, when he made political gaffes and acted with the lack of political finesse that is the stock-in-trade of Dennis Skinner. From about 1643 onwards, however, his political career demonstrates the surefootedness of someone who had quite clearly quickly mastered the art and the guile of many a successful politician. But this is not to say that Cromwell consistently used his political craftiness to further his own career. If he had done so, his career would surely have taken a quite different route from the one it did. He would surely not have held fast to the pursuit of revolutionary change in Britain. Indeed, throughout his recorded political career both selfish personal and family interests and considerations of personal political profit must have tempted him towards a much safer route of conservatism and what he called "settlement" and not one of radicalism and what he called "reformation". But from the moment in August 1642 when he illegally ambushed a waggon train carrying Cambridge College silver to the King at York until the day he died he took a political road that put himself and his wife and children in positions of great personal danger. It is difficult to penetrate the evidential barrier to get a view of the private Cromwell, but the few glimpses one gets are of a loving husband and father (one of the few solid points of comparison incidentally between Cromwell and Charles I). What we see is a man whose family responsibilities and affections must have made him give serious consideration to taking much safer actions than the ones he did. Nor did selfish political considerations (any more than thoughts about the safety of his family) counsel the pursuit of radical change. Cromwell's experiences with his Protectorate parliaments surely told him that the way to political acclaim and support was to ditch the army and "reformation". And many of the reports that the London-based Protector received about political opinion out there in provincial England must have told him how little support there was for "reformation" outside little clusters of godly men, like the hitherto unimportant lesser magistrates like Robert Beake in Coventry and Edmund Hopwood in south-cast Lancashire. Cromwell's diatribe in August 1657 against the inactivity of JPs shows that he realised this. "Really", he said,

a Justice of the Peace shall for the most part be wondered at as an owl, if he go but one step out of the ordinary course of his fellow Justices in the reformation of these things [2].

If selfish considerations had been a prime driving force in his life, then Cromwell would surely have abandoned any hope of bringing about "reformation" and he would have put his full weight behind

bringing about a traditional-type settlement.

But that is not what Cromwell did. The Cromwellian Protectorate was not (as it were) a series of milestones on the conservative road back to the Restoration. Cromwell did not preside over a regime that sold out on the ideals of the Good Old Cause that had been thrust to the surface in the wake of the traumatic events of the winter of 1648-9. It is true that there were traditional aspects of the Protectorate. Cromwell and his court adopted the outward trappings of regality. As Protector, Cromwell was habitually addressed as "Your Highness", and he conducted foreign affairs in as formal and as ceremonial way as any early modern European monarch. But these and other similar aspects of Protectorate government should not be interpreted as the consequences of a Cromwellian decision to return to the old political order in every respect. Amidst Cromwell's yearnings for "healing and settling" there ran persistent and strong revolutionary aspirations.

What were these revolutionary aspirations? That is a short question that is very difficult to answer with any precision, largely because Cromwell, when he wrote or spoke about his aims, was never very precise about what he wanted. When he talked of reformation he used vague phrases like his desire "to reap the fruit of all the blood and treasure that had been spent in this cause", as he said on one occasion. The explanation for his vagueness is fairly straightforward, I think. Cromwell was no ideologue, unlike his son-in-law Henry Ireton, who delighted in disentangling and spelling out his ideas. Cromwell was a man who often acted on impulses, not coldly and calculatingly. The resulting vagueness, however, is not very helpful to anyone who wants to know exactly what Cromwell wanted to do. But behind the Cromwellian impulses I think one can see some consistent elements that give a fairly clear indication of what Cromwell's vision of an ideal Britain was.

Cromwell, it seems to me, was a representative of two reforming tendencies that became fashionable among those who were born (as he was) between about 1580 and about 1620 - the post-Reformation generation - in ways and with probably about the same degree of support among a literate and vocal minority that radical ideas like nuclear disarmament took root among some of my

generation that grew up in Britain after the Second World War. Could I call these two reforming, militant tendencies in post-Reformation England "the Commonwealth ideal" and "the aspiration

for a godly Reformation"?

The Commonwealth ideal took as its starting point the assumption that the state, the Commonwealth, was one in which wealth and power were distributed unequally, but it stressed that everyone (including the rich and privileged) had duties and responsibilities to the Commonwealth as a whole. The keynote of this ideal was what we would call "social justice", the idea that private greed should not be allowed to lead to public injustice, corruption or unalleviated poverty. This, you may not be surprised to hear, is the aspect of the Cromwellian vision that appeals to me. It led Cromwell, like others, to lay great stress on trying to make the legal system of the country fairer, local government less corrupt and education more accessible. It is a theme that Cromwell encapsulated best in his remarkable Dunbar letter in September 1650, which concluded with the remarkable words, "If there be any that make many poor to make a few rich, that suits not a Commonwealth" [3].

Alongside and intertwined with that Commonwealth ideal was another ideal that Cromwell shared with a few others, a vision that had surfaced in the early years after the Reformation and one that had been kept alight in Elizabethan and early Stuart England by enthusiastic men and women who believed that the Reformation, the break with Rome, the establishment of a Protestant English national Church and the Elizabethan religious settlement of 1559 had not been a true Reformation or indeed a Settlement at all. Not only was the new Church's government but "halfly reformed", but the true reformation of people's inner spiritual and moral lives had not even begun. Individual sins - drunkenness, swearing, sabbath-breaking, blasphemy, adultery, fornication - abounded and they believed that only when the true reformation aimed at abolishing those sins had begun would the use of the word "Reformation" be justified. Cromwell shared that craving for "further reformation" and as Protector he worked to create the conditions to promote it by erecting a loose, umbrella-like national Church, which has often wrongly been interpreted as a move towards religious toleration as we nowadays define it. It was not. Not only were Catholics exempted from Cromwellian toleration but also some Protestants (like Quakers and Unitarians) as well. The Cromwellian Church was not intended to promote religious diversity but religious unity among a wide but not unlimited spectrum of Protestants. He wanted (as he said) to allow all Protestant men and women, whether they be Presbyterians, Independents or Baptists,

to make use of the liberty given them to enjoy their own consciences...For...undoubtedly this is the peculiar interest all this while contended for. [That] men that believe in Jesus Christ...men that believe the remission of sins through the blood of Christ, and live upon the grace of God, that those men are certain that they are so, are members of Jesus Christ and are to Him the apple of His eye.

And he added, making it clear that his main concern was with promoting pure inner beliefs and not outward forms of church government, that he wanted to encourage

whosoever hath this faith, let his form be what it will if he be walking peaceably without the prejudicing of others under another form [4].

So it seems to me that Cromwell's vision for Britain was the creation of a godly Commonwealth on earth. His tragedy was that, as he pursued that ideal, many of those who had once shared that aspiration no longer continued to do so. Just as support for the radical cause of nuclear disarmament that fired some of my generation faded in the late 1960s and 1970s, so the radical cause of godly reformation lost much of its support in the late 1640s and 1650s, as it became increasingly associated with radical threats to turn the social and political world upside down. In the seventeenth century case the association was with regicide, with Diggers, Levellers and Ranters, and with those wild people from the north of England who seemed to challenge the very fabric of society, the Quakers.

What is remarkable about Cromwell is that, although he shared some of these qualms, he did not shy away (as did many of his erstwhile godly comrades) from the pursuit of further reformation. As I said, I think that he became increasingly committed to it, and his refusal of the offer of the crown in 1657 is only the most spectacular illustration of that commitment.

Which leaves me with the question "why"? Why did Cromwell pursue the increasingly lonely road of "reformation"? A popular explanation for this is fear of what the army might have done if he had abandoned reformation and taken the crown. Would not army retaliation have been deadly and swift? Did not Colonel Pride threaten to assassinate King Oliver? For me, though, that is a feeble, flawed explanation of Cromwell's behaviour that flies in the face of many examples which demonstrate Cromwell's disregard of army pressure on many other occasions when he outfaced military opinion with displays of courageous bravado, of which his

confrontation with a hostile crowd of army officers on 27 February 1657 is an illustrative example.

This is not to say that Cromwell's military roots are not part of the explanation of his undimmed, burning desire for reformation. He never forgot the camaraderie of the army camp, which reinforced his desire to create a post-civil war land fit for heroes to live in. And, if he seemed to stray from that aim, his one-time army comrades were not slow to bring him back to it. Early in 1657 during the kingship crisis William Bradford wrote to him as someone who, as he said, had gone along with Cromwell "from Edgehill to Dunbar", and he made a powerful, conscience-stabbing point that

the experiences that you have had of the power of God at these two places and betwixt them, methinks, should often make you shrink, and be at a stand in, this thwarting, threatened change [5].

But I do not think that it is this that was the main fuel that kept the reforming flame burning brightly in Cromwell's soul. It was not fear of the army's wrath that drove Cromwell on, but fear of the wrath of a being much more powerful and awesome, the fear of God. To Cromwell, his country in the 1650s faced a situation comparable to that facing the Israelites in Old Testament days, when the Israelites only succeeded in leaving the wilderness and finally and permanently escaping from Egyptian bondage and inheriting the Promised Land after they had won God's blessing by first expiating their sins. Like the Israelites, Cromwell was convinced that for the English the path of moral purity was the only one that would lead to a permanent escape from the bondage of Archbishop Laud and Charles I which had been temporarily achieved during the civil war. To inherit the Promised Land of Godly Reformation the English had now to undergo a process of spiritual cleansing. What we do not want, he told his second Protectorate Parliament in September 1656.

a captain to lead us back into Egypt, if there be such a place - I mean metaphorically and allegorically so - that is to say, returning to all those things that we have been fighting against...I am confident that the liberty and prosperity of this nation depends upon reformation...make it a shame to see men to be bold in sin and profaneness, and God will bless you...Truly these things do respect the souls of men, and the spirits, which are the men. The mind is the man. If that be kept pure, a man signifies somewhat...[6].

This was, however, a plea that fell on many deaf ears in the 1650s, the realisation of which must have plunged Cromwell into deep disappointment. But my last point is that what it did not lead to was the abandonment by Cromwell of his hopes and aspirations. He did not die, as some have said he did, as a broken and disillusioned man. The last months of Cromwell's life are hard to recreate, but the most convincing image to me of them is that of a man in the months before this day 334 years ago still burning with hope that his country was on the point of entering the Promised Land, and that, as he said to his last parliament a few months before he died.

liberty of conscience may be secured for honest people, that they may serve God without fear, that every just interest may be preserved, that a godly ministry may be upheld and not to be affronted by seducing and seduced spirits, that all may be preserved in their just rights, whether civil or spiritual [7].

- 1. D M Wolfe (ed), <u>Leveller Manifestoes of the Puritan Revolution</u> (New York, 1944).
- 2. W C Abbott (ed), <u>The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell</u> (4 vols, Cambridge, Mass., 1937-47), IV, 494.
- 3. ibid, II, 325.
- 4. ibid, III, 271-2.
- 5. <u>ibid</u>, IV, 448.
- 6. ibid, IV, 263, 273-4.
- 7. <u>ibid</u>, IV, 720. Many of the arguments touched on briefly in this address are dealt with in more detail in my <u>Cromwell</u> (Longman "Profiles in Power" series, 1991).

# OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE THE BATTLE OF GAINSBOROUGH, JULY 1643

by John West

During the seventeenth century the small town of Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, was well known as a successful port, trade and farming centre with two annual fairs being held which attracted merchants from as far as London. In 1642, Gainsborough's population consisted of roughly 1800 people, whose trades included butchers, leather workers, textile manufacturers, carpenters, bakers and brewers [1]. The town was roughly triangular in shape and covered an area of about one and a quarter miles north to south and a quarter of a mile west to east. The centre of the town was sited around the parish church of All Saints and the market place and, apart from the stone church and brick manor house, the remainder of the town would have consisted of timber framed buildings which lined the main streets of Bridge Street (then known as "Cawsey"), Silver Street, Lord Street and Market Street.

When civil war was declared, Gainsborough lay in an area which supported parliament. There is some evidence to suggest the town itself had royalist sympathies, although in the end the town's inhabitants decided to remain neutral [2]. The town was of strategic importance to both sides, sited as it was on a crossing of the Trent and laying on a crossing of important roads leading south and north. It became obvious that the town would be sought after by both sides and so, in early 1642, a committee was formed for the protection of the town, and earthwork banks and ditches were constructed for its defence, these still being visible up to the beginning of the last century.

In March 1643 the royalists decided to act. A raiding party from the royalist base at Newark was sent by Sir John Henderson to capture Gainsborough for the King. In the early morning the town was surrounded and the royalists demanded surrender. This was quickly done without a shot being fired and without the least resistance [3]. The town was then put into the charge of the Earl of Kingston and was used as a base, together with Newark, to harass the parliamentary positions in Lincolnshire as well as threatening the parliamentarians at their stronghold at Hull [4]. Parliament could not allow this to continue and royalist attacks at Louth and Market Rasen, together with the capture of parliamentary gunpowder intended for Rotherham, made it clear something had to be done. Parliament decided to send Lord Willoughby of Parham,

commander of the parliamentary forces in Lincolnshire, who on 16 July marched south and launched a surprise attack on the town, seizing it before the commander, Kingston, and his men could call to arms. After the surrender, Kingston was taken under guard by river to Hull, but on the journey the boat came under fire from royalist soldiers on the bank and, as fire was exchanged, Kingston was hit and killed. Willoughby's triumph at Gainsborough was, however, to be shortlived. With the fall of Gainsborough, the royalists had lost their communications with Newark and so immediately sent out a relieving force under the twenty-three-year-old Charles Cavendish to besiege the town. As Lord Willoughby exclaimed, "The same day I tooke it I was beseaged before night, and there kept in some 10 days before I had any release" [5].

Parliament ordered the town to be relieved and forces from Nottingham under Sir John Meldrum and Col. Oliver Cromwell from Cambridgeshire were sent north to attack Cavendish's forces. Cromwell had only just captured a royalist stronghold at Burghley House and so rushed north to join Meldrum's forces, taking with him 600 horse and dragoons. The two forces met up on 27 July at North Scarle, ten miles south of Gainsborough, where they were joined by a detachment of troops from Lincoln. At 2 am the following day the 1200 strong force marched north. At the village of Lea, a mile and a half outside Gainsborough, they met an advanced guard of Cavendish's regiments consisting of about 100 horse. This force was engaged and, after a short skirmish, was driven back to Cavendish's main body which was drawn up on the top of a steep hill to the east of the town, now known as Foxby Hill, the ensuing battle taking place on the hillside overlooking Sandsfield Lane. The royalists consisted of three regiments of horse plus a further regiment in reserve. Although Cavendish had the strategic advantage, Cromwell and his fellow commanders decided that they had no choice but to attack, and so the Lincolnshire troops were ordered to advance up the small tracks leading to the summit. Apart from the steep gradient, their advance was also hampered by the numerous rabbit warrens. Upon reaching the top, they came face to face with the royalist horse who were, according to Cromwell, only a musket shot away. As the Lincolners were forming up, Cavendish's horse attacked, hoping to take them at a disadvantage. Upon seeing this, Cromwell, who was in charge of the right wing of the horse, charged to meet Cavendish. What happened next is best described by Cromwell himself:

> We came up Horse by Horse, where we disputed it with our swords and pistols a pretty time, all keeping close order, so that one could not break the other.

This fearsome "horse by horse" fighting continued until finally the royalist horse gradually began to fall back, eventually fleeing from the battlefield pursued by the parliamentary cavalry for some five miles or so.

Cavendish, meanwhile, had kept a regiment in reserve and, taking advantage of the fact that the parliamentary horse was gone, launched a counter-attack into the Lincolnshire troops who had remained. The Lincolnshire men were thrown back and it seemed that Cavendish might yet win the day. But he had not counted on Oliver Cromwell.

Cromwell had not left in the pursuit of the royalist cavalry and, in fact, had kept back Major Whalley and a reserve of three troops of horse to deal with Cavendish's reserve regiment. Upon seeing the attack on the Lincolnshire's, Cromwell charged Cavendish's rear. In a later account of the battle, Cromwell described what happened next:

I immediately fell on his rear with my three troops, which did so astonish him that he gave over the chase and would fain have delivered himself to me. But I pressed on, forced them down the hill, having good execution of them, and below the hill drove the General with some of his soldiers into a quagmire.

Cavendish was knocked off his horse and killed by a sword thrust in the chest by Cromwell's Captain Lieutenant Berry, and the place where he was killed, to the south of the town near the river, was later known as "Candish Bog". There was never anything romantic about civil war battles and, in this one, we can imagine dead and maimed men and horses littering the hillside. Indeed, the names later given to the fields around it, such as "Graves Close" and "Redcoats Field", testify to the slaughter that happened there.

For parliament it had been a great victory and the credit was largely due to Cromwell's skill as a cavalry leader. Indeed, it was after this battle that Cromwell's military genius first came to the

attention of the country.

Now the battle was over, Cromwell set about supplying Willoughby with such supplies of food, powder and ammunition to help Willoughby withstand any further siege. While this was being done, Cromwell was informed that a small royalist force of six troops and 300 foot was marching on Gainsborough from the north. As Cromwell had no foot soldiers, Willoughby supplied him with 600 men and Cromwell, thinking that this new enemy was a remainder of the late Cavendish's forces not yet engaged, went out to meet them. Cromwell and Meldrum approached them following

the low ridge of hills to the east of the town and, as they neared the village of Morton, they encountered two troops of horse near a mill. These forces were engaged and driven back down into the village. Cromwell and Meldrum now pushed on and, upon reaching the summit of a hill (probably Spital Hill), were shocked to see not a small royalist force but instead an entire royalist army who were now marching on Gainsborough to retake it for the King. As Cromwell was later to recall:

We saw in the bottom about a quarter of a mile from us, a regiment of Foot, after that another, after that the Marquis of Newcastle's own regiment consisting in all of about 30 Foot Colours and a great body of Horse - which indeed was Newcastle's army. Which coming so unexpectedly, put us to new consultations.

Willoughby's foot soldiers, upon seeing this great force, fell back in disorder to the town, but not before suffering casualties due to some royalist horse who got in amongst them. As it would have been suicide to stand and fight or to retreat into the town, together with the fact that the men and horses were exhausted by the recent battle, Cromwell ordered a withdrawal. The withdrawal was at first hampered by the number of hedgerows and they fell back half a mile in disorder, until they came to the end of a lane at the far end of a field. Here Cromwell ordered a brilliant manœuvre, which military historians have cited as a classic example of military tactics and genius. Two rearguard parties of horse, consisting of four troops of Cromwell's regiment and four of the Lincoln troop, were sent under Captain Ayscough and Major Whalley to stand fire and retire alternately in order to cover Cromwell's main force. On eight or nine occasions, a handful of men held back the royalists with the loss of only two men until they finally reached the safety of Lincoln. Cromwell later wrote that this was "equal to any of late times and the Honour of it belonged to Major Whalley and Captain Ayscough".

Meanwhile, Newcastle was besieging Gainsborough and had set up cannon on the surrounding hills, with which he started to fire upon the town. Cromwell pleaded that a force of 2000 be raised to relieve Willoughby, otherwise "you will see Newcastle's army march up into your bowels [the Eastern Counties]". However, this was not done and, back at Gainsborough, Newcastle's cannon had set fire to part of the town. The town's inhabitants now started to harass Willoughby's men and threatened to surrender the town themselves [6]. Finally, on 31 July, after a three day siege, Willoughby surrendered on terms, although some royalists looted

and ill-treated the parliamentarians. Newcastle then turned his forces around and headed north to lay siege to the parliamentary stronghold at Hull, leaving Gainsborough under the command of Colonel St George.

Now Gainsborough was again in royalist hands, raiding parties harassed parliamentary held areas once more. In response to this, parliament sent Cromwell's former colleague, Sir John Meldrum, to retake the town. On 18 December 1643, a small fleet of boats was sent out from Hull and fired upon a royalist fort at Barton on Strather, while Meldrum and a body of horse attacked it from land. After its capture, the combined force advanced down river and commenced firing on Gainsborough. The town surrendered on 20 December with over 600 prisoners, 500 arms and nine pieces of ordnance being taken [7]. For four months, Meldrum used Gainsborough as a base to attack scattered royalist pockets and also to attack and capture a "Royal Fort" [8]. In March 1644, Meldrum evacuated the town at the approach of a royalist army under Prince Rupert, destroying its defences as he left, writing that "if Gainsborough had not been razed by my order, the enemy might have found a nest to have hatched much mischief" [9].

In May 1644 a parliamentary army under the command of the Earl of Manchester retook Gainsborough as it marched north to Marston Moor, near York [10]. Manchester's army quartered around Gainsborough and the town was ordered to pay £80 towards the upkeep of the army by the committee of Lincoln. After Manchester had left, a garrison remained and continued to occupy the town for some time, protecting it from any further royalist attacks. In 1646 Charles and the royalists finally surrendered and it must have seemed to the inhabitants that they had seen the last of the war. In early 1648, however, while Charles was a prisoner, royalist uprisings sprang up throughout Britain. In Doncaster a royalist force consisting of 400 horse and 200 foot moved on the Isle of Axeholme, and on 30 June crossed the Trent at Gainsborough, moving on to capture Lincoln. Parliament acted quickly and an army, under the command of Sir Henry Cholmeley, marched through Gainsborough to meet the royalist army; at Willoughby, near Nottingham, they were finally routed and defeated. All over Britain the uprisings were quickly put down and so Gainsborough, at last, found peace. This must have been a great relief to the town's inhabitants who, since 1643, had had to put up with garrisons, battles, sieges, looting and fire. Now the town could get back to a normal routine of living without fear of warfare and the suffering that it had brought them.

1 The local parish records, particularly the parish registers of

baptisms and burials, provide evidence of occupations.

2 Sir Willoughby Hickman, Lord of the Manor and owner of Gainsborough, had royalist sympathies and in November 1643 accepted a baronetcy from the King during the royalist occupation. At the outbreak of war, he was undecided, however, on who to support, due to the fact that he was related to several puritan families and was thus bound to them by ties of religion and kinship. The nearby towns of Worksop and Retford had decided to remain neutral and this probably influenced Willoughby and Gainsborough to follow suit. A local constable's account for 1642 records the construction of defences for the town. There is a local tradition that Charles I passed through Gainsborough on his way to erect his standard in Nottingham.

3 The Earl of Denbigh wrote to the parliamentary Committee of Safety reporting the fall of Gainsborough in a letter dated 26

March 1643.

4 On 27 May 1643 the Gainsborough parish registers record the burial of a captain killed at Brigg during a royalist raid from Gainsborough. Also, on 3 June 1643 Sir Edward Ayscough and Sir John Broxholme reported to Speaker Lenthall about various raiding parties from Gainsborough, complaining that they "were puffed up with such boldness as...to range over the county to asses towns, to take prisoners and to drive men's horses".

5 The quotation by Lord Willoughby is taken from his report to

parliament.

- 6 Willoughby's report also states that Newcastle's cannon fire upon the town caused panic amongst the town's people "and did so deboyse our soldiers as many of them could not be got to stand to their works".
- 7 Accounts of Meldrum's attack on the town are again taken from his reports to parliament.
- 8 The "Royal Fort" which Meldrum captured may have been at West Stockwith.
- 9 On 4 April 1644 Sir Alexander Dent wrote to Sir Richard Verney, telling him of Gainsborough being evacuated and writing of "Gainsborough quitted and slighted and all the ordnance, ammunition and baggage lost".

10 Manchester's occupation of the town is reported in his letter to the Committee of Both Kingdoms after his return from York and the Battle of Marston Moor.

Sources for the Battle of Gainsborough

The best account of the battle is contained in Cromwell's letter "To the Committee of the Association sitting at Cambridge"

Two good, modern accounts, containing a lot of helpful information, are: I Backworth, Gainsborough During the Great Civil War (Gainsborough, 1969), which contains a good account of life in the town during the 1640s and of the effects war had on the town's population; and C Holmes, Seventeenth Century Lincolnshire (History of Lincolnshire Committee, 1980), an excellent work, particularly full on the mid seventeenth century, which includes many references to Gainsborough.

# OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE ENGLISH EXPERIENCE OF MANŒUVRE WARFARE 1645-1651 Part 1

by Jonathan R Moore

Introduction

With the recent interest being shown in the development of forms and concepts of manœuvre war within Western armies - not least following the dramatic success of Operation Desert Storm - as a means of facing the challenges presented by the rapid evolution of warfare and the new political circumstances in Eastern Europe and the rest of the world, questions have been raised concerning how such concepts could be applied within the context of the British approach to war. Consequently, much historical analysis and many studies have been carried out of those armies which have made extensive use of mobile concepts in the past as a means of providing lessons or paradigms for the present. A particular object of study on both sides of the Atlantic, occasionally bordering on veneration, is the German Army, where great stress is laid upon the influence of a tradition of manœuvre war stretching back as far as Frederick the Great [1].

The possession of a living tradition is a powerful tool in the creation and retention of any form of war within a military

organisation. It leads to a greater readiness to accept ideas and reforms if they can be perceived to be in harmony with "our way of doing things", or at least part of the process of common historical experience. In particular, it is a key means of overcoming the inertia which any organisation develops in procedures and methods of operation. This is particularly so in the case of the British Army, whose sense of the past and continuity, both at regimental level and as an organisation, is an essential factor in the creation of high levels of combat cohesion within the primary unit. However, this sense of tradition can and has been used in the past to oppose necessary change, demanded in response to new battlefield problems. What is clear is that far from being a form of war alien to the British army and its antecedents, there have been periods where what we can define as the mobile military culture [2] has been in the ascendant, and manœuvre concepts were the means by which success was obtained on the battlefield. It is the aim of this article to examine what we can identify as the first English experience of the manœuvre form within the "modern" period of warfare, which is to be found in the three civil wars that racked the nation from 1645 to 1651.

Any civil strife is an ugly phenomenon to contemplate, yet the military consequences of this period were to see the creation of the first regular standing army in our history, and the development of a new approach to war within that organisation. This army embodied concepts of war and a military culture which were to shatter the forces of the King, suppress the long festering rebellion in Ireland and destroy Scotland as an independent political entity. Consequently, England was to return as a serious actor on the stage of continental politics and become a major element in the European balance of power.

The key to the transformation of the course of the war lay in the creation, in 1645, of the New Model Army. Formed with the object of revitalising the parliament's flagging and fragmented war effort, it was ultimately to rejuvenate the battlefield functions of the various arms, and restore decisiveness to military operations.

Much of the credit for its success lies at the hands of its most famous general, Oliver Cromwell, who, irrespective of the controversy surrounding his statesmanship, was one of the most original and able commanders ever to lead English troops in battle. The history of the New Model Army and of Cromwell are inextricably interlinked; yet, if we try and suppress the passions which can still be aroused by those contentious times, we see a profound legacy of mobile war which, even today, when material, political and social conditions and circumstances are so different, can be drawn upon as a source of ideas and inspiration. This article

attempts to examine the evolution of the manœuvre form and concepts of war [3] within the parliamentary military system. We define manœuvre as the movement of combat forces (at the tactical or operational level) in direct relation to the enemy, and in such a fashion as to maximise one's own fighting power at the point of decision. It should be stressed that manœuvre warfare is directed at the enemy strength, that is, his tactical and operational main forces, and does not eschew but actively seeks battle. Emphasis is placed on a high level of aggression, the attack is perceived as the only decisive means of war-fighting, the defence is merely a temporary state of affairs which should allow a transition to the offensive. Evolving from this is an emphasis on achieving surprise as a means of increasing fighting power - the security of one's own forces, likewise, being preserved by the maintenance of a superiority in relative mobility. The advantage in mobility is fundamental as it allows a strict economy of force to be practised, in that all forces and resources could be applied at the critical point.

First, however, we must set the scene by examining some of the key features of seventeenth century warfare, which provided the circumstances within which Cromwell had to act.

Warfare in the seventeenth century

Throughout the "Military revolution" [4], which saw the rise of the firearm-equipped regular soldier as the dominant force on the European battlefield, the positional form of warfare predominated. The combat functions of the forces of such great captains as Maurice of Nassau, Spinola and Gustavus Adolphus were confined to meeting the enemy head on, regiment by regiment, where superior numbers, morale, training or firepower won the day. The art of generalship was to bring one's forces to the battle in the most advantageous conditions and let the troops do the rest. Consequently, battle tended to degenerate into an attritional struggle against the will, if not the material strength, of the enemy. Unless an army was successful along the whole of the battleline, victory tended to be less than decisive. This in turn exaggerated the influence of fortifications, whose security resided not so much in their physical strength, as in the inability of armies to achieve a decisive collapse of the enemy's power in the field. As long as the enemy remained capable of campaigning, then the opportunity to seize fortresses was minimal; if he could not, then the fate of the strongest fortress was sealed.

In these conditions, the acme of success came to be perceived not in terms of the ability to destroy the enemy's forces in battle, but in the means to hold and gain material, to seize the resources which sustained the enemy. As a result the attritional

approach to war predominated to the almost complete exclusion of a rapid decision. Strategy hinged on the capture of territory; tactics, and with that operations, reflected the demand for minimal risk. It was largely on these continental models and methods that the armies of the parliament and King based themselves; individual military experience being confined to service in, and as supporting elements of, foreign armies such as those of the Dutch and Swedes.

The integration of arms into a cohesive mutually supporting whole, where strength aided weakness and acted as a force multiplier, was still in its infancy. As the armies of Europe still struggled to absorb the impact of new technology rather than exploit its full potential, the integration of the arms was limited, if not completely non-existent. Battlefield formations ensured that each arm fought unsupported and was expected to win their own individual struggle with their immediate opponents to the exclusion of everything else. Consequently, the use of reserves and echelons in mutual support was rare. The tendency, exaggerated by the rise of firepower, was to commit all forces in a single assault along the line, encouraging the adoption of linear formations at the expense of depth. The function of the commander subsequently became that of a cheerleader, whose ability to influence events declined as he committed all available forces on a single throw or was confined to the combat power of his personal bodyguard. The ability of a commander to influence actions hinged largely on his personality or physical prowess. With few reserves to exploit opportunities, the outcome of the battle too often hinged upon the unco-ordinated actions of subordinates and their limited perception of the battle as an integral whole, with the notable exception of the Swedes under Gustavus Adolphus. Lack of common training, experience and often social differences militated against the cohesive and coherent approach to command and control on the battlefield.

It should be stressed that the ability of armies to adopt manœuvre concepts of war was limited by the problem of mobility. Communications were poor, roads were few and unmetalled, and an army was normally confined to a single route; the search for suitable overnight accommodation and a grossly inflated logistical tail were further major constraints upon movement. Under these constraints, further exacerbated by inadequate organisation, armies were largely unwilling or unable to develop a superiority in relative mobility vis à vis their opponents. It was clear that the limitations in communication exaggerated an unwillingness to adopt more aggressive and decisive forms of war.

Consequently, the first year of the English civil war became a struggle to control territory, and pitched battles, which took place more frequently than on the continent, were invariably the product

of operations to capture or relieve towns and fortresses. These engagements never resulted in the total defeat of the enemy, as he was always given the opportunity to retire, lick his wounds and reform as the victor settled down to milk a newly captured locality of its resources. The military structures employed by both sides reflected this, being largely territorially based and parochial in their activities. Concentration of forces was rendered difficult if not impossible as troops were dissipated in dozens of garrisons and any number of county "armies". Coupled with a lack of clear political and hence strategic direction, the conflict degenerated into a grim battle of attrition, in which inevitably the civilian population bore the brunt of the hardship caused.

This indecisive, yet increasingly costly struggle ultimately forced many of the supporters of parliament to demand a complete reform of their military organisation and war effort. As Cromwell made clear to the House of Commons, "I do conceive if the army be not put into another method, and the war more vigorously prosecuted, the people can bear the war no longer, and will enforce you to a dishonourable peace" [5]. In the closely fought decision to create a single main force in the form of the New Model Army, a weapon was forged which was to alter radically the course of the war and English history.

To analyse the development of the New Model, and the emergence of manœuvre form and concepts of war, this paper will now examine three key campaigns, highlighting the evolution of the organism at the tactical, operational and strategic levels of decision. To this end the battle of Naseby of 1645 has been chosen and (in Part 2) the campaigns of Preston in 1648 and Dunbar in 1650. It is not the intention to provide a detailed description of these engagements, but to concentrate on those features which illustrate the development of a manœuvre military art, and endeavour to explain the reasons underlying those characteristics.

Naseby 1645: Manœuvre and the tactical level of decision
The first evidence we see for the development of a manœuvre approach to war by the New Model Army occurs at the tactical level and is first displayed at the Battle of Naseby of 14 June 1645. The army had hardly formed at Windsor when it was committed to a series of operations which, in the manner of past campaigns directed by the Committee of Both Kingdoms (the executive body charged by the Commons with running the parliamentary war effort on a day to day basis), dissipated its fighting power in three divergent directions. A substantial force was dispatched to raise the siege of Taunton [6], a brigade of horse was sent north to reinforce parliament's Scottish allies and the main body was directed to

besiege Oxford. That city had been the King's headquarters since 1642. However, the main royalist field force which had garrisoned the place had marched into the Midlands, and the New Model was committed to a futile siege against a well-fortified and provisioned town. Oxford would not fall whilst the King was active in the field. Only the loss of Leicester on 30 June, and the immediate threat this posed to communications between London and the north and the vital economic and manpower resources of the Eastern Association [7] changed parliament's somewhat confused and lethargic war effort. Control of military operations was removed from the hands of the committee and placed under the direct authority of the commander of the New Model, General Thomas Fairfax [8].

The result was to add a new dynamic to the campaign. Fairfax immediately abandoned the siege of Oxford and marched rapidly to seek out and destroy the King's army in a single decisive engagement. Fairfax was determined to break the royalist strength and their ability to resist. That power was located in the royalist field force and, with it broken, parliament would at last be able to force the King to address their political and religious grievances.

The campaign and battle of Naseby illustrate the changes which were underway in parliament's arms, as Fairfax ruthlessly manipulated conditions by achieving a favourable tempo of operations to maximise his chances of success on the battlefield. First, he achieved complete tactical surprise over the royalist forces who were enjoying the fruits of the fall of Leicester, being dispersed in billets around Daventry, "the soldiers in no order, and their horse all at grass, having not the least knowledge of our advance" [9]. The speed of the New Model's advance (despite appalling weather the army moved from Oxford to Naseby in just seven days) took the royalists completely unawares. Unlike Fairfax, they were poorly served by their intelligence organisation. By the time the royalists had reformed, they were unable to avoid a general engagement. The seizure of tempo had obtained for Fairfax the battle he sought, battle being the currency of a manœuvre concept of war.

For this action, Fairfax was determined to increase his chances of success by maximising all available forces. Vermuyden's brigade of 2,500 horse joined at Newport Pagnall. Fairfax also ordered the garrisons of Coventry, Warwick, Northampton and Nottingham to march immediately to join the army, although they were unable to rendezvous before the battle. On the eve of Naseby, Cromwell joined with a further 600 Eastern Association horse. This gave an estimated strength on 14 June of some 14,000 horse and foot, with around 7,000 of each.

In contrast the royalists had dispersed their available forces. Goring had been dispatched to the West Country with a substantial

cavalry contingent to take charge of operations against Taunton. Furthermore, from the King's already depleted field army, a strong garrison had been left at Leicester; as a consequence royalist strength was reduced to around 7,500 horse and foot. Overall, this gave the New Model a favourable force correlation on the battlefield of nearly 2:1. In the case of the individual arms, the ratios [10] were as follows:

Horse New Model 1.75:1 Royalist Foot New Model 2:1 Royalist

These figures do obscure differences in fighting power, that is in actual combat capability, but they do give the New Model Army a numerical superiority, which it was capable of turning into an advantage at the decisive point. As a result, the army was able to deploy in depth, with two echelons on the left and centre and three on the right wing, composed of some six regiments of horse under Cromwell. It was at this point on the line that the actions which decided the fate of the battle took place.

The battle opened when Cromwell's first echelon overwhelmed Langdale's royalist Northern Horse. However, they did not then pursue the remnants off the field, but halted in good order to cover the King's reserve on Dust Hill. Cromwell, meanwhile, retaining firm control of his troops, brought his second and third echelons around to envelop the left and left rear of the royalist foot. The royalist infantry were at that time having substantial success in the centre of the field, where Skippon, the New Model's Major-General, had been forced to commit his second line and reserve of foot to stem the onslaught. These actions are significant, as in this manner both royalist reserve and foot were effectively "fixed", enabling Cromwell's envelopment to be carried out without interference. On the King's right, the royalist horse led by Rupert broke Ireton's regiments after a short melée. However, in contrast to Cromwell, the victorious royalists effectively fixed themselves by pursuing most of the parliamentarian troopers off the field. This was in contradistinction to the single movement by which Cromwell transformed the fortunes of the day for parliament. By bringing his units in against the now open and vulnerable royalist right flank, he achieved surprise and maximised the combat power of his own forces at the decisive point. After brief resistance the royalist cohesion collapsed and their foot surrendered en masse. Fairfax reformed his line of battle, facing the still uncommitted royalist reserve, and such of Langdale's and Rupert's horse which had rallied or returned. As soon as the parliamentarians advanced, the remaining royalists, their morale and cohesion already shaken, broke and fled.

The battlefield success was immediately followed by an active pursuit covering some fourteen miles, leading to the complete dispersal of the remnants of the King's army. As a viable force it had ceased to exist. According to Sprigge, 4,500 prisoners were taken, including some six Colonels, eight Lt-Colonels, eighteen Majors and some 430 other officers [11]. The loss to the royalists of their most experienced foot and irreplaceable officer cadres negated any future possibility of re-establishing an effective field army.

The significance of Cromwell's envelopment manœuvre is not to be confined to the purely tactical level. It is a clear example of an action at the tactical level of decision altering conditions, and in so doing profoundly influencing circumstances [12] and the strategic pattern of the war. It is an example of where tactical success has operational results, altering the course of a particular campaign and thus shifting, in this case, the strategic balance decisively in favour of parliament. Fairfax was determined to exploit this change in circumstances and, by advancing immediately into the West Country and by dictating the tempo, he was again to achieve surprise over the royalist forces in Somerset and Devon. At Langport, Goring was decisively defeated, and this removed the last chance for the King's faltering cause. The only task that remained was the mopping up of the isolated royalist garrisons, which was

merely a question of time.

What lessons should be drawn from the application of manœuvre concepts to solve battlefield problems? Clearly, an allarms approach was central to the successful use of manœuvre in battle. With the greater fluidity which that approach envisaged, the chances of an army being able to deploy in the conventional line of battle would be correspondingly reduced. Such conditions would require intimate support from each arm as they would have to cover for other arms' weaknesses and exploit their strengths. For example, in a meeting engagement, the foot would have to support advanced horse units and be able readily to form a base of manœuvre around which successive columns could deploy. Foot assaults would have to be co-ordinated in such a manner as to fix the enemy, presenting an opportunity for the horse to encircle or envelop. It is significant that Naseby proved the first and last occasion in which the New Model adopted a "conventional" battlefield deployment; the old method of "wings" and "centre" proved too limiting for the effective mutual support of horse and foot.

In the same manner there was a closer integration of infantry firepower with cavalry shock action, the latter exploiting the opportunity created by the former. At Langport, the task of the horse was prepared by extensive use of skirmishing foot and

artillery. The mutual support of both horse and foot ensured that the infantry had less need to place reliance on pikes, increasing steadily the proportion of muskets to close combat weapons. In contrast to the use of linear formations, there was greater use of tactical echeloning, increasing depth, maximising shock by allowing the use of successive waves, which created successive moral impact, magnifying fighting power, but also allowing greater opportunities to exploit success and carry out manœuvres such as envelopment and encirclement. It also enabled the commanding general to fight a more controlled and integrated battle, thus maintaining tempo and hence the creation and exploitation of opportunities in his favour [13]. This integration of arms was essential. If, due to the demands of increased mobility, the army was to move as a series of detached columns, directed towards a particular objective or enemy, each column should have sufficient strength at least to hold any force it

met, until support arrived.

The maintenance of a superiority in relative mobility was essential for manœuvre war. By increasing reliance on the formation of columns, mobility was enhanced by avoiding the need to march along a single route; improved organisation and march discipline reduced the logistical tail. Transporting troops and heavy equipment by sea boosted in-theatre mobility, as did the preparation of supply dumps in advance of movement. Improved methods of obtaining and using intelligence aided the development of superior mobility, as did the recognition that clear objectives and tasks were essential for a successful troop concentration and resulting favourable correlation of forces in effect, to achieve true economy of force on the battlefield. Any exploitable advantage in mobility would find expression in the use of time and space on the battlefield and campaign and in the ability of the army to achieve a favourable tempo. Superior relative mobility and the achievement of surprise put stress on the enemy's "central nervous system", in turn forcing him to react to, if not conform to, one's own actions, thereby increasing the chance of his making mistakes and providing one's own troops with further opportunities to be exploited. Simultaneously this would preserve one's own cohesion by increasing the psychological and moral security of those forces, increasing the difference in fighting power.

What caused these changes was not so much the result of a deep theoretical study of warfare (such rigorous analysis largely lay in the future), but was a product of practical solutions to the problems faced by parliament's commanders. Such solutions had their origins in the insight of war brought by such soldiers as Cromwell, Lambert, Jones and Harrison, who had entered the conflict war with no direct military experience except that which they were to gain on the battlefields of England. As a result they were not encumbered by preconceptions of continental positional war which had so emasculated the generalship of Essex, Manchester and Middleton. To Fairfax and Cromwell what we can clearly identify as manœuvre concepts of war were practical and self-evident solutions for all-too-real battlefield problems. The key to success lay in translating recognition of the solution into practical reality.

It was the change in mental approach which enabled the essential transformation of the command and control system to be carried out. Unless the manner in which an army decides upon the type of action necessary and the manner in which it is implemented is altered, it is impossible to realise manœuvre concepts of war. At the level of command it is based on the development of a common approach to problem solving, a common recognition of the best means of achieving an end. It is significant that seven out of eleven New Model Army cavalry regiment commanders came from the Eastern Association, where Cromwell's influence in recruiting and promoting talented and dedicated officers, regardless of social background, had been paramount in transforming the combat capability of the Association horse. This enabled a unity of understanding and action to be inculcated within the New Model from the moment of its formation. Only in this way could command be devolved to those elements in contact with the enemy, thereby permitting the achievement of superior tempo.

If a commonality of action had not been achieved, then the army's effort would have been dissipated as the battle became little more than a mass of unrelated regimental actions. Likewise, control had to be developed, so that at the highest level the commanding general could make full use of the forces available and exploit all available opportunities. Essentially this hinges on a high level of discipline and unit cohesion in the basic command units and subordinate commanders. As a result, forces held in reserve and in secondary echelons allowed the commander and, just as importantly, his subordinates, directly to influence the course of the battle in a previously unheard of fashion, as occurred with Cromwell at Naseby. This allows for the exploitation of opportunities and for increasing fighting power, as units could at last be readily deployed against observed enemy weaknesses and in response to changing conditions. It is only the ability to maintain effective control of one's own forces balanced by the ability to seize tempo by devolved command which enables successful use of allarms to take place.

Control is immeasurably improved by increasing the understanding of subordinate commanders of their particular

responsibilities and missions in a battle; without this, control can cripple the development of flexibility and creativity at the point of contact. The maintenance of the balance between command and control was eased by the compact nature of battlefields which allowed the commander to control, yet whose technical means for dissemination of orders, messengers and personal intervention allowed more devolved and flexible command structures. The growing importance of the pre-battle council of war exemplifies this. It was used, not so much as a forum for debate as in previous years, but as a means of developing a common approach to the forthcoming battle and ensuring that regimental and brigade commanders could fight as part of a whole, to a common end, rather than in an ad hoc, unco-ordinated manner.

From these changes in command and control emerged improved tactical and strategic integration. Campaigns were increasingly perceived in a strategic context, the important factor being not to seize terrain but to destroy the enemy's will and ability to resist.

- 1. See, for example, W S Lind, <u>Manœuvre War Handbook</u> (Boulder, 1985) and also T N Dupuy, <u>A Genius for War: The German Army and General Staff 1807-1945</u> (London, 1977).
- 2. See Major R A D Applegate & J R Moore, "Warfare: an Option of Difficulties", <u>RUSI Journal</u>, vol 3 (autumn 1990). For pioneering work on the impact of military culture on armed forces see M Elliott-Bateman, <u>Defeat in the East</u> (Oxford, 1967).
- 3. See Applegate & Moore, <u>ibid</u>, for a detailed explanation of these terms. Briefly, the "form" is the theoretical approach to warfighting, the "concept" is the means by which theory is realised in practice towards a specific end.
- 4. M Roberts, "The Military Revolution 1560-1660" in his own Essays in Swedish History (London, 1967), pp. 195-225.
- 5. Quoted in T Carlyle (ed), <u>Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches</u> (revised edn, London, 1907), I, 176.
- 6. Taunton, a vulnerable and unwalled town, was the linchpin for parliamentary opposition to the complete royalist control of the West Country. It was besieged several times and vigorously defended by Robert Blake, later to achieve fame as one of the Commonwealth's Generals-at-Sea. See M Baumber, General-at-Sea: Life of Robert Blake (London, 1989), pp. 40-53.
- 7. For an insight into the function of the Associations as key elements in the parliamentary war effort and the central role played by the wealthy and populous Eastern Association see C

Holmes, The Eastern Association in the English Civil War (Cambridge, 1974).

8. For biographical details of Fairfax see C Markham's dated but comprehensive life, The Great Lord Fairfax (London, 1870) and M A Gibb, The Lord General (London, 1938).

9. J Sprigge, Anglia Rediviva (London, 1647, reprinted 1854), p.

34.

10. It should be stressed that the use of force ratios in this case is purely illustrative. The ratios shown only assess force numbers; they do not attempt to quantify combat capability or fighting power. Both armies evinced substantial differences in fighting power between their regiments from excellent to indifferent. This is largely a result of internal factors, for example training, leadership, combat experience and morale. The achievement of a favourable numerical force ratio does not guarantee success; what it does provide is to increase the possible chance of success by increasing the numbers which can be brought to bear against an enemy. Likewise, the sense of being outnumbered can lower an opponent's morale and with it his fighting power.

11. Sprigge, Anglia Rediviva, pp. 44-5.

12. "Conditions" we define as those elements acting immediately upon the military organism or its subordinate elements and which change rapidly and continuously, and which can in many cases be influenced by the organism. Examples include terrain, weather, supply, morale, etc. "Circumstances" are those factors which influence the whole organism and which change slowly if at all, for example climate, the presence of allies, geography, the level of industrial production, etc.

13. In contrast, the attritional conception of tempo is the achieving of a favourable rate of exchange in forces and resources. Tempo in our model is not an absolute, but is defined by the particular

military culture of the army.

This is the first part of a two part article, originally published in the journal <u>British Army Review</u> no. 99 (December 1991) and 102 (December 1992). It is being republished in <u>Cromwelliana</u> in similar form, save only that the illustrations - and textual references to them - in the original are here omitted. The editor of <u>Cromwelliana</u> is grateful to the Ministry of Defence for permitting the reproduction of this article.

© British Crown copyright 1993/MOD reproduced with the permission of the Controller of Her Britannic Majesty's Stationary Office.

by C H Davidson

Oliver Cromwell was never one of my heroes and indeed he is remembered in this part of the country (Inverness-shire) with less than reverence, as the beautiful Priory of Beauly was desecrated by his troops in order to get stone for the fort they were building in Inverness. Then, a few years ago, Antonia Fraser told me she was writing a biography of Cromwell and wanted some help with his medical history. With the thoroughness of the professional historian she enclosed a few references which I read with great interest. The material suggested that he had not died from malaria, the accepted view of historians [1], but from septicaemia following an infection of the urinary tract secondary to a stone. The suggestion was included briefly in her biography [2] and is amplified in the present paper, which gives all that was recorded at the time about Cromwell's terminal illness and post mortem.

**Previous Medical History** 

An account of all that is known about Cromwell's medical history was written in 1848 by Cooper [3], a surgeon at the North London Eye Infirmary. A contemporary account is by Dr George Bate(s) [4], a graduate of Oxford who became a Fellow of the College of Physicians in London in 1640. Soon after he was appointed physician to King Charles I and, like the Vicar of Bray in the popular song, he kept his place throughout the political turmoils of the time, being state physician to Cromwell when he became Lord Protector and to King Charles II after the Restoration in 1660. The following summary is based on information given by Bate and Cooper and also from Antonia Fraser's book and a paper on one of the surgeons in Cromwell's army [5].

Oliver Cromwell was born in 1599 in Huntingdon. As a child he was said to be melancholy and had a premonition that he would become the greatest man in England, a view which incurred paternal displeasure. According to Bate, Cromwell "laid an unsolid foundation of learning at Cambridge where he enjoyed robust health and threw himself into a dissolute and disorderly life, being famous for football, cricket, cudgelling and wrestling". He also earned an unenviable reputation for practical jokes and on one occasion was thrown into the village pond by his outraged victims. His father died after he had been at Cambridge University for only a year, and he returned to Huntingdon to look after the small family property. During this period he was described by his local doctor as "a most

splenetic man and hypochondriacal". He regularly summoned the unfortunate doctor in the middle of the night as he thought he was

dying.

In 1628, when still a very junior member of the parliamentary establishment, he had the benefit of a consultation with Sir Theodore de Mayerne (1573-1658) who was physician to James I and Charles I. The royal doctor pronounced a diagnosis of "valde melancholicus". I was unfamiliar with this term but Professor Arthur Beattie tells me that "valde" is merely a word of emphasis, so that "valde melancholicus" means very, or highly, melancholic. Today the diagnosis would probably be acute depression. Many writers have claimed that his mental condition was due to malaria contracted in the marshy lands around Huntingdon but that would seem to be most unlikely.

For the next twenty years Cromwell must have been healthy as he was very active both in parliament and in the army. Then, in 1649 when serving in Ireland, he was stricken by a serious illness described as "a country sickness, with a recurrent fever, like many of the troops". This was thought, probably correctly, to be malaria. In February 1651 while in Edinburgh after his victory at the battle of Dunbar, he became ill with "a flux or country sickness" and three months later had an attack of "the stone". Dr Goddard, his personal medical attendant, became very alarmed and two eminent London physicians, Drs Bate and Wright, were summoned to Edinburgh. They were "affectionately received" by the patient whose clinical condition improved and he was soon able to take the air in the grounds of Moray House in the Canongate. Unfortunately, no details are available of the diagnosis or the treatment. It is noteworthy that all three attendant doctors practised in London and were Fellows of our sister College. At this date the great Sibbald was only nine years old and thirty years were to elapse before the establishment of the Edinburgh College which raised the status of physicians working in the city.

The next recorded illness occurred in 1655 when a diagnosis of vesical calculus was made. Cromwell was not averse to seeking the best advice available, whether from a royalist or parliamentary source. James Moleyns, an avowed royalist, was the leading lithotomist of the day and he was consulted on the advice of Cromwell's physicians, Drs Bate, Goddard, Wright and Bathurst. The patient was said to be cured by the treatment and on parting said to the doctor, "Ask what you want and you shall have it". Moleyns replied, "I want nothing because I have not attended you out of love but because I could not do otherwise. The only thing I wish is something to drink". He was taken to the cellars and drank deeply, with a toast to King Charles Stuart. This was reported to Cromwell

who said, "Let him alone, he is mad, but he has done me good and I do not want to harm him". The next day he sent Moleyns £1000, begging him to accept them in the name of King Charles. Cromwell was not without a certain humorous insight; on one occasion he said "I would gladly rule by consent, but where can we find such consent?" One can hear Mrs Thatcher express similar sentiments.

## Terminal Illness

On 3 August 1658 Cromwell's favourite child, Betty Claypole, died after a long, distressing illness. Her father collapsed completely and was unable to attend the funeral but he had recovered sufficiently by the 17th to do some work and ride in the park. Then he developed a febrile disorder and died on 3 September. Dr Bate, his physician, gives the following account of his last illness in his Elenchus Motuum Nuperorum:

But all his Distemper was not in his Mind alone; for shortly after he was taken with Slow Fever, that at length degenerated into Bastard Tertian Ague. For a Weeks time the Disease so continued without any dangerous symptoms, (as appearing sometimes one, and sometimes another kind of distemper) that every other Day he walked abroad: but after Dinner his five Physicians coming to wait upon him, one of them having felt his pulse, said that it intermitted, at which suddenly startled he looked pale, fell into a Cold Sweat, almost fainted away, and orders himself to be carried to Bed, where being refreshed with Cordials he made his Will, but Onely about his Private and Domestick Affairs. Next Morning early when one of his Physicians came to visit him he asked him, "why he looked so sad?" And when he made Answer, "That so it becomes any one who had the weighty care of his Life and Health upon him"; "Ye Physicians", said he, "think I shall die": Then the Company being removed holding his Wife by the Hand, to this purpose he spoke to him, "I tell you, I shall not die this bout: I am sure on't". And because he observed him to look more attentively upon him at these words "Don't think", said he, "that I am mad; I speak the Words of Truth, upon surer grounds than Galen or your Hippocrates furnish you with. God Almighty himself hath given that Answer, not to my Prayers alone, but also to the Prayers of these who entertain a stricter commerce, and greater intimacy with him. Go on cheerfully, banishing all sadness from your looks, and deal with me as you would do with a Serving-man. Ye may have skill in the Nature of things, yet Nature can do more than all Physicians put

together; and God is far more above Nature". But being ordered to take his rest, because he had not slept the greatest part of the Night, as the Physician was coming out of the Chamber, he accidentally met another, who had been a long time very familiar with him; to whom, "I am afraid", says he, "our Patient will be light-headed". The said he, "You are certainly a Stranger in this House: Don't you know what was done last Night? The Chaplains, and all who are dear to God, being dispersed into several parts of the Palace, have Prayed to God for his Health, and all have brought this Answer, 'He shall recover". Nay, to this degree of madness they came, that a Publick Fast being for his sake kept at Hampton Court, they did not so much pray to God for his Health, as thank him for the undoubted pledges of his Pacovery and repeated the same at Whitehall

Recovery; and repeated the same at Whitehall. These Oracles of the Saints were the cause that the Physicians spake not a word of his danger. In the mean time Cromwell leaving Hampton Court, where hitherto he had lain sick, is brought to London; and the Physicians meet at a Consultation in the Chamber of the aforementioned Doctor. who at that time was troubled with a grievous Head-ach, and an Imposthume in his Ear. But next Morning early another Physician coming, who had watch all Night with the Patient. and telling the rest, how ill he had been in the last fit, they all conclude that he could hardly out-live another. This sentence of the Physicians awakening the Privy Council, at an appointed time they come to advise hime, that he would name his Successour. But when in drowsy fit he answered out of purpose, they again ask him, if he did not name Richard his eldest Son for Successour, to which he answered, "Yes". Then being asked where his Will was which heretofore he had made concerning the Heirs of the Kingdom, he sent to look for it in his Closet, and other places, but in vain; for he had either burnt it himself, or some body else had stole it. And so Richard being nominated his Heir, the Day following, being the third of September, he yielded up the Ghost about three of the Clock in the Afternoon; not, (as it was commonly reported) carried away by the Devil at Midnight, but in clear Day-light, and the same Day that he had twice defeated the Scots. His Body being opened; in the Animal parts, the Vessels of the Brain seemed to be overcharged; in the Vitals the Lungs a little inflamed; but in the Natural, the source of the distemper appeared; the Spleen, though sound to the Eye, being within filled with matter like to the Lees of Oyl. Nor was that

Incongruous to the Disease that for a long time he had been subject unto, seeing for at least thirty years he had at time heavily complained of Hypchondriacal indispositions. Though his Bowels were taken out, and his Body filled with Spices, wrapped in a fourfold Cerecloath, but put first into a Coffin of Lead, and then into a Wooden one, yet it purged and wrought through all, so that there was a necessity of interring it before the Solemnity of his Funerals.

**Differential Diagnosis** 

Tertian agues (malaria) were common in Cromwell's time in southeast England [6] and also in Ireland [7]. It is almost certain that he had suffered from more than one attack of malaria. These would have been likely to have been due to the benign tertian variety due to "Plasmodium vivax" with a good prognosis, in contrast to malignant tertian malaria due to "Plasmodium falciparium", more common in the tropics, which can be fatal.

I suggest that Cromwell died of a gram negative septicaemia secondary to urinary tract infection. This diagnosis is based on the history of vesical calculi, the fulminating nature of the last illness and the post mortem report indicating a putrid infection. In his account of the funeral Bate refers to "the filth breaking through the lead and wooden coffins and raising such a noisome stink that they were forced to bury him out of hand". Anyone who has opened an old fashioned "Escherichia coli" abscess will readily appreciate the description.

Comment

Dr Bate goes on to make the more philosophical comment, "Death has confined all his vast ambitions and all his cruel designs into the narrow compass of the grave". The corpse was duly buried and there is doubt about the exact location of this burial and also a strong belief that the body which was later interred in Westminster Abbey was not that of Cromwell. The state funeral was a grand affair, estimated to cost £60,000 which was charged to Richard Cromwell "the son and heir". Subsequently, he retired to the country, disconsolate and depleted in resources which is hardly surprising as even in our inflated days there must be few undertakers who could assemble an account of £60,000.

Following Cromwell's death numerous rumours circulated regarding its cause. Inevitably, poisoning was mentioned; some said it was a tertian ague, while others named a vesical calculus as the determining cause of death. Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) the French mathematician and moralist gives the following remarkable account in one of his <u>Pensees</u> [8]:

Cromwell would have laid desolate all Christendom. The royal family was ruined; his own was completely established: but for a small grain of sand, which entered the urethra, even Rome would have trembled before him; but when only this atom of gravel, which elsewhere was as nothing, was placed in that spot, behold he dies, his family is degraded, and the king restored!

It is not clear how the eminent French scholar, without any medical training, was able to make such a confident and precise clinical diagnosis. Perhaps on some social occasion he had met Dr Moleyns, the royalist surgeon, who had dined well and was gossiping indiscreetly about his illustrious patient.

- 1. M Ashley, <u>The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell</u> (London, 1957), p. 357; "Cromwell, Oliver" in <u>Encyclopaedia Britannica</u> 5 (1974), 295.
- 2. A Fraser, Cromwell, Our Chief of Men (London, 1973), pp. 671-2.
- 3. W Cooper, "The diseases and death of Oliver Cromwell", <u>Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medical Science</u> 5 (1848), 339-70.
- 4. G Bate, Elenchus Motuum Nuperorum in Anglia or, A Short Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Late Troubles in England (London, 1685).
- 5. G Peachey, "Thomas Trampham (Cromwell's surgeon) and others", <u>Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine</u> 24 (1931), 1441-9.
- 6. W Smith, "Malaria and the Thames", <u>Lancet</u> 2 (1956), 433-6.
- 7. W Wylde, "Report upon the tables of death in the census of Ireland for the year 1841", Edinburgh Medical Surgeons Journal 63 (1845), 249-85.
- 8. B Pascal, <u>Thoughts on Religion and Other Subjects</u>, ed. E Craig (Edinburgh, 1925), p. 17.

This paper was first published in <u>The Proceedings of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh</u>, volume 18, number 3 (July 1988) pp. 295-99. The editor of <u>Cromwelliana</u> is indebted to the editor of <u>The Proceedings</u> and to Dr Davidson for permission to reprint it here, and to Mr Ralph Shirley for bringing the article to his attention.

## by Sarah Jones

In the study of history the relationship between women and politics has been problematical, largely because most historians have been bounded by notions of public versus private, political versus domestic, with men active and all-powerful in the public sphere and women restricted to, but allowed to be the "queen" or "governor" of, the private sphere. Such separation is of course as we know inapplicable to the way most lower class people lived their lives in the seventeenth century; but breaking down the separation would also beg a redefinition of politics and political activity. When considering more specifically government legislation, the main question we have to ask ourselves here is, what was the relationship between laws about, or affecting, women and the power of the state and its hierarchies. Because women's history has been long association with social history, there is a general belief that it is impossible to study men and women of the lower classes separately. That obscures the fact that of however low a class a man might be, he could always obtain dominance by gender, whereas a woman could only obtain dominance by her class.

In the mid seventeenth century, as in all periods of warfare, there is an essentially female story to be found. A strong and familiar theme in history is the contradiction between the opportunities for freedom that war brings with revolutionary promises of change, and the continued subservience that peace or restoration brings, with post-restoration emphasis on social order and the family. There is also a further distinction between women in war and women in revolution: usually hidden and absent, women active and invaluable in the war effort are brought to the foreground; in revolution, too, their presence is often vital, but they rarely benefit from the human and civil rights that we associate with revolutions. In the mid seventeenth century we have a war, to all intents and purposes we have a revolution, and we certainly have a monarchical restoration. The 1650s may also provide us with a unique opportunity to look at women mid-way between revolution and restoration.

The political end of the civil wars did not stop the activities that women had been involved in throughout the 1640s; indeed it would be truer to see the civil wars as a catalyst to certain activities which continued at least as long as did the repercussions of the war, which was well into the 1660s.

One of the most specifically female of those activities was

petitioning parliament, ironically lobbying in the 1640s for an end to the war which was pushing women to lay some small claim to civil

rights.

On 27 October 1651 "The Women's Petition" was presented to Oliver Cromwell on behalf of "many thousands of the poor, enslaved, oppressed and distressed men and women in this Land". They spoke against the practice of, and legislation about, imprisoning poor men and women for debt, and suggested that a new representative be called "from which Lawyers and all ill -affected persons be excluded". In 1653 a group of women led by Katherine Chidley attempted to secure the release of John Lilburne. One petition was said to have been "subscribed by above 6000 of that sex". They were "much saddened to see our undoubted Right of Petitioning with held from us, having attended several days at your House door". The Commons had told the women after a previous petition on the same matter that "the House gave an answer to your husbands", so the women were told to "go home" and "meddle with your own huswifery". The women spoke of Esther, "that righteous woman being encouraged by the justness of the Cause", and "although women" they hoped the Commons would be as "that Heathen King was to Esther, who did not onely hear her Petition, but reversed that Decree or Act gone forth against the Jews". They argued that their petition should be heard "since God is ever ready and willing to receive the Petitions of all, making no difference of persons", and the "ancient laws of England are not contrary to the will of God". They reminded the Commons of "the readiness and willingness of the good women of this Nation, who did think neither their lives, nor their husbands and servants lives and estates to be too dear a price for the gaining of yours and the Nations ancient Rights and Liberties out of the hands of incroachers and oppressors. The idea of the very weakness of women being the reason why God used them to speak out was reiterated in a petition against tithes which was presented to parliament on 20 May 1659 from over 7000 Quaker women, "the Handmaids and Daughters of the Lord", their signatures and objections grouped by county. Mary Forster in her preamble to the printed version acknowledged that "it may seem strange to some that women should appear in so publick a manner, in a matter of so great concernment as this of Tithes" but it was the work of God.

Between 1653 and 1659, partly because parliament was no longer in constant session and partly because of the fortunes of the radical groups, women did not petition parliament as a pressure group, but petitioning itself did not stop. Elizabeth Lilburne for example turned her appeals to the Council and the Lord Protector, and even after her husband died in 1657 she requested the repeal of

the act which had heavily fined him and in effect his family. The petition remained very much a female mode of expression, and there are here three important point to make: women were speaking not just for themselves, but for relatives and male friends; not just as individuals, but often collectively; and they demonstrated a knowledge of the day-to-day workings of government. The Council was inundated with petitions from widows of soldiers and sailors who had died in service, stressing both their own and their husbands' loyalty: in 1655 one widow petitioned on behalf of herself and the eighty soldiers of the garrison which her husband had governed; one begged for a pension "to enable me to plant in Ireland"; another, illustrating that petitioning was not confined to metropolitan women, complained that she was "240 miles from home and [have] spent nine months last year and 3 months now in pursuance of the case". Widows also made claims to property and salaries, or arrears: the widow of a minister spoke of how her husband "had suffered much under the bishops"; and another, petitioning in December 1655 and again in March 1656 for the estate of her husband who had been "involved in the late guilt in the West", reassured the Council that her "husband had entered into the rebellion much against her will" for she had been "a servant to colonels Norton and Eliot during the troubles". In 1656 Deborah, widow of Stephen Love, minister of Haverfordwest, petitioned the Protector, acknowledging his "great tenderness to me and my poor helpless children, but till a manifestation of it, I cannot return to Wales to perform my necessary maternal duties; therefore I submit myself to you". In 1659 William Brassey told his wife that he hoped she would "do your utmost to get my release", and women were constantly petitioning on behalf of, or to speak to, male relatives in prison, often suggesting exchanges of prisoners - such women as Anne Nayler, whose husband caused such debate in parliament in 1656, or Alice Blackleech and eight other poor women whose husbands, the crew of a ship from London, had been captured near Dunkirk. Women also asked for the discharge of sons from impressment or husbands from service at sea.

At the Restoration legislation was passed severely limiting the right to petition, on the grounds that it had "been a great meanes of the late unhappy Wars, Confusions and Calamities". Widows of royalist soldiers petitioned for reparation, while the wives of Cromwellian or republican partisans pleaded for mercy, like Frances Lambert, Anne Scot, Anne Deane, Frances Vane and Anne Disbrowe. In March 1662 Mary Okey, Mary Barkstead and Mrs Corbett petitioned together for permission to be with or to visit their husbands who, having initially fled abroad, had been committed to the Tower. The Dutch wars brought, as they had done in the 1650s,

yet more distressed petitions of the wives and widows of sailors, often collectively, and necessitating, as ever, "many tedious journeys to London". A printer's wife told her husband that she would not present the petition for his release until she was sure "his only friend at Council", Lord Anglesey, was present. In 1670 one woman would still use her own and her husband's civil war loyalties in requesting a clerkship for a friend; another asked that her husband's job as flagmaker be officially passed on to her son "as there may be some who will endeavour to supplant us in it"; and the wives of shipwrights and ropers at Woolwich petitioned Lord Arlington, having already approached the navy commissioners, the Duke of York and the King, for the payment of arrears due to their husbands for "they cannot get food, and some of their goods are seized for hearth money". In short, women were still claiming the right to speak and act for themselves.

But the main opportunity given to women in the Interregnum for power and self-expression in a semi-public context was membership of the religious sects. While it is difficult to ascertain what proportion of the female population was involved, there can be no doubt that "women were numerically extremely prominent" among the sects themselves, whether as founders, preachers or audience. In principle the sects preached equality and, perhaps more dangerous to the fabric of society, they insisted that a woman's loyalty to the sect should be above her loyalty to her husband. However, there was a considerable gulf between theoretical equality and gender roles in practice. The equality the sects preached was, as in most religions, spiritual equality; but what was more of a hindrance to women was the sexism of the men in the sects themselves. Women had every right to be involved in the running of the congregation; what was problematic was authoritative public speaking, whether preaching, arguing or debating. Women were involved not just in the Quakers and radical sects, but in many separatist churches. In 1650, for example, a company of women assembled together to form the Bedford church which a little later Bunyan attended. If there had been any challenge to patriarchal order in the 1650s, it was certainly lost with the Restoration; not that the Protectorate had not seen parliament and local justices punish Quakers, mainly for breach of the peace, but in 1662 the government specifically legislated against Quakers and for uniformity. Women also of course featured largely in the lists of recusants brought to court during the Protectorate, as they did in post-Restoration lists of those who held conventicles and did not attend church. Religion could be seen as one public sphere that women of all classes were encouraged to be active in. However, three points need to be made: that the image of women as pious and

devout was a stereotype that reinforced patriarchy; that women were expected to keep the religion of their father or husband; and that sectarian action, such as going naked for a sign, was considered even more shocking when performed by a woman. A corrollary of this last point is that active women would be accused not only of acting like men but the Quaker Ann Blayking was told that she was "no woman but a man", another stereotype. Despite such caveats, the important point here is that dynamic, courageous and political activism in religious organisations was not a male preserve - indeed in some groups it could be said to have been a female preserve - nor was it confined to the radicalism of the civil war and Interregnum.

In 1654 Eleanor Channel had a vision when, though

inwardly she be but a weak woman in expression, she was taught in brief how to express her message from God to your Highness [Oliver Cromwell]... being three times hindered by her Husband, who is a very poor man and hath many small children, three of them very young ones, her mind was sore troubled that her sleep went from her and at sometimes she was speechless... [but] seeing her restless condition, [her husband] consented to let her come to London.

When she arrived at court she was not able to see Cromwell as she had expected; after waiting two days, she went into the City to find a printer, which she eventually did; but there were rumours that she had been thrown into Bridewell and then disappeared. Her defender in print said that though her message, which included the advice to choose in the forthcoming parliamentary election "Men that neither acted for King or Parliament but stood Newters all this while", "be but short, yet you shall find more truth and substance in it, than in all Hana Trampenels songs or sayings". Anna Trapnel was, as Marchamont Needham told Cromwell. "much visited and does a world of mischief in London and would do in the country", and indeed Trapnel's words, as with those of a few other women, were taken seriously by the authorities. Eleanor Channel was not unusual in being moved to speak. She implied that she was in a trance - after the vision she had become speechless - and that was one of the few ways that women were, in principle, allowed to pronounce on law or doctrine. But there were other women who took it upon themselves simply to tell off priests and pastors in no uncertain terms. In 7658 Alice West was imprisoned in Sussex for "disturbing the minister of Wisborough in his publique exercise"; in Devon the same year a woman was gaoled for two months for disturbing the minister of Talaton on Sunday "contrary to the statute"; and in

disturbed Mr Alflatt the minister by speaking words of which he only heard 'deceiving the people'. Whereupon the informant took her out of the chapel. Joseph Phippen heard the said Edith say 'The day of the Lord is at hand' and she wished the minister to repent, with many other words he knoweth not. Mr Alflatt did give off and did not pray after his preaching, which he usually doth.

Other women used the defence that - as we saw the petitioners arguing - it was God's way. Elizabeth Calway told a minister at Taunton "that he was a deluding person, and 'I am sent from the Lord this day to witness against thy unrighteous deeds', therefore she did exhort the people to repent and fear the Lord". In 1653 Mary Nethway, the leading member of a "church of Christ" in Bristol, wrote to Cromwell asking him to remove ornaments in Whitehall garden for there "is much evel in it, for wils the grases and altars of the idels remayn'd untaken away in Jerusalem, the routh of God continued agaynst Israel. Tis some presumption for me to rite to you of such things", she wrote, "but its safth for you and me to folow God's word". So too in 1666 Ann Blow walked 150 miles to entreat the mayor and aldermen of Chester to repent before God's "fury breaks forth amongst them" and in 1668 Ralph Josselin was told by Mrs Martin that "if shee should see me preach a sermon in coat or cloake shee would run out of the church". These women were finding temporary release from the traditional hierarchy and in doing so were even challenging it. But they were also "unruly women" and unacceptable once they denounced or undermined authority. In general they were either punished by the courts or labelled mad. Similarly in 1653 Bedfordshire justices fined Margaret Pennyfather, "a widow, for speaking false and opprobrious words against the governors and government of England".

Let us now look briefly at other activities that women were involved in as a direct consequence of political events, particularly spying, nursing and making depositions. In 1650 Susan Bowen was paid £10 for giving intelligence to the state, and in 1652 Dorothy Virgo was to be rewarded with "any sum not exceeding £5". Throughout the 1660s there were many petitions from women claiming to have helped the king's cause, particularly immediately after the battle of Worcester, to have carried letters, sheltered royalists and been instrumental in the Restoration. Women providing intelligence to the government continued after 1660, most notably by Katherine Hurleston. How far, one wonders, were women useful to intelligence services specifically because they were

women? Elizabeth Alkin was known as "Parliament Joan", a word similarly used for the women who defended Lyme Regis in 1645 - they were called "Joanereidos" - possibly deriving from the slang use of "Joan" meaning a rustic or coarse ordinary woman. In 1653 Alkin petitioned the Council for the place of nurse to maimed seamen at Dover, stressing how she had "been faithful and serviceable to the State upon all occasions in the late wars". Employing other nurses, she also worked at Ipswich and Harwich, and had constantly to ask the navy commissioners for money. Alkin also acted against printers of seditious literature for rewards worth £13, and many women used discoveries of concealed land in the 1650s to earn money. Women themselves were accused of sedition: in 1650 Barbara Bagshaw was imprisoned for writings in her possession, and in 1656 Mrs Smyth, a grocer's wife in Uppingham, was accused of distributing scandalous books. But it was the Restoration government that came down particularly heavily on unlicenced printing. Elizabeth Evans was arrested several times; so too was Elizabeth Calvert who throughout the decade was in and out of the Gatehouse "for her usual practices", which included a pamphlet in 1661 calling for a change of regime and another in 1667 concerning the fire and popish recusants.

In all these examples of women coming into contact with the government, it is clear that they would have needed to have political awareness. Mary Ellis, a servant, had to know who "Major Wildman, Praise God Barebone, Colonel Bishop and others" were and what their meetings were about at her master's house in 1661; Mrs Philippes of Chancery Lane was told about a rising to have taken place on 12 October 1663; and Mary Roe said that "Mrs Palmer was the King's whore, but not that she could prove it...[but] when told she would be punished for it she said 'What, for speaking the truth? She would prove it'". Two essential points need to be made about the women's activism. Firstly, it largely arose out of their traditional roles as wives and mothers and as providers of food and services; indeed once women had preached or petitioned, they would have returned to the family, the shop, the master's house. This is not to denegrate the role of women; it is to suggest that historians abandon the common assumption that the traditional domestic role was necessarily separate from, or in conflict with, the non-traditional, political role. Secondly, this activism should be seen within the context of women's essential involvement throughout Europe at this time in the defence of their communities, most obviously in protests over grain and taxes.

In the 1650s there were just two pieces of legislation directly related to women. The first, to provide for the relief of widows, came out of the war situation; the second, the Act for the

Suppression of Incest, Adultery and Fornication, out of the revolutionary situation.

Legislation to ensure relief for soldiers maimed in action was not new, but with the civil war came a series of ordinances to make provision for their dependents. Initially awarded by parliament and according to merit, the responsibility for piecemeal grants and pensions soon fell onto the parishes. While money to maimed soldiers was based on an Elizabethan statute, it was emphasised that allocations to widows and orphans were "over and besides such relief as they shall gain by their work and labour and shall be allowed them by charity and benevolence of the parish". In 1647 there had been concern that justices had not been carrying out sufficient relief, and there were several petitions to the Commons, including one in 1650 from 3,000 soldiers and widows. In September 1651 an act was passed to make provision for maimed soldiers or the widows and orphans of soldiers in service in Ireland and Scotland, not exceeding four shillings a week "or else provide that such of the said Widows and Soldiers that are able to work, shall be set on work... And likewise take care of the setting of Children of such Widows to be Apprentices". Accommodation was also sometimes provided. It was also ordered that the Committee for the Army should consider the cases of widows and orphans of soldiers who had died at Worcester, as certified by Cromwell. Two years later in an Act for Adventurers in Ireland provision was made for maimed soldiers and "helpless or aged" widows of soldiers killed in Ireland. Concern for better relief continued through the Protectorate. The important points here however are that it was discretionary; and many widows, often collectively, appealed to the Council and local courts alike.

Forty petitions were recorded in the Essex order book between 1652 and 1661 from distressed widows, usually with small children. In 1658 Anne Larke told the court

that shee hath beene the wife of Two men who served the Parliament in the late warres and were soe wounded as pencons were granted unto them. And that her last husband Larke lately deceasing, his pencon is ended & praying the continuance of the same for the releife of her selfe & the Children left her by them.

Officially a widow would have to show the appointed assessors a certificate from the colonel of the regiment in which her husband had served. There was a market in counterfeiting certificates. Ellen Lovell, one so accused of forgery, spoke in her defence of how "many poor widows, who had only those papers for the loss of their

husbands to live on, are brought to death's door". However, in Essex at least the certificate rule was not strictly enforced where pensions granted were generally 40 shillings per year paid quarterly or occasionally £3. It was not unusual that one woman was given 30 shillings per annum "to continue [only] dureing her widdowhood". Often, however, widows were given single payments rather than a pension with the stipulation "that she trouble the Court no more". In 1652 the Somerset treasurer for maimed soldiers was ordered to pay Christian Marks 20s, but given that she was "of a competent ability to live of herselfe and the maymed souldiers desiringe releife [were] very numerous", she was "not to have or seek any further releife". Indeed, as with aid to widows generally, there was, reflecting parliamentary legislation, always a sense of the relief being a supplement or a last resort. In 1655 inhabitants of Wellington in Somerset petitioned on behalf of Maud Cape whose husband had been slain: "by her industry she had maintained herself and family, but now it hath pleased the Lord to visit her and child with sickness so that she can no longer work". In 1657 it was declared at the Devon quarter sessions that maimed soldiers' widows were no longer to be paid except by special order. Women of Tiverton who had themselves been wounded in the war were on the recommendation of Cromwell in 1653 given 40s "for present needs". Some provision was also made for mariners and their dependents, though when a widow, who had travelled from Milford Haven to London for relief, was granted money in 1650, the admiralty committee made the point that it was "not to be a precedent". In the Act for Better Preaching of the Gospel it was laid down that pensions should be given to wives and children of deceased godly ministers, not exceeding £30 per annum; and in the Ordinance for Ejecting Scandalous Ministers there was provision, though very limited, for the dependents of ejected ministers and schoolmasters. In short, widowhood has always been one of the starkest realities of war for women but one that does not make women into heroes.

The Adultery Act of May 1650 was one of the most distinctively "puritan" measures of the Rump, but it amply demonstrates the gulf between central government legislation and individual local government enforcement. It defined adultery, adjudged like incest a capital offence, as any married woman being "carnally known by any man" except where her husband had been absent for three or more years (a qualification relevant to the war situation); while adultery was then still being described as that done to the woman by the man, the Act did stress that "every person, as well the man as the woman, offending therein" should suffer death, with the proviso that it should not extend to any man who at the time

of the offence did not know the woman was married. Fornication, that if any man should "have carnal knowledge of the body of any Virgin, unmarried woman or widow", would be punishable by three months in the common gaol. The language here says a lot about not only the legal, but also the perceived, position of women in society.

In the localities in the 1650s there were in fact few accusations of, let alone punishments for, adultery, though virtually all the known cases are against women. On the other hand, while some justices were more active than others, there was generally considerable activity against fornication, though this became interchangeable with charges of bastardy, which had long been provided for by the law. Indeed justices in Essex, Leicestershire and Somerset, for example, continued to sentence women "to remain and be set at work" for one year in the house of correction, and sometimes whipped, rather than three months in the common gaol. In Hampshire however an allowance was made to the gaoler of five shillings a month for the support of every "queene" (slang for a woman with a bastard child) committed. In one case at least the mother was not to be sent away until "the Childe shalbe weanable". There was no imprisonment for the father of the child. Instead he, or occasionally a relative of the woman, would be ordered to pay maintenance until the child was seven years old.

Pregnancy, or indeed fornication, was normally seen as a prelude to marriage; so, as just one example, Dorothy Haytor told the court that she "asked Sanders if he would father the child if she was with child, and he said he would and would marry her" and "if he had kept his promise she would not have complained". But it is clear from reading the records that a single woman with a bastard child unprovided for, and therefore brought before the magistrate, presented two major problems. Firstly, women who bore bastards did not fit into the general familial, and therefore social, order for they were creating a family without a head of household. Secondly, if there was no man to pay and the mother was impoverished, the parish would be responsible for paying poor relief, and quarter session records are full of wrangles between two parishes over which one should pay for a certain child. There were also attempts to stop "foreign" pregnant women coming into a parish. The inhabitants of Cutcombe, near Taunton, complained in 1651 that:

one Mrs Mary Osbourne an Irishwoman and Traveller cominge to Luxburrow to repose herself beinge greate with child and ready to lye Downe was by...a Tithingman of Luxburrow forced to Cutcombe where shee fell in Travell assoone as shee came thither and was there delivered of twoe female children and is sithence deceased leavinge the

Hence the approach of justices was twofold: to provide for the child but also to correct the "evil course of life" of the mother. Thus in Northamptonshire in 1657 the jurors presented, in language reflecting the wording of the Adultery Act, that:

Elizabeth Harrodd wilfully and wickedly the said Robert Verney...to have the carnall knowledge of her body permitted and suffered to the evill and dangerous example of otheres and against the forme of a statute in that case made and alsoe against the publicke peace.

Women were also often accused of fleeing after the birth of their bastard children, and of infanticide. There was of course an essential different between fornication and rape; and it was not unusual for a woman to name her master as the father of her bastard child. The Adultery Act also stiffened the penalties for keeping a brothel or bawdy-house, for after being whipped, pilloried and branded, the guilty man or woman would be imprisoned for three years. In Portsmouth in 1653 Eleanor Hewes, giving evidence in the case against a couple, said James "catched" Jane and kissed her "but she saw no harm"; then Hewes herself was accused of keeping a common bawdy house and one neighbour complained that she could not "sleep for what goes on" and said she heard Hewes call the mayor "an old grisle bearded rogue" because he had committed her to prison before her misdemeanours. Two years later Joan, wife of Thomas Wilks, was alleged to keep a brothel, to be "a notorious whore, an uncivil and ungodly woman, who curses and swears and is a great disturber to her neighbours". These are archetypes, who were seen ambiguously as both shameful and outrageous and yet dominant, vigorous and anti-establishment. Yet the common combination of alleged crimes and the generalised characterisations point to stereotypes rather than individual women. While not sticking specifically to the 1650 adultery legislation, both the action and language of the justices demonstrate their awareness of the Act, and in a number of counties it legitimised campaigns against fornicators. However, there were considerable county variations and, more importantly, illicit sex, sexual assault and the stigma attached to having a bastard child were hardly unique to the 1650s.

The Marriage Act of 1653 laid down that the only legal form of marriage was, after the couple had obtained a certificate from the registry, a civil ceremony conducted by a justice of the peace, in which "in the presence of God the searcher of all hearts" the man swore to be a "loving and faithful husband" and the woman to be a

"loving, faithful and obedient wife". Parliament had begun its consideration of matrimonial reform ten years previously; and concern at the 1653 Act's lack of success revived the matter in 1657 when parliament continued the Act but without the clause invalidating all other forms of marriage service. There is evidence that most couples were having both civil and church ceremonies. Most women's petitions to local magistrates in fact concerned desertion or neglect by their husbands and domestic violence, though some cases did involve marriage contracts or separation agreements. At Ilchester in 1655 Alice Wagge told of how her husband, they "now living asunder", had been ordered to keep their child but the child had been "much abused" and Alice, "out of motherly care", desired to have the child to live with her, with a contribution from the father; and so it was agreed. That year four women charged Capt Nicholas Foster with bigamy, begging the Council that "he may be checked, so that others may take warning". The Restoration saw a prudent Act which legalised all marriages "solemnised in England since 1 May 1642 before any JP or pretended JP", as well as the return of church weddings by the Book of Common Prayer.

Restoration after revolution, which in 1660 meant the return of monarchy, the House of Lords and the Anglican church, has generally been a restoration of tradition and of social and religious order. The family has long been frequently used as an analogy for the nation and its hierarchy, both in the economic sense of master and servant and in the political sense of sovereign and subject, and the implication of the Restoration Settlement was that women should return to their traditional roles and dependence. While this can be dismissed as a matter of theoretical debate (though it would be interesting to look at the sermons of the period as much as the literature), there is no doubt that the gentry elite also displayed their chauvinism at a local level. In the counties the "natural rulers" were truly restored.

Relief to maimed soldiers remained a pressing social problem. The 1662 Act for the Relief of Maimed Soldiers who had faithfully served Charles II and his father reiterated almost verbatim the Interregnum provisions for widows and orphans, with the additional clause that "the said reliefe shall be paid out of the Surplusage of such stock of maintenance as shall remaine in the hands of the said Treasurers". The Council received a petition in 1664 from 162 females, widows and orphans, for relief "to save them from perishing, as neither Act of Parliament had provided for them"; it was decided that "they shall have divided amongst them, according to rank, the profits resulting from their discoveries of arrears of rent, benefit of renewing leases, and moneys charged on

accountants in the Savoy and Whitefriars". But there was nothing like the local provision for war widows made in the previous decade.

Justices continued to act against bastardy but the records are less full of cases, partly because there was no longer the zeal of reformation of manners, but also because sentences to the common gaol were no longer permissible, so women would be sent straight to Bridewell without appearing in court, part of the Restoration "drift to petty sessions government and triumphant localism". The 1662 Act for the Better Relief of the Poor, which has been seen. along with the Clarendon Code, by at least one historian as a deliberate attempt to check the growth of a mobile and fluid society associated in the Interregnum with religious toleration, included a power given to churchwardens to seize the goods and chattels of the putative father and of the "lewd" mother deserting, to support their bastard child. The Somerset justices largely concentrated on orders touching the maintenance of illegitimate children, but they were also told of women who had had bastards but had never been punished; and one of them at least, whose offence had in fact been complained of because her child was "likely to become chargeable to the parish". was committed for a year "with such correction as is provided by the law". The Act of General Pardon and Indemnity (1660) excepted amongst others "all Rapes and carnall Ravishments of Women, And alsoe excepted all Ravishments and wilful taking away or marrying of any Maid, Widow or Damzell against her will, or without the assent or agreement of her parents". Patriarchy explains the clause providing for parental agreement, but why did the government legislate against rape and for women's right of consent? The reality of women's lives was that the Somerset justices received a complaint by Anne Trott in 1666 "that her husband ill-treats her and denies her sufficient maintenance" just as they had done ten years before in 1656 from Ann Bryant whose "husband John had put her in fear of her life by his threats and cruel behaviour".

Whether one sees the Restoration of 1660 as putting women back into subservience depends largely on whether the Interregnum had seen a liberation for the vast majority of women, let alone social disorder and mobility. For the majority of people it is doubtful that the family was undermined during the Interregnum, nor were parish hierarchies; and officially women were still denied a place in local governing bodies as much in the 1650s as in the 1660s. Grace Barnard who voted in 1654 in the Bristol election is a rare example of female franchise [1]. We should not ignore the opportunities during the revolution for women to challenge patriarchy, opportunities presented most obviously by the religious sects but also simply by women's involvement by necessity in the war effort,

since increased responsibility would imply increased independence. But we have to question how liberating those opportunities actually were and how far-reaching for how many women they were. We need to discover what the majority of women were doing in the 1650s and 1660s. Women's work did not isolate them for they were of the community - in the centre of Leicester, for example, there was an area called the "women's market". Nor did it mean that they did not have contact with local ruling officials - the Leicester corporation paid women to clean the castle, to keep the post horses, and to provide wine and beer. Nor did it mean that they were unaware of political events - a Hungerford constable paid widow Stace for firewood when Richard Cromwell was proclaimed Protector in 1658, just as the Bodmin mayor paid Mrs Bond for wine on coronation day three years later. These are the realities for women in both the 1650s and 1660s. I hope that I have not given the impression that women should be seen as simply the oppressed. Indeed marriage, for example, could be, and was often expounded as, a partnership between husband and wife. However, one cannot get away from the belief in the subservience of women, a belief underpinned by religious, legal and political dogma, and demonstrated in both the wording of government legislation and in the execution of that legislation by local authorities.

1 I am indebted to Bernard Capp drawing this to my attention.

# AFTER THE RESTORATION CULTURE BECAME POLITICS: JOHN MILTON AND PARADISE LOST

by John Newland

After 1660 and the restoration of Charles Stuart to the English throne, the forms in which political views as a whole were able to be expressed became severely limited. Instead of the freedom from censorship of the Commonwealth period, the Licensing Act of 1662 reimposed a check on views of which the government did not approve. Not repealed until 1695, this Act had the consequence of compelling those with social or political views critical of the renewed political order to put them in a coded and less overt form if they wished to have them published. It also enabled government supporters to advance their views without obviously involving their official patrons.

Apart from putting forward specifically political arguments, whether connected with the political situation as a whole or with contemporary events, the cultural forms of the Restoration era expressed the new emphasis on social order and public harmony in the state. This was encouraged quite deliberately by the King and court after 1660.

In part, this concern resulted from the years Charles and his circle had spent in France during their exile. There, they had assimilated the new movement towards classicism in French drama and architecture. In part, it was an attempt, to be pursued with great intent, to turn away from the seeming social turbulence of the past twenty years. Out of social sight, out of social mind and everything nice and calm was the policy Charles was to follow.

In the first few years after the Restoration, the attempt was made politically to restore the world as much as possible to what it had been before the civil war. Some measures were simple to enact. Executing the regicides settled the problem of the killers of Charles I. The various measures of legislation against the Presbyterians and other non-conformists, known as the Clarendon Code, were designed to exclude these groups from the exercise of any political power, even on a local level.

With the plague, Great Fire and Second Dutch War (especially with the shame of the Dutch attack up the Medway) all coming together in the middle part of the 1660s, a watershed was reached in the political landscape of the reign. Concern began to shift from the past to what was happening in the political present. Although, as a result, the nation became gradually repoliticised in the late 1660s and 1670s through suspicion of Charles's

involvement with the French and his well-meaning but unsuccessful attempt to extend toleration to Catholics, it was not until 1678 and the succeeding five years that domestic politics once more exploded with the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. In the decade in between, the facade of an unbroken smoothness of social order was largely maintained, albeit with private hedonism underlying it and fuelled by the antics of the court circle and of the King himself.

\*\*\*\*

Although it stands artistically on its own merits, <u>Paradise Lost</u> cannot be divorced from the beliefs of the man who composed it. It does have a contemporary relevance after 1660 and an understanding of its political resonance comes from an understanding of Milton's career and commitments over the previous twenty years. Not only had he supported the parliamentary cause and the execution of Charles I (in his pamphlet <u>The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates</u>) but he had also worked for the government of Protector Cromwell as Latin Secretary until afflicted by blindness.

In February 1660, when popular feeling had already begun to run in favour of the return of the King, Milton published The Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth, in which he argued for parliamentary rule and against monarchy. It might be argued that in February of that year the political situation was still unclear enough for such an argument to have an impact but by April, when a second edition was published, it was entirely obvious that Charles Stuart was going to be restored. To publish again, at that point, was a straight act of courageous defiance and a measure of Milton's rejection of the Restoration.

This commitment to the "Good Old Cause" is what helped create and was part of the energy of <u>Paradise Lost</u>. It is an epic about the Fall of Man; it is also about the Fall of the free Commonwealth of England into the renewed slavery of monarchy. But to have argued thus in a pamphlet would simply have led to the work being banned under the Licensing Act and have brought down the wrath of the royalists upon him. To present the argument in a poem was to get the message published and to safeguard his own neck.

The story told in <u>Paradise Lost</u> does, indeed, support the view of it being a political allegory on the recent past and a cast of Miltonian heroes and villains can be assembled that fits the bill. God becomes parliament and satan the monarch (both Charles I and his son). Refusing to compromise with parliament, Charles I causes the civil war, which his son later continues on his own account. Exiled

with his cronies, the now Charles II seeks to return to claim his throne, even resorting to such devices as arbitrary proclamations (the Declaration of Breda) to insinuate his way back into the country. And the country, mistakenly and shamefully according to Milton, allows him back. In other words, satan is cast out of heaven but returns to the Garden of Eden and persuades the humans to trust him, causing the Fall and their ejection from Eden.

Of greatest note is the way Milton has satan succeed through Eve, whom he presents in Book IV as unreflective, simple and easily led. That she is so naive is precisely the point, given Milton's extensive knowledge of the bible. In the old testament scriptures, especially the Wisdom books, the woman had a very special role. She was held to be the personification of Wisdom itself, the figure who should be sought and held onto at whatever cost; the one who danced on the waters at the beginning of time, such was the closeness of her relationship with God.

This is Wisdom as God means her to be. Milton would have been quite aware of this. So, when Milton creates the woman Eve as totally lacking in all of Wisdom's attributes, it can be assumed that this has been done for a purpose. In fact, Milton does mean Eve to be the Wisdom figure in relation to Adam, and so as the Garden by extension is meant to be England, Adam becomes representative of the English people. Eve, his Wisdom figure, becomes the personification of the moral sense and right judgement of the English people as a whole.

Furthermore, just as Adam gave in to an already corrupted Eve, in 1660 the English people as a whole embraced a Wisdom as false and shallow as Eve, and gave themselves up wilfully to the ungodliness of monarchy. The expulsion of the humans from the blessed state and ease of Eden was brought on by themselves, as a result of their own actions. In like manner, for the consequences of monarchy, the English people will only have themselves to blame.

As a political commentary on the times, by the time it was published in 1667 <u>Paradise Lost</u> was distinctly backward-looking. It was, however, hardly out-of-date for the non-conformist ministers ejected from their livings under the Clarendon Code Acts nor for ordinary non-conformists ejected from local government or penalised for unauthorised preaching. John Bunyan, languishing in gaol, could vouch for that.

# CROMWELLIAN BRITAIN VI

# INCE CASTLE, CORNWALL

by Stephen Roberts

Ince Castle, or Ince Barton, to use its seventeenth century name, lies on a peninsula on the Lynher or St Germans River near Saltash in Cornwall. It has interested local historians because it was built in brick in the early modern period, when other gentry houses in the area were built of stone. It in fact embodies the earliest known use of brick in Cornish housebuilding. It has attracted its share of romantic myth; an owner is said to have kept each of his four wives in one of its corner towers. The myth-making has until recently been better promoted than discussion of the true date of the house. Historians of the English castle have concluded from slight architectural evidence that the house was built in the 1550s. Others have suggested the 1620s or 1630s, and Pevsner considered the early seventeenth century to be a likely period. The Cromwellian Gazetteer describes Ince as "the Tudor fortified mansion of the Killigrew family", and goes on to mention that the house was used by royalists in the civil war as a base from which the southern route into Cornwall could be guarded.

We know that from the 1570s the name of the Killigrew family is associated with Ince, but at that time the name Ince referred only to the peninsula on which the present house stands. These were the Killigrews whose principal estate was Arwennack, and whose most eminent member was Sir Henry Killigrew, MP for Truro and diplomat under Elizabeth I. While Sir Henry was busy developing property interests in the City of London, the family was slowly consolidating its hold on land in and around the site at Ince. The manor of Landrake was acquired by 1575 and in 1611 Sir Joseph Killigrew, eldest son of Sir Henry, bought the rectory and tithes of Landrake.

Purely architectural evidence about the origins of the house is ambiguous, because Ince is a "transitional" building. Most Cornish houses of the early modern period still clung to the medieval hall as a focal point, whereas in Georgian properties the hall was scaled down to become an entrance room. Ince incorporates features of both styles, and historians have noted too the continental influences on the building. Plans for hunting lodges for Francis I of France seem broadly comparable to the plan of Ince Barton.

We now know that Ince was built in 1640 by Henry Killigrew esquire, younger son of Sir Henry Killigrew the diplomat. In depositions during complex Chancery cases over the ownership

The messuage and tenement of Ints is not parcell of the mannor of Landrake and that the same was purchased by Henry Killigrew esquire about the yeare 1640 for building a convenient dwelling house which 'tis thought cost £1500.

Several people were willing to testify that this was the date when the building was erected. Around the same time Henry Killigrew was very active in buying property in the area. He described himself in 1638 as of "Larick" [Landrake], the manor adjacent to Ince. Until 1638 he had always been "of Wormingford", Essex, the parish where his wife, Jemima Waldegrave, originated. Killigrew was establishing himself among the gentry of Cornwall, and Ince was his new home with which to consolidate his local credentials. He was successful in carving a place for himself in Cornwall, as he was elected MP for West Looe in both the Short and Long Parliaments. Clarendon describes Henry Killigrew as "Sir Henry", but it is unlikely that he was ever knighted; he himself never used the title, and in all legal records he is called "esquire".

Henry Killigrew had significant continental and metropolitan influences on his early life and career. His mother, Jael de Peigne, was French. His childhood and young manhood were spent in London, Essex and Middlesex. He was of Cornish descent through his father, but when Henry went to Cornwall in the late 1630s it was as a virtual newcomer. Ince, in its design and appearance, reflects this "outsider" quality.

Henry Killigrew supported Charles I with enthusiasm at the outbreak of the civil war. He withdrew from the House of Commons in summer 1642, announcing

If there be occasion I will provide a good horse and a good sword and I make no question but I shall find a good cause.

It is likely that Ince was garrisoned from early in the war, even though the first reference to fortifications there is from May 1645. Killigrew travelled with Lord Hopton for much of the war. He was with him in September 1642 and in the autumn of that year garrisons were established at Saltash, Stonehouse, Inchcombe and Millbrook, all overlooking the Tamar. Killigrew was with Hopton strengthening positions at Saltash, and it seems improbable that Ince would have been overlooked, particularly as it may still have been under construction when war broke out. This explains the military, fortified appearance of the house, quite unnecessary in a house of the mid seventeenth century, were it not for the unexpected war. The

building of Ince has to be set in the context of the local arms race, in which fortifications were erected by both sides to strengthen or to undermine the major parliamentary stronghold of Plymouth.

Henry Killigrew and his son, also called Henry, were with Hopton at the siege of Bristol in July 1643, and Henry the younger was killed there. Killigrew senior seems not to have been permanently undermined by this blow, and in August 1644 he was one of a number of gentry requesting resources for an attempt on Saltash town, then in parliamentary hands. But the rejuvenation of the forces under Sir Thomas Fairfax proved decisive, and by the early part of 1646 parliamentary troops were camped for the winter around Exeter. Killigrew was with Hopton at Torrington in February 1646 when the church there was blown up. By March 1646 the royalist field force in the south-west was being mopped up, and Henry Killigrew retreated to Ince.

The Cromwellian Gazetteer tells us that "there is no record of fighting" at Ince, but this is not quite so. An attack launched on Ince on 30 March 1646 by the governor of Plymouth garrison, Sir Ralph Weldon, was part of this mopping up. Weldon was a man of Kent, son of Sir Anthony Weldon, leader of the Kent county committee. Ralph was described after the Restoration as "cunning, industrious, sober". The royalist position in the Saltash area was hopeless. The town itself had been abandoned two weeks earlier, so hastily that fortifications had been left in place. Weldon sent sixty musketeers to Ince, who surrounded the house. A march on the building was led from the landward side (contrary to local legend there was no bombardment from Antony, the gentry house across the Lynher), but as Plymouth was in the hands of parliament there could be no escape by river. Killigrew's response to a call to surrender was a "scornful answer", but this was silenced by the appearance of another sixty soldiers with light artillery. After a few hours, Ince surrendered quietly and without bloodshed. The house contained six barrels of powder, ninety muskets and four small cannon, suggesting a purposeful if not numerous occupying force.

Killigrew's war ended at Pendennis, the last outpost of the royalists in the south-west. When articles of surrender were signed in August 1646, Killigrew helped disarm the fort. While discharging small arms which had long been loaded, one blew up, and he sustained a shrapnel wound to the head. He was not thought to be in danger, and took ship from Falmouth to St Malo. His condition worsened, and he died at St Malo on 27 September 1646. His body was taken for burial at St Helier on Jersey, a haven for royalists, and he was interred in the church there. Clarendon's verdict on Killigrew focussed on his unpopularity among parliamentarians:

He was very terrible and exceedingly hated by them; and not loved by men of moderate tempers, for he thought all such prepared to rebel when a little success should encourage them, and was many times too much offended with men who wished well, and whose constitutions and complexions would not permit them to express the same frankness which his nature and keenness of spirit could not suppress.

Killigrew's property, including Ince, was seized by the Cornwall parliamentary county committee, and never returned to the Killigrew family. It was acquired by Edward Nosworthy, a Truro merchant who had served parliament as a minor committeeman. His own tenure of the property was hardly happier than Killigrew's had been, as his title was contested by a family that Killigrew himself had had to fight off in order to buy the house. Others, too, were ready to use the law to stake their claim to Ince. These lawsuits were pursued with wearying tenacity by the claimants, and eventually, after the Restoration, Nosworthy was driven into bankruptcy. By the end of the seventeenth century the house was crumbling; it was restored in the following century and by the early 1900s it was occupied as a farmhouse.

Today, Ince stands in splendid isolation on its small peninsula, surrounded on three sides by the tidal waters of the Lynher. After speculating on the date of the original building, Pevsner went on to describe the house as a perfect brick-built square, with four corner towers, crowned by pyramidal slate roofs. Many of the windows and the pedimented main doorway reached by a flight of steps may be Georgian. Pevsner felt that "the whole, in spite of its symmetry, is eminently picturesque, thanks to the variety of materials and colours". Ince is now a private residence, reached by a long, unmetalled road. It stands on private land - no public footpaths pass close by - roughly three miles south-west of Saltash (at map reference SX402565). Although the house is not open to the public, occasionally the gardens are opened on weekends.

The story of Ince may be followed in greater detail in six short articles by Stephen Roberts which appeared in <u>Devon and Cornwall Notes and Queries</u> XXXVI, parts v-x (1989-91).

#### SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PUBLICATIONS

### compiled by Peter Gaunt

#### I. BOOKS.

M Abbott, Family Ties: The English Family 1540-1920 (Routledge, 1993).

- J Addy, <u>Death, Money and the Vultures: Inheritance and Avarice 1660-1750</u> (Routledge, 1992).
- R C Allen, Enclosure and the Yeoman: Agricultural Development of the South Midlands 1450-1850 (Oxford UP, 1992).
- A Atkin and W Laughlin, Gloucester and the Civil War: A City Under Siege (A Sutton, 1992).
- S W Baskerville, <u>Not Peace but a Sword: Political Theory of the English Revolution</u> (Routledge, 1993).
- S A Bendell, <u>Maps, Land and Society: A History with a Carto-Bibliography of Cambridgeshire Estate Maps 1600-1836</u> (Cambridge UP, 1992).
- W B Bidwell and M Jansson, <u>Proceedings in Parliament 1626</u>: <u>vol I House of Lords</u>; <u>vol II House of Commons</u>; <u>vol III House of Commons</u> (Yale UP, 1992-3).
- R L Brenner, <u>Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict and London Overseas Trade 1550-1653</u> (Cambridge UP, 1993).
- I Brown, <u>Guide to the Civil War in Nottinghamshire</u> (Nottinghamshire County Council, 1992).
- K M Brown, <u>Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union 1603-1715</u> (Macmillan, 1992).
- G Burgess, <u>Politics of the Ancient Constitution: Introduction to English Political Thought 1600-1642</u> (Macmillan, 1992).
- C Carlton, Going to the Wars: The Experience of the British Civil Wars 1638-1651 (Routledge, 1992).
- A B Chambers, <u>Transfigured Rites in Seventeenth Century English Poetry</u> (Missouri UP, 1992).
- A Clark, The Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century (reissued, Routledge, 1992).
- S Cohen, <u>The Evolution of Women's Asylums Since 1500</u> (Oxford UP, 1992).
  - P Coldham, Emigrants in Chains 1607-1776 (A Sutton, 1992).
- S J Connolly, <u>Religion, Law and Power: The Making of Protestant Ireland</u> 1660-1760 (Oxford UP, 1992).
- J S Cooper, For Commonwealth and Crown: English Gunmakers of the Seventeenth Century (W Hunt, 1992).
- T M Corns, <u>Uncloistered Virtue</u>: <u>English Political Literature 1640-1660</u> (Oxford UP, 1992).
- B Cottret, <u>The Huguenots in England: Immigration and Settlement 1550-1700</u> (Cambridge UP).
  - C Davies, Stamford and the Civil War (Paul Watkins, 1992).

- J Davies, <u>Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism 1621-41</u> (Oxford UP, 1992).
  - S Davies, John Milton (Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991).
  - M Duffy, Parameters of British Naval Power 1650-1850 (Exeter UP, 1992).
- M Duffy, A New Maratime History of Devon, vol I, From Early Times to the Late Eighteenth Century (Conway Maratime P, 1993).
  - H Elsynge, ed. E R Foster, <u>Judicature in Parliament</u> (Hambledon P, 1991).
- C Falkus, The Life and Times of Charles II (reissued, Weidenfeld & N, 1992).
  - K Fincham, The Early Stuart Church 1603-42 (Macmillan, 1993).
- G N Godwin, Civil War in and around Winchester (reissued, Partizan Press, 1992).
- T Gray, <u>Tudor and Stuart Devon: The Common Estate and Government:</u>
  <u>Essays Presented to Joyce Youings</u> (Exeter UP, 1992).
- R L Greaves, <u>John Bunyan and English Nonconformity</u> (Hambledon P, 1992).
- I Grundy and S Wiseman, Women, Writing, History 1640-1740 (Batsford, 1992).
- J Guy and J S Morrill, Oxford History of Britain, vol III, The Tudors and Stuarts (Oxford UP, 1992).
- D R Hainsworth, <u>Stewards, Lords and People: The Estate Steward and his World in Later Stuart England</u> (Oxford UP, 1992).
- J Harrington, ed. J G A Pocock, <u>Commonwealth of Oceana</u> (Cambridge UP, 1992).
  - P Harrington, Archaeology of the English Civil War (Shire, 1992).
- T Harris, <u>Party Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715</u> (Longman, 1993).
- J S Hart, <u>Justice upon Petition: The House of Lords and the Reformation of Justice 1621-1675</u> (Routledge, 1992).
- N Henshall, <u>The Myth of Absolutism: Change and Continuity in Early Modern European Monarchy</u> (Longman, 1992).
- C Hill, The English Bible and the Seventeenth Century Revolution (Penguin, 1993).
  - F Hill, Tudor and Stuart Lincoln (reissued, P Watkins, 1991).
  - M Hobbs, Early Seventeenth Century Verse (Scolar Press, 1992).
  - T Hobbes, ed. R Tuck, Leviathan (Cambridge UP, 1991).
- K J Holsti, <u>Peace and War: Armed Conflicts and International Order</u> (Cambridge UP, 1991).
- J Holstun, <u>Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution</u> (F Cass, 1992).
- R W Hoyle, Estates of the English Crown 1558-1640 (Cambridge UP, 1992).
- S Ingham, <u>Discovering the Civil War in Nottinghamshire</u> (Nottinghamshire County Council, 1992).
  - G H Jenkins, Protestant Dissenters in Wales 1639-1689 (Wales UP, 1992).

J G Jones, <u>Concepts of Order and Gentility in Wales 1540-1640</u> (J D Lewis, 1992).

C Kenny, <u>King's Inns and the Kingdom of Ireland: Irish Inn of Court 1541-1800</u> (Irish Academic P, 1991).

J Klein, <u>Daughters, Wives and Widows: Writings by Men about Women</u> and <u>Marriage in England 1500-1640</u> (Illinois UP, 1992).

W Lamont, <u>Puritanism and the English Revolution</u>: <u>vol I Marginal Prynne</u> 1600-1669; <u>vol II Godly Rule</u>: <u>Politics and Religion 1603-1660</u>; <u>vol III</u> Richard Baxter and the <u>Millenium</u> (reissued in 3 vols, Gregg Revivals, 1992).

B Y Kunze and D D Brautigam, Court, Country and Culture: Essays in Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin (Rochester UP, 1992).

B Lavery, Line of Battle: Sailing Warships 1650-1840 (Conway Maritime P, 1992).

B Lemire, <u>Fashion's Favourite</u>: The Cotton Trade and the Consumer in Britain 1660-1800 (Oxford UP, 1992).

M Leslie and T Raylor, <u>Culture and Cultivation in Early Modern England</u>: Writing and the <u>Land</u> (Leicester UP, 1992).

S A Lloyd, <u>Ideals and Interests in Hobbes' 'Leviathan'</u> (Cambridge UP, 1992).

D M Loades, Politics and the Nation 1450-1660 (new edn, Fontana, 1992).

N Lutt, <u>Bedfordshire Muster Rolls 1539-1831</u> (Bedfordshire Historic Records Society 71, 1992).

M K McIntosh, <u>A Community Transformed: Manor and Liberty of Havering-atte-Bower 1500-1620</u> (Cambridge UP, 1991).

N K Maguire, Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy 1660-1671 (Cambridge UP, 1992).

B Manning, 1649: Crisis of the English Revolution (Bookmarks, 1992).

A Milford, Eye and Ear Witness: The English Civil War from Contemporary Sources (Partizan Press, 1992).

J Miller, An English Absolutism? The Later Stuart Monarchy 1660-1688 (Historical Association, 1993).

J Milton, ed. G Parry, The History of Britain (Paul Watkins, 1991).

J S Morrill, The Nature of the English Revolution (Longman, 1993).

J S Morrill, Revolution and Restoration (Collins & Brown, 1992).

J S Morrill, <u>Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth Century England: Essays Presented to G E Aylmer</u> (Oxford UP, 1993).

D Norbrook and H R Woudhuysen, <u>The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse</u> 1509-1659 (Penguin, 1992).

R Ollard, The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II (reissued, Pimlico, 1993).

S Orgel and J Goldberg, John Milton (Oxford UP, 1991).

G Parfitt, English Poetry of the Seventeenth Century (Longman, 1992).

A M Patterson, John Milton (Longman, 1992).

S Peachey, <u>Infantry Combat: The Mechanics of Infantry Combat in the First Civil War</u> (Stuart P, 1992).

S Peachey and K T Gardner, <u>Tippler's Guide to the mid Seventeenth Century</u> (Stuart P, 1992).

N Phillipson and Q Skinner, <u>Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain</u> (Cambridge UP, 1993).

M Pittock, <u>Religious Politics Under Charles I and James II</u> (Royal Stuart Society, 1991).

M Pittock, <u>The Invention of Scotland: Stuart Myth and the Scottish Identity</u> 1638 to the Present (Routledge, 1991).

'A Polkey, Civil War in the Trent Valley (J H Hall, 1992).

R Pooley, English Prose of the Seventeenth Century 1590-1700 (Longman, 1992).

B Quintrell, Charles I 1625-40 (Longman, 1993).

R C Richardson, <u>Images of Oliver Cromwell: Essays for and by Roger Howell</u> (Manchester UP, 1993).

R C Richardson, <u>Town and Countryside in the English Revolution</u> (Manchester UP, 1992).

D Rollison, <u>The Local Origins of Modern Society: Gloucestershire 1500-</u> 1800 (Routledge, 1992).

J Scott, <u>Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis 1677-83</u> (Cambridge UP, 1991).

S Sedley and L Kaplan, <u>Spark in the Ashes: The Pamphlets of John Warr</u> (Verso, 1992).

K Sharpe, Personal Rule of Charles I (Yale UP, 1992).

R Sherwood, Civil War in the Midlands (A Sutton, 1992).

E Skerpan, <u>Rhetoric of Politics in the English Revolution 1642-1660</u> (Missouri UP, 1992).

J R Smith, <u>Pilgrims and Adventurers: Essex (England) and the Making of the United States of America</u> (Essex Record Office, 1992).

V F Snow and A S Young, <u>Private Journals of the Long Parliament 2 June to 17 September 1642</u> (Yale UP, 1993).

C J Sommerville, <u>The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith</u> (Oxford UP, 1992).

J P Sommerville, <u>Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context</u> (Macmillan, 1992).

B Stone, Derbyshire in the Civil War (Scarthin Books, 1992).

L Stone, <u>Uncertain Unions: Marriage in England 1660-1753</u> (Oxford UP, 1992).

C J Summers and T L Pebworth, On the Celebrated and Neglected Poems of Andrew Marvell (Missouri UP, 1992).

P E Tennant, Edgehill and Beyond: The People's War in the South Midlands 1642-45 (A Sutton, 1992).

M Tolhurst, The English Civil War (English Heritage, 1992).

D J Trela, <u>Thomas Carlyle's Writing of Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches</u> (E Mellen P, 1992).

R Tuck, Philosophy and Government 1572-1651 (Cambridge UP, 1993).

N Tucker, North Wales in the Civil War (reissued, Bridge Books, 1992).

A Turton, The Chief Strength of the Army: Cavalry in the Earl of Essex's Army (Partizan Press, 1993).

H Trevor-Roper, <u>From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution</u> (Secker & W, 1992).

T Warner, Newark: The Civil War and Siegeworks (Nottinghamshire County Council, 1992).

D R Watson, <u>The Life and Times of Charles I</u> (reissued, Weidenfeld & N, 1993).

J West, Oliver Cromwell and the Battle of Gainsborough (Richard Kay P, 1992).

P White, <u>Predestination</u>, <u>Policy and Polemic</u>: <u>Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War</u> (Cambridge UP, 1992).

A S P Woodhouse, <u>Puritanism and Liberty: Being the Army Debates (1647-49) from the Clarke Manuscripts</u> (reissued, Everyman, 1992).

J Wroughton, <u>A Community at War: Civil War in Bath and North Somerset</u> (Lansdown P, 1992).

M Wynne-Davies, <u>The Renaissance from 1500 to 1660</u> (Bloomsbury, 1992).

#### II. ARTICLES.

J C Appleby, "A Guinea Venture c1657: A Note on the Early English Slave Trade", Mariner's Mirror 79 (1993).

D Armitage, "The Cromwellian Protectorate and the Languages of Empire", Historical Journal 35 (1992).

S Barber, "Irish Undercurrents to the Politics of April 1653", <u>Historical</u> Research 65 (1992).

M Bennett, "Between Scylla and Charybdis: The Creation of Rival Administrations at the Beginning of the English Civil War", <u>Local Historian</u> 22 (1992).

D M Bergeron, "Francis Bacon's 'Henry VII': Commentary on King James I", <u>Albion</u> 24 (1992).

J H Bettey, "Manorial Customs and Widows' Estates", Archives 20 (1992).

J Black, J Clarke, R Porter and W Speck, a series of contributions on the theme of "1688 and All That", <u>British Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies</u> 15 (1992).

F J Bremer, "To Live Exemplary Lives: Puritans and Puritan Communities as Lofty Lights", <u>The Seventeenth Century</u> 7 (1992).

G Burgess, "The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered", English Historical Review 107 (1992).

P Carter, "An Internecine Administrative Feud of the Commonwealth: Thomason Tract 669 f20 (18)", British Library Journal 18 (1992).

J F Champ, "The Franciscan Mission in Birmingham 1657-1824", Recusant History 21 (1992).

S M Cooper, "Intergenerational Social Mobility in Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Century England", Continuity and Change 7 (1992).

P Croft, "The Parliamentary Installation of Henry, Prince of Wales", Historical Research 65 (1992).

P Croft, "Sir John Doddridge, King James I and the Antiquity of Parliament", Parliaments, Estates and Representation 12 (1992).

R Cust, "Anti-Puritanism and Urban Politics: Charles I and Great Yarmouth", Historical Journal 35 (1992).

R Cust, "Parliamentary Elections in the 1620s: The Case of Great Yarmouth", Parliamentary History 11 (1992).

R Cust, "Charles I, the Privy Council and the Parliament of 1628", <u>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</u> 6th series, 2 (1992).

J C Davis, "Religion and the Struggle for Freedom in the English Revolution", Historical Journal 35 (1992).

M E Dever, "Moderation and Deprivation: Reappraisal of Richard Sibbes", <u>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</u> 43 (1992).

C Durston, "Phoney War, England Summer 1642", <u>History Today</u> (June 1992).

J H Elliott, "A Europe of Composite Monarchies", Past & Present 137 (1992).

B English, "Sir John Hotham and the English Civil War", Archives 20 (1992).

N Evans, "A Scheme for Re-pewing the Parish Church of Chesham, Buckinghamshire, in 1606", Local Historian 22 (1992).

K R Fairclough, "Temple Mills as an Industrial Site in the Seventeenth Century", Essex Archaeology and History 22 (1991).

J Ferris, "Before Hansard: Records of Debates in the Seventeenth Century House of Commons", <u>Archives</u> 20 (1992).

W Ford, "The Problem of Literacy in Early Modern England", <u>History</u> 78 (1993).

D Gobetti, "Goods of the Mind, Goods of the Body and External Goods", History of Political Thought 13 (1992).

M Gray, "An Early Professional Group? The Auditors of Land Revenue in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries", Archives 20 (1992).

R L Greaves, "Shattered Expectations? George Fox, the Quakers and the Restoration State 1660-85", Albion 24 (1992).

R L Greaves, "Radicals, Rights and Revolution: British Nonconfirmity and the Roots of the American Experience", Church History 61 (1992).

T Harris, "From Rage of Party to Age of Oligarchy?: Rethinking the Later Stuart and Early Hanoverian Periods", <u>Journal of Modern History</u> 64 (1992).

D F Harrison, "Bridges and Economic Development 1300-1800", <u>Economic History Review</u> 45 (1992).

G A Harrison, "Parliaments and Sessions: The Case of 1621", Parliamentary History 12 (1993).

J S Hart, "New Perspectives on Parliaments", Historical Journal 35 (1992).

C Hill, "New Contributions on Seventeenth Century Social History", Journal of British Studies 32 (1993).

J M Hill, "The Origins of the Scottish Plantations in Ulster to 1625: A Reinterpretation", <u>Journal of British Studies</u> 32 (1993).

E B Holifield, "Peace, Conflict and Ritual in Puritan Congregations", Journal of Interdisciplinary History 23 (1993).

C Hollick, "Owen Roe O'Neill's Ulster Army of the Confederacy May-August 1646", <u>Irish Sword</u> 18 (1991).

R Houston, "Mortality in Early Modern Scotland: The Life Expectancy of Advocates", Continuity and Change 7 (1992).

R W Hoyle, "Some Reservations on Dr Ward on the Rental Policy on the Estates of the English Peerage 1649-60", <u>Agricultural History Review</u> 40 (1992).

P Hughes, "Property and Prosperity: The Relationship of the Buildings and Fortunes of Worcester 1500-1660", Midland History 17 (1992).

H L Ingle, "George Fox, Millenarian", Albion 24 (1992).

J R and M C Jacob, "The Saints Embalmed: Scientists, Latitudinarians and Society", Albion 24 (1992).

N H Keeble, "Rewriting the Restoration", Historical Journal 35 (1992).

J Kenyon, "Revisionism and Post-Revisionism in Early Stuart History", Journal of Modern History 64 (1992).

B Klein, "Between the Burns and Bellies of the Multitude: Civic Pageantry and the Problem of Audience in Late Stuart London", London Journal 17 (1992).

P E Knowlden, "West Wickham and North-West Kent in the Civil War", Local Historian 22 (1992).

A Laurence, "Women's Work and the English Civil War", <u>History Today</u> (June 1992).

P Lenihan, "The Leinster Army and the Battle of Dugan's Hill, 1647", <u>Irish Sword</u> 18 (1991).

D Loewenstein, "'An Ambiguous Monster': Representing Rebellion in Milton's Polemics and 'Paradise Lost'", <u>Huntington Library Quarterly</u> 55 (1992).

W R Lund, "Hobbes on Opinion, Private Judgement and Civil War", History of Political Thought 13 (1992).

M Lynch, "Anglo-Scottish Relations 1500-1707", <u>The Historian</u> 37 (spring 1993).

M MacCurtain and M O'Dowd, "An Agenda for Women's History in Ireland 1500-1900, Part I, 1500-1800", <u>Irish Historical Studies</u> 28 (1992).

J L Malcolm, "Charles II and the Reconstruction of Royal Power", Historical Journal 35 (1992).

N von Maltzahn, "Henry Neville and the Art of the Possible: A Republican 'Letter Sent to General Monk' (1660)", The Seventeenth Century 7 (1992).

J A Mendelsohn, "Alchemy and Politics in England 1649-65", Past & Present 135 (1992).

M Mendle, "The Great Council of Parliament and the First Ordinances: The Constitutional Theory of the Civil War", <u>Journal of British Studies</u> 31 (1992).

- S Minnitt, "A Civil War Coin Hoard from West Hatch", <u>Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society</u> 135 (1991).
- J S Morrill, "The Causes of the British Civil Wars", <u>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</u> 43 (1992).

C Muldrew, "Credit and the Courts: Debt Litigation in a Seventeenth Century Urban Community", <u>Economic History Review</u> 46 (1993).

M Nicholls, "'As Happy a Fortune as I Desire': The Pursuit of Financial Security by the Younger Brothers of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland", Historical Research 65 (1992).

J H Ohlmeyer, "The 'Antrim Plot' of 1641 - A Myth?" <u>Historical Journal</u> 35 (1992).

J H Ohlmeyer, "The Marquis of Antrim: A Stuart Turn-Kilt?", <u>History</u> Today (March 1993).

I Palfrey, "The Royalist War Effort Revisited: Edward Seymour and the Royalist Garrison at Dartmouth", <u>Transactions of the Devonian Association</u> 123 (1991).

G Parker, "Success and Failure During the First Century of the Reformation", Past & Present 136 (1992).

D Parrott, "The Military Revolution in Early Modern Europe", <u>History Today</u> (December 1992).

W Prest, "Predicting Civil War Allegiances: The Lawyers' Case Considered", Albion 24 (1992).

J D Ramsbottom, "Presbyterians and 'Partial Conformity' in the Restoration Church of England", <u>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</u> 43 (1992).

C Russell, "The Scottish Party in English Parliaments 1640-42", <u>Historical</u> Research 66 (1993).

R Shephard, "Court Factions in Early Modern England", <u>Journal of Modern History</u> 64 (1992).

P Slack, "Dearth and Social Policy in Early Modern England", <u>Social History of Medicine</u> 5 (1992).

D L Smith, "Catholic, Anglican or Puritan? Edward Sackville, Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Ambiguities of Religion in Early Stuart England", <u>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</u> 6th series, 2 (1992).

W R Stacey, "Impeachment, Attainder and the 'Revival' of Parliamentary Judicature under the Early Stuarts", <u>Parliamentary History</u> 11 (1992).

R Tittler, "Seats of Honor, Seats of Power: The Symbolism of Public Seating in the English Urban Community c1560-1620", Albion 24 (1992).

M Todd, "Puritan Self-Fashioning: The Diary of Samuel Ward", <u>Journal of British Studies</u> 31 (1992).

J Travers, "Apostasy and Knavery in Restoration England: The Checkered Career of John Travers", <u>Catholic Historical Review</u> 78 (1992).

I Ward, "Rental Policy on the Estates of the English Peerage 1649-1660", Agricultural History Review 40 (1992).

I Ward, "Settlements, Mortgages and Aristocratic Estates 1649-1660", Journal of Legal History 12 (1991).

M J Westerkamp, "Puritan Patriarchy and the Problem of Revelation", Journal of Interdisciplinary History 23 (1993).

D Willen, "Godly Women in Early Modern England: Puritanism and

Gender", Journal of Ecclesiastical History 43 (1992).

A Woolrych, "Looking Back on the Levellers", The Historian 34 (spring 1992).

B Worden, "The 'Diary' of Bulstrode Whitelocke", English Historical Review 108 (1993).

J Wormald, "The Creation of Britain: Multiple Kingdoms or Core Colonies?", Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 6th series, 2 (1992).

B Yardley, "George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham, and the Politics of Toleration", Huntington Library Quarterly 55 (1992).

#### **VIDEO REVIEW**

The English Civil War: By the Sword Divided, (video and accompanying book, 1992). video directed by Graham Holloway, book by John Barratt

(In England and Wales available exclusively from W H Smith; customers elsewhere can order direct from Partizan Press, 26 Cliffsea Grove, Leigh on Sea, Essex, SS9 1NQ.)

Many of us awaited the release of this video with considerable anticipation, and we were not disappointed. It is a superb production, showing what the Channel 4 series could, and should have been, but was not. Of course, this reviewer could be accused of some bias, having been peripherally involved in the project, but one showing should be enough to convince anyone that this is a piece of work which deserves wide circulation. It will certainly appeal to a very wide audience.

The focus of the film is on the military aspects of the civil war, between 1642 and 1649. This is no surprise, given that the video is part of a series subtitled <u>Campaigns in History</u>. Nevertheless, it does not ignore the political, religious and social aspects of the war. Clever editing, and the well written script by Stuart Reid, succeed admirably in integrating all of the aspects of the conflict, giving a convincing picture of a country struggling, sometimes reluctantly, with itself. Similarly, there is no overt bias. Both sides are treated sympathetically and critically. Thus, for example, while Charles I is criticised for his duplicity and indecision, the film nevertheless succeeds in portraying

him with compassion, allowing viewers to understand something of his dilemma, whatever their sympathies. This is a significant advantage, and makes the video especially appropriate for those wanting an overview of the first civil war without necessarily having to deal with academic minutiae. It also makes the video ideally suited for use educationally.

Given the length, format and marketing of the video, it is not, of course, "advanced" level. There will be little that is new to most serious cognoscenti. But even those who know quite a bit about the civil war will find the film enjoyable, and informative. The structure of the narrative, the way it unfolds, follows a traditional approach, including some discussion of causes, actions and outcomes. But this is not to criticise because the format is precisely suited to the kind of audience that the film is aimed at: those who want a good introduction to the civil war but do not need, or want, to know about the various interpretative strands in civil war studies. That said, however, the film would be well suited for use in introductory courses in schools or colleges, as a stimulus for discussion, further study and so on, perhaps in conjunction with Yorkshire TV's recent series The Way We Used To Live. It is also suitable for leisure viewing at home.

Production standards in the film are uniformly high throughout. The commentary, narrated by Robert Powell, and visual imagery are combined in a way that allows each to illuminate the other. There are few, if any, irrelevant images, and none of the irritating space fillers, such as water splashing over rocks, that Channel 4 used in their series. As the narration proceeds, the viewer is shown a succession of images comprising, in turn, contemporary woodcuts, paintings and pamphlets, interspersed with footage of re-enactors and computer generated battlefield maps produced from "the most advanced 3-D computer mapping techniques available". In addition, there are short clips where Dr David Chandler, Head of the Department of War Studies at Sandhurst, discusses the points covered in the commentary from the point of view of an academic historian. The overall effect is remarkably good.

The use of re-enactors in a film such as this is, of course, contentious. It can too easily turn into a farce, doing neither the film nor the re-enactors themselves any favours. In this case, however, the effect is impressive. At no point does one get the impression of "a bunch of amateurs fooling about". On the contrary, those re-enactors who took part, representing all three societies, acquitted themselves admirably and looked thoroughly professional. Indeed, their performance is in some senses probably better than might have been expected from some professionals. This footage, moreover, adds considerably to the overall impact of the film, and is in no sense merely a decorative addition. Not only does it add movement to what otherwise could have been a very static film (pace Channel 4), but in some cases illustrates points that could not have been shown in any other way.

Creative direction and editing are much in evidence. One particularly clever scene, for example, shows re-enactors marching in column superimposed over a winter landscape. This gives a superb impression of a winter campaign, and is probably more effective, from an

artistic point of view, than it would have been had the attempt been made to shoot the scene in a snow covered field. In anther example, two superimposed columns of re-enactors are shown marching in opposite directions, conveying the idea of armies "on the march" to confrontation, reinforcing the impression of anticipation given by the narrative. It is perhaps evidence of the strength of the film that the words, whilst having a natural priority, in that they present the historical detail, are given an iconographic impact which they would otherwise have lacked.

The choice of static images is excellent. These are used to creative effect throughout, and like the footage of re-enactors, they enhance the force of the words significantly. The range of static images has been well chosen, and one wonders why, to return to the main comparison, Channel

4 found it so difficult to match it.

Accompanying the video (which runs for around 80 minutes) is a small book (96 pp) written by John Barratt. Like the video, this contains little that will surprise English civil war buffs, but it is, nevertheless, quite a useful publication, providing neat summaries of the military aspects of the war, principally focussed on the armies. If there is one criticism of the book it is that the details contained within it are not likely to appeal to as wide an audience as the film, and in practice will probably be less useful. But for those interested in the armies of the period, it will be quite a worthwhile addition to their book collection.

Overall, it is difficult to see how the film could have been much improved. But this is not to claim that it is perfect. Naturally there are some flaws. The "advanced 3-D computer mapping techniques", for example, were disappointing, unless one enjoys the impression of swooping backwards and forwards over an impressionistic battlefield. In this case some movement of the blocks representing the two armies might have helped, a technique used to good effect by the Tower Amouries as part of their travelling exhibition, which would have been a splendid addition to this film. Nevertheless, the faults are trivial, and in no way detract from the superb overall quality of the film.

This video package should have a very wide appeal. At the very least, anyone interested in the civil war will find it rewarding. And educationally, it has great potential; hard pressed teachers looking for good material on the civil war would find it more than worthwhile investigating. Finally, one might also venture so far as to suggest that it deserves an airing on the TV; its quality certainly puts into the shade what we have been presented with thus far (Channel 4 please note), which is pitiful compared to the American productions marking the anniversary of their civil war.

Les Prince

### **BOOK REVIEWS**

J R Smith, <u>Pilgrims and Adventurers: Essex (England) and the Making of the United States of America</u> (Essex Record Office Publications, 1992, £7.50).

It was while visiting our local bookshop in Chingford that I purchased this attractive soft cover A4 publication. For the past year I had been researching the role of the Puritans in the colonisation of America, and was therefore pleased to see a new publication produced by a county whose people played an important part in the shaping of the nation.

The book starts off with a brief outline of Columbus and others who were involved in the discovery of the Americas, mentioning the privateering expeditions against the Spanish who were in the process of colonising the American mainland. It continues with potted histories of the settlements and future states, together with biographies of notable people such as Warwick, Hugh Peters, John Winthrop and Henry Vane. It covers the emigration of the 1630s, and the social and political situation in England at the time with reference to Laudian policies and the religious difficulties.

The publication is well designed and illustrated throughout with photographs, maps and artwork, so it will appeal to, and be used on, several levels. This would be an excellent book for schools or anyone of any age who wishes to learn more about the USA in an unstuffy way and hopefully to use it as a background for further study in English and American history.

Peter Harrington, Archaeology of the English Civil War (Shire Publications, 1992, £3.95).

Once again it is nice to see that publishers are realising the merits of the English civil war period and the need still to explore the sphere. The publishers of the Shire series produce interesting books on various subjects, and they have now quite an extensive catalogue of titles. This latest work has come out under the "Shire Archaeology Series", which mostly covers the Coltic Roman and medical projects.

mostly covers the Celtic, Roman and medieval periods.

The book is divided by chapters covering the different types of sites, i.e. town defences, castles and fortified houses. Many sites were destroyed during the Commonwealth and it really was not until the nineteenth century that interest was aroused due to the writings of Sir Walter Scott and Thomas Macaulay and the artists who portrayed the era as a romantic time. Harrington explains that in recent years our understanding of the seventeenth century has improved and that many sites are now being reappraised. For example, Tout Hill, Sawtry, was originally thought to be Roman, but after it was surveyed it was concluded that it was a seventeenth century gun platform.

This slim volume is an ideal book for those of us who wish to visit civil war sites and need a little background without going into too

much technical detail. The book is well illustrated with photographs and drawings to help clarify the sites mentioned, there is a glossary of terms, together with a list of sites and a guide to further reading.

Jane Mills

Philip Tennant, Edgehill and Beyond: The People's War in the South Midlands 1642-1645 (Alan Sutton, 1992, £17.99)

Over the past two or three decades historians have made a determined attempt to look beneath the national picture of the civil war and to explore the impact of the war within and upon particular regions, counties or localities. Most, like Morrill on Cheshire, Fletcher on Sussex or Hughes on Warwickshire, take a fairly broad chronological perspective, thereby placing the military and administrative experience of the war years within the wider context of the development of those counties in the early and mid seventeenth century. Philip Tennant's approach is rather different. He focusses on the war years alone, and looks in detail at how the war was waged within, and affected the inhabitants of, that part of the southwest Midlands centred on southern and central Warwickshire but also encompassing parts of Oxfordshire, Gloucestershire, Worcestershire and Northamptonshire. Instead of starting with the political, administrative and social life of the area and then exploring how during the 1640s the impact of the war brought (often temporary) changes in those fields, Mr Tennant begins with the war itself and examines at length how the unfolding military events affected life in Warwickshire and the surrounding area. This book, then, is neither a traditional military history of the war, nor a broad study of the "county community". It is an attempt to show how the military events of the three years of the height of the war affected the common people in this region.

Through meticulous research of the primary sources, principally the so-called Commonwealth Exchequer Papers at the Public Record Office and George Thomason's collection of contemporary newspapers, pamphlets and other tracts held by the British Library, a clear and detailed picture is assembled of the impact of the war. A convincing case is made for that impact being intense, profound and damaging, both because of the level of direct military action within the area - the marching, garrisoning, raiding, plundering and skirmishing are charted in detail, while the larger and better known actions, such as the siege of Gloucester and the battles of Edgehill, Cropredy and Naseby, are merely sketched in - and because of the heavy demands and suffering which the military imposed upon the local civilian population. In this respect, Mr Tennant's study thus complements and confirms the thrust of Professor Carlton's broader study, Going to the Wars (reviewed by Ivan Roots below). Tales of local farmers and ploughboys astonished by the appearance of an army and quite unaware that a civil war had been in progress for months or years, suggestions that most of the population not only avoided any direct involvement in the fighting but were also unaffected by the war, can and should be dismissed. Contemporary accounts, quoted at length here, suggest that life in the towns, villages and countryside of this part of England was severely disrupted by the civil war.

Mr Tennant gives a broadly chronological account of the war in the south-west Midlands, highlighting the intense if piecemeal military activity underway throughout the period, and stressing the heavy demands made upon whole districts in quartering and supplying an army on the move as well as the more obvious impact of fighting, physical destruction and desecration. At times, the war comes across as something amateurish, almost comic - rival units flying identical colours so confusing Captain Legg that he rode boldly into the enemy camp and was promptly captured, the soldiers of Warwick garrison getting so carried away during a training exercise that they killed and wounded many of the townsmen, George Purefoy badly injuring himself when his horse galloped into a tree during a military pageant. All sorts of interesting sidelights are thrown on the conduct of war and the nature of military life - the reported use of mines laid under the battlefield at Southam in 1642, Waller marching his men during the evening because of the intense daytime heat in June 1644, the strong cockney accents of the Tower Hamlets regiment, the collapse of a rotten floor beneath Waller and other officers holding a council of war at Great Bourton, the royalists sending a message by letter physically torn into two pieces so that if just one messenger was captured the paper would reveal little, as well as the familiar and depressing litany of the wounded and the dead, the massacres and the executions, the plundering and the destruction.

It is a shame that, presumably for reasons of space, each individual quotation, anecdote or incident is not footnoted and the references cited there and then. Instead the numbered footnotes tend to appear only every couple of pages and run together references to all that has been discussed since the preceding footnote. Mr Tennant tries to indicate which source applies to each part of the story, but it is often difficult to work out from the long, cumulative references the precise source for a particular quotation or anecdote. It is also a shame that the story stops so abruptly at or soon after the battle of Naseby and that the author (or his publisher) could not have found space for a more detailed review of 1645-46. Overall, however, this is a superb book, interesting, fresh, and thoroughly researched. The text, which is well supported by maps, illustrations and full indices, has a lively and new story to tell. That story is related convincingly and with real flair. This is an important contribution to our understanding of the civil war, for which Mr Tennant is to be warmly congratulated.

Christopher Davies, Stamford and the Civil War (Paul Watkins Publishing, 1992, £4.95).

Riding on the back of the 350th anniversary of the outbreak of

war. 1992 saw the publication of a spate of small books and pamphlets exploring the history of the civil war in particular towns or parishes. Christopher Davies's account of Stamford, Lincolnshire, was one of the best. Pleasantly produced, inexpensive and resting upon - and quoting from - a fair range of (mainly printed) primary sources, in a little over fifty pages Mr Davies explores Stamford's role and history during the civil wars. Having sketched in the physical and economic state of the town in the early seventeenth century, the study moves on to explore the aristrocratic and gentry influences upon Stamford and its religious sympathies, noting the parliamentary and "Puritan" inclinations of the local great family, the Cecils, but also highlighting elements that might have pushed Stamford towards neutralism, perhaps even towards the King's cause. As it turned out, Stamford lay in something of a frontier zone, frequently disputed by royalists and parliamentarians, though the town itself, poorly defended and thought by contemporaries to be almost impossible to hold against determined assault, suffered neither a garrison nor a siege worthy of the name. But if Stamford escaped the destruction and misery visited upon some other Lincolnshire towns, it did suffer economically as time and again armies marched through, many of them halting, quartering and plundering in and around Stamford. The text is supported by several maps, contemporary illustrations and a facsimile reproduction of a pamphlet of July 1643 describing Cromwell's capture of Burghley House, just south of Stamford. Although this work will not set the field of civil war studies alight - not least because the history of civil war Stamford is broadly similar to that of scores of other small market towns - Mr Davies has written a well-researched, intelligent and lucid account of this town on the fringe of what might be called "Cromwell country".

Peter Gaunt

1992 saw the 350th anniversary of the outbreak of the civil war commemorated by postage stamps, newspaper and magazine supplements, lectures, exhibitions and re-enactments. There were no books issued on the actual events of 1642 to compete with earlier works on the causes and origins by Anthony Fletcher, Conrad Russell, Anne Hughes and others. But as Peter Gaunt's bibliography for the year shows, the output of writing on the seventeenth century context and on particular aspects within it continues unabated. Some of this has come my way. Here are my reactions.

David Rollison's hot pursuit of <u>The Local Origins of Modern Society</u> (Routledge, 1992, £35) concentrates on Gloucestershire from 1500 to 1800. So it is clear from the start that he finds them in early modern England and, indeed, the book is an attempt to explain, through a

particular area and case studies within it, "focal points in the transformation of English society and culture" associated with "the rise of industries in the countryside" initially, but ultimately with powerful effects everywhere, a slow process involving the everyday lives of individuals and their diverse communities, through "an intensification" in the processes of both evolution and cumulative change. One thinks of a pebble thrown into a pond, setting off a pattern of ripples, distorted by objects on the surface of the water. Gloucester, chosen for the richness of its archives and the work already done upon them, turns out to be apt for such an enterprise, which has produced a stimulating and controversial book of which more will deservedly be heard. Cromwellians will find of special interest the third section on "Two Revolutionaries". The first is John Corbet, whose Historical Relation of the Military Government of Gloucester from the Beginning of the Civil War, published as early as 1645, has been long valued for its acute observations on the war's local dimension. Dr Rollison concludes that, in spite of its obvious propagandist drift, the book leaves a vivid and acceptable impression of the time's "extraordinary complexity", offering what might be called "a middle class view of revolution". Certainly, Corbet himself talks of a "middle rank". There is also an absorbing chapter on John Roberts, an articulate Quaker - as by nature many of them were - in the infant, as yet undisciplined phase of a movement which could produce a James Nayler as well as a George Fox. Roberts was a "spiritual egalitarian", convinced that perfection in this world is attainable, if truly and energetically worked for. There is an echo here of William Walwyn's remark about the impossibility of the abolition of private property: Yes, that may be so, but "we must endeavour it".

We are whisked away southwards in David Underdown's remarkable Fire From Heaven (Harper Collins, 1992, £17.99 cloth, Fontana paperback due later this year at £7.99), subtitled "life in an English town in the seventeenth century". That town is Dorchester. The experience that Professor Underdown recreates raises issues, ideas, problems and solutions - or at any rate attempted ones - which have a general relevance for the period. The emphasis is on experimental developments in local society and culture in two decades following 1613, the year in which a great fire - a catastrophe not uncommon then in urban life - destroyed a good part of the town, coming over to many as a sharp expression of the wrath of God for the sins of the citizenry. In response, under the dedicated leadership of John White, a minister with a mission, a group of them set out to build a godly community with a commitment also in the secular sphere, not unconnected, to decent order and controlled charity. This powerful recognition that if a man does not live by bread alone, certainly without it he does not live, provided for swift improvements in education, poor relief, social health and public morality, which took in a proper overseeing of alehouses and vagrancy. Discipline and deserving were vital. "Hospital children" were taught useful trades, which unsurprisingly happened to be of the kind favoured by wealthy but concerned clothiers like Dennis Bond. Welfare then as now ought, it seems, to be cost-effective. The conscientiousness of the religious

performance of these guardians of the community need not be doubted, even if on examination they turn out to be "in income and status... not very different" from their more worldly predecessors, and like them "a veritable cousinhood" tied by blood, marriage and friendships. Anything else would have been quite unlikely. During the civil war Dorchester was for Clarendon "the most malignant town in England". There were, in fact, a good many places competing for that bad eminence. Ironically, the town soon surrendered rather abjectly to the royalists and the puritan effort

withered. There was little enthusiasm there for the Commonwealth, though the town was effectively controlled under the Protectorate by John Disbrowe, the prototype of the rule of Oliver's major-generals. After the Restoration dissent struggled on, but by 1688 altar rails were being

installed at Trinity Church, oddly - or perhaps not so surprisingly - by a nonconformist craftsman. David Underdown has given us a study of the highest academic quality, exploiting rich documentation with historical

imagination, humane and written with unforced elegance to appeal to a wide readership. On the reverse of the title page appears "David

Underdown asserts the moral right to be identified as the author of this book". He certainly has the moral right to take pride in it, too.

Under his directorship, the Yale Center for Parliamentary History has produced two more volumes of Proceedings in Parliament 1626 (Yale University Press, 1992-93, £45 each), both edited by W B Bidwell and M Jansson. Volume I, devoted to the Lords, was noticed in Cromwelliana 1992. Volumes II and III tackle the House of Commons, for which the sources, notably private diaries, are more extensive. A fourth volume will complete the work with appendices and a full index. The new volumes maintain the meticulous standards of scholarship of the whole Yale series, which is a recognition of the close relationship of old and New England in this formative period for both. The 1626 parliament, Charles I's second, was a lively and active one, which apart from matters of high politics such as the impeachment of Buckingham, worked a good way through a pile of intended legislation, both public and - always as significant to many MPs private. At least 300 Members of the House of Commons had served in the previous parliament and could consider themselves experienced in doing things "in a parliamentary way". Among those who kept diaries, drawn upon for these volumes, was Bulstrode Whitelocke, aged twentyone and already an inveterate scribbler. His record here was by his own account "imperfect" - even he could not get everything down - but "laborious". "Neither swayed by court flattery nor popular vanity, but only by that reason and conscience which God had given [him]", Bulstrode was well set to become unsinkable in the 1650s. The King, opening the parliament, was conscious of his stammer and remarked, "I know I am not very good to speak much", and left it to the Lord Keeper to tell them his mind "at large". Oliver, who in the second session of his second Protectorate Parliament certainly did speak at some length, like Charles called upon his Lord Keeper, Nathaniel Fiennes, to expatiate further. These volumes are expensive but essential aids for the proper study of parliament - King, Lords and Commons - the history of which in the 1620s may not have been all of that of England, but certainly made up

a good part of it, bringing to a focus much of the national situation in religion, finance, foreign and social affairs.

Yale University Press have also brought out another instalment of their series of The Private Journals of the Long Parliament (1993, £65). this time for the pregnant months from 2 June to 17 September 1642. during which the Nineteen Propositions were presented and rejected, and war itself was signalled by a royal standard raised at Nottingham. The volume, edited by V F Snow and A S Young, reproduces three surviving diaries - there may have been others now lost - all from the Commons. those of the indefatigable Sir Simonds D'Ewes, and the contrastingly named Framlingham Gawdy and Roger Hill. The last two gave up writing on 28 July. Perhaps the drift towards war made for qualms about putting down details. All three remained in the Long Parliament until Pride's Purge, when Gawdy was excluded and D'Ewes retired. Hill stayed on and served in the Exchequer under Oliver. The diaries make it clear that the Commons were well aware of much of what was happening across the country and were concerned to keep, through their committees particularly, abreast of events and trends. Oliver Cromwell served assiduously on some of these but was also making himself prominent in the full House - notably in matters of defence, money and Ireland. (When several years later he went to Ireland on a major mission he did not go in complete ignorance, though perhaps not without prejudice.) As Charles seemed increasingly likely to take to the field, measures were put into operation to see to the defence of the kingdom as yet outside of his control and of the parliament itself, and also for the defence of a King arguably misled by evil counsellors. All the time the size and composition of the Commons - as of the Lords - were changing through expulsions, disablements, quiet withdrawals among actual defections and by natural deaths. During September some members left, too, for active service in the localities. The effect of all this was to make for a House more susceptible to the "director of the whole machine", John Pym, but the D'Ewes diary in particular shows evidence of continuing partisanship and if consensus was the keynote, it was hardly a plangent one. The future of the church remained a difficult problem arousing divided passions. Amid all these big concerns, the House was prepared to give serious attention, in response to the victim's petition, to a rape committed by one of its own members. Among punishments contemplated was perpetual banishment, not on the cards these days. An important procedural development clinched in these months was the weakening of the role of the Speaker as a traditional royal servant. It is to be hoped that further diaries for the 1640s will not be long in coming into print in editions of this quality.

Dr Maurice Ashley maintains his interest and ours in the civil wars and in Cromwell with his handsomely illustrated The Battle of Naseby (Alan Sutton, 1992, £17.99), subtitled "and the Fall of King Charles I". It is actually an account of the reign from the beginning, peaking at Naseby. The last third of the book traces the search for a settlement to the climax of the axe at Whitehall. Noted is Cromwell's urge for the thing to be done with "some plausible appearance of legality and justice", even though he had decided at last that the King was too great a dissembler, anyway, to be

trusted further. Dr Ashley concludes that "unquestionably Charles's martyrdom did more to secure the future of the English monarchy than if he had won the battle of Naseby". This seems a somewhat cavalier dismissal of the 1650s.

A deep and broad study of the civil wars is undertaken by Charles Carlton in Going to the Wars (Routledge, 1992, £25), aiming to recreate "the experience of the British civil wars" from 1638 to 1651 and the battle of Worcester. Though the story begins in Scotland and goes to and from there and into Ireland and Wales, the experience is largely that of the English, civilians and soldiery. There is much about discipline or lack of it, the latter often the consequence of breakdown in the commissariat and sometimes the ineptitude and callousness of the officers on either side. Cromwell told the Earl of Manchester, who after the second battle of Newbury showed no sign of appreciating the sheer exhaustion of their troops, "you may have their skins but you can have no service". Sentiments like that go some way towards explaining Oliver's charisma. George Monck perceived that "soldiers go into the field to conquer and not to be killed". But in a later, even more bloody civil war, General Sherman saw them as going out "to kill and get killed", and "therefore not entitled to expect kindness". Professor Carlton suggests that casualties, including loss of life, were "immense, even when set in the context of other wars or catastrophes". But his statistics are rather dubious. It may be true that "for the vast majority of ordinary soldiers and even officers who fought and died and changed sides whenever necessary, ideology counted for less than it has for historians". But without some ideological content, war would hardly have started or been fought through, and perhaps some historians are more sensitive to that than others. Dr Carlton's book is nevertheless a vivid reminder - if one were needed as "former Yugoslavia" is currently being thrust into another mould - of how uncivil civil war can be, even one, as some would have liked to have kept it, "without an enemy". If "inhumanity between English and English was demonstrably limited", between the English and the Irish, whether in England or in that green, unhappy land, it predominated. The volume concludes with a résumé of how the war lingered on in memory, to inform many of the attitudes, political, religious and social, in the later seventeenth century, typified in the cry "No standing armies!", and even as the war generations died out, to survive in folklore, distorted but vibrant. Oliver Cromwell is as alive today as Elvis Presley.

Women played a part in Professor Carlton's story of the warssome doing rather more than just keeping the home fires burning. But in spite of the growth of women's studies and interest in topics such as the history of families, where it is obvious women's activities were vital, we have yet to dig well down into their grass roots. A pioneer study of the activity of women below the aristocratic milieu was made in 1919 by the liberal Quaker, Alice Clark. Her Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century became a classic. It has been reissued in a third edition with an extensive and largely laudatory Introduction by Louise Erikson (Routledge, 1992, £11.99). Though much of Miss Clark's analysis has been modified or superseded, "even today her findings are as

regularly confirmed as they are disputed". The history of the domestic economy remains dominated by male approaches. What is most helpful about this book is its demonstration of "the great productive capacity of women".

The work of men then as now was often underpinned by the efforts of their womenfolk, whether in agriculture or in industry, whether in town or in country. There is unfortunately not much directly about that in R C Richardson (ed), Town and Countryside in the English Revolution (Manchester University Press, 1992, £40), although the contributors include two distinguished women historians. The object of the collection is to consider the ways in which town and country share or did not share common concerns and problems during the 1640s and 1650s. The editor's Introduction underlines how complex were the impacts of those disturbed years on communal relations and developments. While some towns and rural districts were not much affected, others certainly were, some of them not even in the areas most sharply contested, suffering physical damage, economic and social dislocation and administrative strains. Anne Hughes writes on Coventry, where blood was spilled even before the war "proper" began, David Harris Sachs on Bristol and David Salt on York, three major urban centres, each with its own peculiarities but some things typical. Keith Lindley traces the divisions which grew almost organically within London's citizenry during this time of municipal crisis, for that it was. This essay, like all the others, cries out for a continuance beyond the Restoration. (It is a pity that the spine of the seventeenth century is still so often broken at 1660, which did not bring one generation and its problems to an abrupt end and nor sharply start off another.) More general articles are by Joan Thirsk on agrarian problems and Buchanan Sharp on rural discontents. Like most contributors, they have written before on their topics, but have much that is fresh to say. Barry Coward emphasises that the "experience of the gentry" - "experience" is a good seventeenth century term which is becoming popular among historians - could be as much urban as rural, the influence of both making many gentlemen by the end of the 1650s ready to welcome a restored monarchy as a guarantee of stability in both areas of their lives. The upshot was through their omnipresence to tighten the connections of town and country over a range of aspects, as Defoe would observe at the end of the century. There are other stimulating essays in a well-edited volume, each firmly rooted in its own exploitation of primary sources but well aware, too, of current trends in historiography.

The Partizan Press of Leigh-on-Sea must be well known to many Cromwellians. It provides a valuable service mainly, but not solely, for military buffs and the re-enactment societies by its numerous publications, mainly in pamphlet form, about the period. It greeted the 350th anniversary with Anna Milford's Ear and Eye Witness (1992, £8.95), mostly an eclectic collection of brief extracts from contemporary writings memoirs, tracts, news-sheets, "true relations" and whatever, interspersed with pictures, including one of the Naseby obelisk and plaque. Topics include women, music and Oliver Cromwell. A useful facsimile reprint is The Civil War in and around Winchester (1992, £5) by G N Godwin, a

keen nineteenth century antiquarian. Alan Turton's The Chief Strength of the Army (1993, £4.99) is an anatomy of Essex's horse (1642-45), well researched and well illustrated, a follow up to his Old Robin's Foot, which tackled the Earl's infantry. A third volume on his dragoons, artillery and engineers is promised. The Press's English Civil War Notes and Queries has reached numbers 44 (£1.75) and 45 (£1.50). The former includes an article on Edward Montagu's regiment of foot, and the latter one on evidence of the use of cartridges in artillery in the hundred years before the Restoration. This periodical is by no means a mere desultory series of snippets and trivia, but rather a genuine appeal on matters of interest.

James Harrington's Oceana (1656) is recognised as one of the vital texts of English political philosophy, and has been much drawn upon in interpretations of the nature of the troubles of the decades which produced it. But it has rarely been reprinted. J G A Pocock's magisterial edition of the complete Political Works (1977) has seemed too weighty for the non-specialist. So the addition of The Commonwealth of Oceana - the full title has some significance - to the "Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought" series, joining Hobbes, Filmer and Locke, is very welcome (Cambridge University Press, 1992, £35 cloth, £10.95 paperback). It draws on texts in The Works, but with a briefer Introduction, and with the addition of the post-Restoration A System of Politics "in short and easy aphorisms", such as "all government is interest, and the predominant interest gives the matter or foundation of the government". Oceana is intimately associated with theories of republicanism, which came to notice after, rather than before, the abolition of monarchy. Charles in fact lost his head not in response to a theory but to a particular experience. The abolition of his office was a pragmatic afterthought. Even by 1656 most republicanism was without a philosophical base of any depth. Oceana itself sets out to show in a romancy historical way how traditional English government, located in King, Lords and Commons - or monarchy, aristocracy and people (gentry and others of substance) - had collapsed by 1649, because of changed power relationships between the three elements, leaving a vacuum that needed filling by a commonwealth which would be a reality not a Utopia. As Professor Pocock says, "a revolution had been produced by the erosion of the political structure and the substitution of another by a process of long-term social change" - of a sort which these days hardly seems feasible to revisionist historians. The Introduction is stuffed with thoughtful observations, e.g. "the Cromwellian army was a revolutionary force because it was less an army maintained by the state than an army in search of a state which could either maintain it or pay it off". The latter was achieved in 1660.

The republicanism of Algernon Sidney, also a product of the troubles, was of a different kind from Harrington's. Sidney's <u>Discourses</u> are even less accessible than <u>Oceana</u> has been, yet they are another major, if discursive and difficult work of political thinking (and feeling). In a monograph mentioned in <u>Cromwelliana</u> 1992, Dr Jonathan Scott has shown how Sidney was an actor in practical politics in the 1650s. In a second volume, <u>Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis</u>, 1677-83

(Cambridge University Press, 1991, £40), he takes us through Sidney's later activity to his execution for treason in 1683. The Restoration Crisis of the title is what is commonly known as the Exclusion Crisis, the attempt after the brouhaha of the Popish Plot to exclude the Duke of York from the throne. Exclusion, Dr Scott argues with considerable conviction, was the result of the crisis not a cause, and never a primary issue. What the crisis was about was "a confrontation with the past", "a second struggle for parliaments", which shaded off naturally, following the first into republicanism and insurrection. The situation was one from which Sidney could not detach himself. Conflict had become for him a way of life, joining up what he had said and done in the 1650s with his aspirations in the later 1670s and early 1680s. He was concerned to restore or to introduce a version of the republic which ought to have been established in the 1650s. This was his service to the fisile "Good Old Cause" for which in the end he was ready to give his life. Dr Scott's book is deliberately provocative, but as much of thought as of sheer disagreement. It is at once a narrative, a biography and an analysis, and is idiosyncratically revisionist in all three. Sidney emerges from these volumes as a complicated personality, at once appealing and offputting, capable of combining idealism with a sort of realism, a difficult product of difficult times.

One of the many Restoration characters who stood foresquare for stability, but with the court, was Henry King (1592-1669), whose life had been disrupted by the wars. He is best known as a minor poet, with one exquisite work, The Exequy upon his Dead Wife, with its oddly touching military metaphor:

But hark my pulse like a soft drum Beats my approach, tells thee I come, And slow howe'er my marches be I shall at last sit down by thee.

But he was also Bishop of Winchester, made so on the day after the bill to exclude bishops from the Lords was introduced. A convinced royalist, he was ejected at the outbreak of war, but stayed in England and was restored in 1660. King was a cultivated scholar, friend of Donne, with a knowledge of Shakespeare, devoted to the Prayer Book, the bible and the liturgy and ceremonial of the Church of England as he saw it was before the civil war. His printed Sermons, much esteemed in his time, have been collected in a scholarly edition by Mary Hobbes (Scholar Press, 1990, £55). Though hardly of the high literary quality of Donne's or Andrewes's, they are well worth reviving for themselves and as historical documents. King emphasises the necessity of order - decency is his own word for it. He objects to extremes. He talks of "the science of Christianity", speculative and practical. His imagery shows him au fait with alchemy, the law, heraldry, country pursuits and commerce. Though he lived quietly during the 1650s, he had a meeting with Bishop Duppa (whose funeral sermon he would preach) about the fate of the Prayer Book, and was involved in a proposal of Charles in exile for some of the bishops remaining in England to go over "to consecrate some of those

eminently worthy divines who then attended him", "thus preserving the order until God gave opportunity to fill up the other vacancies...But that design fell, though God brought back the King in time to restore the church to its lustre". "Anglicanism" during the Interregnum requires further investigation.

Hobbes and Milton turn up every year. The latter is prominent in Thomas N Corns's Uncloistered Virtue (Clarendon Press, 1992, £40), an interdisciplinary survey of "some of the political literature" of the 1640s and 1650s, which I have reviewed elsewhere. It is particularly useful on Milton's pamphlets defending the Commonwealth in 1649 and again in 1659-60, but also has the attraction of directing attention to Abraham Cowley and (not so strange as it might seem) Robert Herrick. The Hobbes study which has come my way, S A Lloyd's Ideals as Interests in Hobbes's Leviathan (Cambridge University Press, 1992, 42.50), is directed more at specialists in political theory than historians. Subtitled "the power of mind over matter", it takes as its central thesis Hobbes's belief that "people can be taught properly to conceive their moral and religious interests", and to regard them as "overriding or transcendent". So Hobbes is optimistic about the prospect of securing "a stable social order". To get there, men need to be encouraged "by positive teaching of moral and political virtue to control their individual passions". Hobbes's absolutism from which there is no getting away - stresses a view of the state as "a living organism" that can be upset by both "external violence and intestine disorder". As organisms, states must respond to change and there can be no such thing as "government settled once and for all", but continuing effective government is feasible by the reconciliation of interests within society. The historical possibilities of these considerations hardly gets a look in in Dr Lloyd's consideration, and though Hobbes's Behemoth, his history of the civil wars, is mentioned, some application of the theory to, say, Cromwell's attempt at "healing and settling" would have been appreciated.

I have also reviewed elsewhere and can recommend Kevin Sharpe's The Personal Rule of Charles I, 1629-1640 (Yale University Press, 1992) which, lavishly produced, with nearly 1000 pages plus illustrations and a forceful, innovative and thoroughly documented text, must at £25 be one of the academic bargains of the year. Dr Sharpe's conscientious statesman king needs to be put alongside, e.g. Conrad Russell's more flawed politician. The postscript on 1640-42 may or may not be helpful in connecting up the happy years of the 1630s (down to 1637, at least) with the hectic 1640s.

It is remarkable how often stability and the search for it have been major themes in the books under review. But perhaps given the way we live now it is surprising that we should look back to the experience - that word again! - of our predecessors. It is always more difficult than might be supposed for historians to be really detached from what they set out to observe.

Ivan Roots

# **CROMWELLIANA**

Published by The Cromwell Association, this annual journal of Civil War and Cromwellian studies contains articles, book reviews, a bibliography and other comments and contributions. Further copies of this and previous editions may be obtained from the Honorary Secretary (at the address on the inside front cover), who can supply details of prices and availability.

ISBN 0-905729-04-8

