# Cromwelliana

## The Journal of The Cromwell Association


# 2000

## The Cromwell Association



THE CROMWELL ASSOCIATION was founded in 1935 by the late Rt Hon Isaac Foot and others to commemorate Oliver Cromwell, the great Puritan statesman, 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, 5 Town Farm Close, Pinchbeck, near Spalding, Lincs, PE11 3SG

Press Liaison Officer: JOHN GOLDSMITH, Cambridgeshire Heritage,
Castle Court, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge, CB3 0AP

# CROMWELLIANA 2000

edited by Peter Gaunt

**********

## CONTENTS



ISBN 0-905729-12-9

# CROMWELL DAY, 1999
# LIBERTY AND RESPONSIBILITY

*by John Morrill*

We meet today in the shadow of this great Thornycroft statue of the Lord Protector on 3 September, the day of his death, in the 400th year since his birth, and never has it been more appropriate to meet here than today. For today is also the sixtieth anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War; and we remember that when the wartime government prudently removed many of the great statues that grace central London for safe-keeping from German bombs, this statue, at the particular behest of Winston Churchill, was left defiantly in place. Oliver Cromwell, sword in one hand and the Bible in the other, represented a tradition of fearless integrity and resolve in the face of tyranny.

We are all familiar with the sad, apologetic words of Neville Chamberlain as he addressed the nation to say that Hitler had ignored the ultimatum to withdraw from Poland and that since no message had been received by the 11 a.m. deadline on 3 September, Britain was at war with Germany. That speech is as uninspiring a call to arms as it is possible to imagine; but fortunately it was made up for a remarkable speech by King George VI broadcast later in the day and published in all the newspapers the next morning. It called on the people 'to meet the challenge of a principle which if it were to prevail would be fatal to any civilised order in the world'. The principle in question was that which permitted statesmen 'in the selfish pursuit of power' to disregard all their obligations to others and led them to the use of force or the threat of force to force their will on others.

> Such a principle, stripped of all disguise, is surely the mere primitive doctrine that might is right, and if this principle were established... then freedom...would be in danger; and the [people] would be kept in the bondage of fear...It is unthinkable that we should refuse to meet the challenge. It is to this high purpose that I now call people...The task will be hard. There may be dark days ahead, and war cannot be confined to the battlefield, but we can only do the right as we see the right, and reverently commit our cause to God. If one and all we keep resolutely to it, ready for whatever service or sacrifice it may demand, then with God's help we shall prevail.

I have used only George VI's words in the above but I have omitted those which make it clear that he was speaking of an international principle, an international cause. But adapted as above, they echo not just down the



sixty years since 1939 but down the centuries. As I speak them here, we stand within a few feet of the Palace of Westminster which houses the Mother of Parliaments and the cradle of parliamentary democracy, and we gaze up to the statue of the man who fought for that parliament against a king who rather than listen to unpalatable advice from his parliaments, tried to do what the rulers of France and Iberia and much of central Europe were doing at that time: bring them to an end. So we should spend a few minutes today reflecting on the courage and resolve and selflessness of Oliver Cromwell. How close must the words I have just extracted from George VI have been to those spoken by Oliver Cromwell in the summer of 1642 as he stood outside the Falcon Inn in Huntingdon raising his first troop of volunteers?

There is irony in this, of course. For Cromwell himself was to grow impatient with the men who sat in one parliament after another. The dissolution of parliament by main force on 20 April 1653 is but the extreme example of a man of whom many were to say that he had turned might into right. Yet while Charles I disliked and saw no purpose in parliament itself, Cromwell strove always to create the conditions in which a representative body of the nation could be re-established which put the public interest first and self-interest second. War has a habit of warping the best of intentions and the highest of motives. In the context of George VI's words, think of the saturation bombing of Dresden or British complicity in the annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; and in that same context think of Cromwell's levelling of Basing House or his killings in cold as well as hot blood at Drogheda and Wexford. Such things do not invalidate George VI's words; they simply demonstrate the difficulty of realising them without moral slippage.

But, as Frank Dobson reminded us on the 400th anniversary of Cromwell's birth, we admire Oliver because he was on the right side and thanks to him the right side won. We admire Cromwell's moral warts on the conscience as well as physical warts on the face because he was a man of towering personal integrity. How many other leaders have risen from the dust to supreme power and been so little corrupted by it? This is no Napoleon, no Stalin, no Hitler, no Idi Amin, no Ceaucescu. Cromwell's faith and his belief that he was the instrument of God's will protected him not only from the gross materialism and greed of those others, but also from their megalomania. If anything, Cromwell lost confidence in his own ability and his own fitness to rule as time went on. As he told his last parliament when he came in sorrow and in anger to dissolve it:

> I can say in the presence of God in comparison with whom we are but poor creeping ants upon the earth - I would have been glad to

have lived under my woodside, to have kept a flock of sheep rather than undertaken such a Government as this.

There is a danger in identifying ourselves too closely with Cromwell's achievement: the danger of anachronism, of seeing him too readily as the progenitor of modern constitutional and religious liberty. On the one hand it is perfectly reasonable to rejoice *morally* at the defeat of Hitler and of fascism in World War II, fought before most of us were alive, so cannot we rejoice *morally* at the victory of the values Cromwell stood for in so far as we see ourselves as the inheritors of them? On the other hand, the values he fought for are so specific to his age that it makes an easy anticipation of the present much harder than the events of 60-70 years ago. To take just one example: we all know and applaud Cromwell's commitment to religious liberty. But it had little to do with the modern commitment to religious pluralism and the *right* of free expression. Cromwell only believed in *outward* liberty and diversity, freedom from set forms and formularies, because he wanted to encourage a deeper *inner unity* as the Holy Spirit spoke with a single voice to everyone who was to be saved. As he wrote to the Speaker of the House of Commons on 14 September 1645:

> All that believe have the real unity, which is most glorious, because inward and spiritual, in the Body and to the Head. As for being united in forms, commonly called Uniformity, every Christian will for peace sake study to do, as far as conscience will permit.

Some would claim that there is another hazard of identifying ourselves too much with the historical Cromwell; the hazard of taking him at face value. Did he not kill a tyrant only to rule tyrannically? Did he not defend parliament against a king who would be rid of parliaments only to purge and forcibly disperse one parliament after another? Did he not proclaim that there was no greater hypocrisy than to claim freedom from the oppression of Laudian episcopacy, only to oppress Catholics and Quakers as soon as the yoke was removed? Did he not demand the release of John Lilburne from unjust imprisonment in 1640 only to be all too willing to keep him incarcerated without charge or conviction when himself in power? They are hard charges, and for Cromwell years in military harness when the issues were all black-and-white, as clearly distinguished as life and death, the exercise of power brought its harsh choices. He came to believe that the means justified the end, so long as he was absolutely clear in his conscience that that end was desired by God, had been manifested by God. Whatever the testimony of his contemporary critics, whether royalist critics, presbyterian critics, sectarian critics, or republican critics, his own words have an integrity that has swayed generations of those who have read them. I have exposed fifty of the brightest and best Cambridge



students in recent years to a year-long course in which they have studied all his known words, and pondered the opinions of twenty four men and one woman who knew him well and who recorded their suspicions and dislike of him; and I have acted as neutral umpire. Many of those students have come to believe that he was capable of quite extensive self-deception, but not one of them believes Cromwell to have been a cynical and ruthless liar. They have come to see that his actions were driven by a deep commitment to living out his principles whatever the cost to himself, and that those principles were rooted in a profound Christian faith and a deep commitment to seeking out God's message for him and his times in the scriptures and in the pattern of human affairs (divine providence). One does not have to share his faith to feel the deepest respect for his personal integrity, for his willingness to place his life and his own well-being on the line, to be true to the truth as he saw it. He shines out, as Mahatma Gandhi, St Theresa of Calcutta and Nelson Mandela stand out in our time, as people who lived out their faith and changed their world. There are more warts on the face of his career than theirs, perhaps, but there is surely the same inner strength and integrity. And his rhetoric is as brilliant and as convincing at its best as that of Winston Churchill or Martin Luther King. Alongside the moral authority of Churchill's wartime speeches or King's addresses to the civil rights marches, one can set Cromwell's advocacy of Christian Liberty, of social justice for the poor, of calling for rulers to be radically accountable for their actions, as passionately and movingly expressed. I find it hard not to say Amen to him when I read passages like these:

> In my pilgrimage and some exercises I had abroad, I did read that Scripture often, Forty First [chapter of] Isaiah; where God gave me, and some of my Fellows encouragement as to what He would do there and elsewhere; which he hath performed for us. He said 'he would plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah [sycamore] tree, and the myrtle and oil-tree; and He would set in the desert the fir-tree, and the pine-tree, and the box tree together.' For what end will the Lord do all this? That they may see, and know, and understand together, that He hath done and wrought all this for the good of the whole Flock. Therefore I beseech you...have a care of the whole flock: love the sheep, the lambs, love all, tender all, cherish and countenance all, in all things that are good. And if the poorest Christian, the most mistaken Christian, shall desire to live peaceably and quietly under you - I say if any shall desire but to lead a life of godliness and honesty, let him be protected. [Speech to Parliament, 4 July 1653]

Or again:

> There is one general grievance in the Nation. It is the law. Not that the Laws are a grievance; but there are laws that are; and the great grievance lies in the execution and administration. I think I may say it, I have as eminent judges in this land as have been had, as the Nation hath had, for these many years...The truth of it is there are wicked and abominable Laws, which it will be in your power to alter. To hang a man for six and eight-pence and I know not what, to hang for a trifle and acquit murder - is in the administration of law, through the ill framing of it. I have known in my experience abominable murders acquitted. And to see men lose their lives for petty matters: this is a thing God will reckon for. [Speech to Parliament, 17 September 1656]

The man we honour today should not be respected as the man who fought for the values we hold dearest. The man we honour today is not a man free from fault, from self-delusion, from a capacity for cruelty. He took the bigotry of his age to Ireland and he demonstrated an English arrogance of power in respect to the Irish people that was there before his time and has contributed, and still does contribute, to the problems of that troubled island. But to blame Cromwell for the slaughter in Ireland and for the policies of ethnic cleansing there in the seventeenth century is to let the English much more generally off the hook. He was nowhere near as bad as too many Irish people continue to believe; the English nation were much worse. So he was a man with the strengths and weaknesses of his age. But he had the strengths of his age and he sought to realise their full potential. This was an age of religious faith, and an age which recognised that liberty came with responsibilities (the quatercentary of his birth - 25 April 1999 - coincided with the slaughter of children in an Ohio schoolroom, a graphic example of what happens when the cause of liberty, in this case the liberty of the citizen to bear arms, hardens into a demand for a right). Cromwell is a dazzling example of a man who lived out his vision of liberty and while we cannot empathise with every particular of the vision, we can share the principle that we should seek to have and to live out our own vision of liberty. If we do not do so, we will not respond to the words of George VI. And the extent to which we do respond to his words is the extent to which we respond to a higher human calling. Look at them again:

> Such a principle, stripped of all disguise, is surely the mere primitive doctrine that might is right, and if this principle were established... then freedom...would be in danger; and the [people] would be kept in the bondage of fear...It is unthinkable that we should refuse to meet the challenge. It is to this high purpose that I now call people...The task will be hard. There may be dark days ahead, and war cannot be confined to the battlefield, but we can only do the



> right as we see the right, and reverently commit our cause to God. If one and all we keep resolutely to it, ready for whatever service or sacrifice it may demand, then with God's help we shall prevail.

Can any of us doubt that Cromwell could have spoken these words? Can any of us doubt that he would have lived by them? Would we have risked as much, suffered as much, attempted as much to make them a reality? The extent to which we assent to these propositions is the extent to which we honour him. In this 400th year since his birth, at this place which marks his passing, we salute him. *If one and all we keep resolutely to the cause of liberty, ready for whatever service or sacrifice it may demand, then with God's help we shall prevail.*

Professor John Morrill is Professor of British and Irish History and Vice Master and Fellow of Selwyn College, Cambridge. He was President of The Cromwell Association from 1990 to 1999 and is now a Vice President.

# THE EDUCATION OF MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN LAMBERT

*by David Farr*

Bulstrode Whitelocke stated that Lambert had 'studied in the Inns of court, and was of a subtle and working brain.'[1] The truth of the latter part of this statement is testified by, amongst other things, Lambert's part in the Heads of the Proposals, the Instrument of Government and the establishment of Durham College. The actual nature of Lambert's formal education has, however, apart from Whitelocke's comment, remained unexamined. Indeed, such was the perilous state of the family finances in the early seventeenth century, Lambert was fortunate to gain any kind of education at all, let alone one befitting his gentry status. That Lambert may have done so appears to be due to the help of those in his kinship circle and his link with them was to be a strong determinant with regard to the choice he had to make when civil war broke out.

Josias Lambert had reason for real concern for the future of his son, John Lambert, the future Major-General, as the value of the Lambert estates had deteriorated significantly during his stewardship. The position at Josias's death on 2 September 1632 is clear from the 'confession of the Reall and p[er]sonall estate late belonginge to Josias Lambert Esq'. The long and disadvantageous leases stand out, along with a mortgage of £500. Josias's debts in total amounted to £1300. The leases of the land mentioned in the document meant that 'there is but in possession onely Calton Hall & those lands in the wydowes Jointure'. This in total amounted to no more than £30 a year.[2] As Lambert was a minor when his father died, the Court of Wards granted his mother £20 a year from the Calton estate during her son's minority.[3] Matters were no doubt further complicated by Josias's first marriage to Elizabeth, daughter of William Claxton.[4] From this marriage he had a daughter, Cassandra.[5] Furthermore, the Major-General's sister, Jane, was described as a co-heir.[6]

Given the limited finances at Lambert's mother's disposal, it would seem probable that had Lambert attended university and one of the Inns of Court, he would have received funds from some other source. Wrightson has commented that

> in order to have attained university entrance they would already have had to be maintained at school until their late teens - a formidable burden for any parent. As for the Inns of Court, they offered no such avenues of advancement for the poor student. Maintaining a youth at an Inn meant expenditure of at least £40 a year, a very sizeable slice from the annual income of even the more wealthy of English families.[7]



The most likely source of such funds was Sir William Lister in the light of a deed of December 1629 in which Josias Lambert tried to secure the future of his son:

> to the preferment of John, his younger son, and of such other children as shall be living or in ventre matris at the time of his death and for the good and orderly bringing up and education in such sort as the said Sir William Lister, Martin Lister, etc, and Anne Lambert now wife of the said Josias and the more pte of them shall think meet.[8]

The deed, following a century of links between the two families, meant that when his father died in 1632 Lambert would be subject to the influence of the Lister family.

The leases mentioned in the 'confession of the Reall and p[er]sonall estate late belonging to Josias Lambert Esq', especially to Sir Richard Tempest and Thomas Heber, further suggest the link with the Listers.[9] Both Heber and Tempest are also recorded in the inquisition of Josias Lambert in 1632.[10] Their inclusion in both documents doubtless results from both of them being related to Lambert.[11] In turn, the Heber and Tempest families were related to the Lister family.[12] It is possible that Josias had arranged his estate before his death so that Sir William Lister could manage it in the interests of his son John.

Josias's wish that Sir William Lister should take care of the education of his son was far from the first link between the two families.[13] In 1534 Laurence Lister was granted a fifth part of the manor of Twiston from John Lambert.[14] Similarly, John Lambert was one of the witnesses to Christopher Lister's will in February 1548.[15] In 1609 Benjamin Lambert left money in his will to Sir William Lister's father, Laurence.[16] The Listers had also contracted various agreements with the Banester, Robinson and Greenacre families, who had married three of Josias Lambert's sisters.[17]

In the journal of the their distant kinsman, Nicholas Assheton, there are various accounts of the Lamberts' day to day interaction with their kin and gentry neighbours, reinforcing the evidence of the financial documents. For example, on 5 January 1618, Assheton recorded that he dined with Sir William Lister's sister, Mary, and was visited by Michael Lister and Mr

Lambert who had travelled from Waddow, the Tempest family residence.[18]

Josias Lambert's wish for his son's 'good and orderly bringing up and education in such sort as the said Sir William Lister, Martin Lister, etc, and Anne Lambert now wife of the said Josias and the more pte of them shall think meet' echoes a similar agreement made during Sir William Lister's own minority. Whilst trying to resolve difficulties over his marriage agreement, Lister recalled that

> whereas Laurence Lister Esqr yor orators laite father nowe deceased beinge very aged and infirme and yor orator then beinge in his minoritye yor orators said father did comitt tuicon and judgment of yor orator and of his estaite to Michaell Lister Esqr...and Martin Lister Esqr...[19]

Support for an education is a clear example of how kinship could operate and how the link with Sir William Lister would translate in practice for Lambert. Slater has commented that 'in this society it was family, defined here as parents and their children, who together with the kin were the brokers of access to opportunities of all kinds, whether educational or career, and especially of marriage.'[20] The evident long bond between the Lister and Lambert families was made concrete with the marriage of John Lambert to Frances Lister, Sir William's daughter, in 1638.[21]

Though it cannot be said with certainty, it is possible that this marriage was arranged, perhaps even before Josias Lambert died, as part of his debt transactions.[22] Even if it was arranged after Josias's death, the example of John Dutton's will requesting that his son might marry Cromwell's daughter, Frances, shows that such things were not uncommon.[23] Perhaps this was the nature of the agreement between Josias Lambert and Sir William Lister. From an examination of the grants of wardship in the Lambert estate papers, the link between wardship and marriage can be seen.[24] Further evidence in support of this contention comes from Sir William Lister's own minority. He stated that his aged father committed his tuition and guidance to two of his uncles. The surviving uncle then

> being very studious and carefull in the due and upright manageinge of the said charge...did for the benefitt and advancemente of yor orator and of his estaite enter into speech and communicacon wth Sr Henry Bellasis...for a mariage...[25]



Whatever its origin, the marriage to Frances Lister is of central importance to any understanding of Lambert. Slater has outlined the importance of marriage in the seventeenth century:

> the act of marriage expanded the network of relations upon whom an individual and his or her family of origin could legitimately make a variety of claims, marriage had a dimension of importance in a patronage society which it seldom has today.[26]

It is the long link between the Lambert and Lister families, cemented by the marriage of Frances Lister and John Lambert that, in the light of the 1629 deed, suggests that a John Lambert who attended Trinity, Cambridge, in 1636 was the future Major-General.

In the Admissions to Trinity College, Cambridge, on 14 March 1635/6 there is entered as a pensioner a John Lambert. The only other information supplied is that he was assigned a Mr Hall as his tutor, that he matriculated in 1636 and that he did not graduate.[27] Our John Lambert in 1635/6 was sixteen and a half years old. This was the normal age for entering university during this period.[28] This is, of course, far from conclusive evidence of Lambert having attended Trinity. What is more revealing and of more weight are the facts surrounding the education of Sir William Lister's sons. This is, of course, with reference to Josias Lambert's wish that Sir William Lister play a part in the education of his son.

On 30 May 1636 two of Sir William Lister's sons, Henry and Christopher, were admitted as pensioners at Trinity College, Cambridge. Henry Lister matriculated in 1636, received his B.A. in 1639/40, his M.A. in 1643 and was a Fellow from 1640 until he was ejected in 1644. Christopher Lister also matriculated in 1636 and is listed as a Scholar in 1638.[29] That Sir William Lister sent two of his sons to Trinity in 1636 suggests that the John Lambert listed as entering Trinity in the same year was the future Major-General.[30]

Although not conclusive, the names in the Admission register of Trinity of students who were later linked with Major-General Lambert is supportive of the suggestion that the John Lambert who attended Trinity was the Major-General.[31] Further evidence from 1654 links Lambert to a Cambridge education. In September 1654 Lambert was one of thirty appointed Visitors to the University. A consideration of the nine other 'politicians' appointed as Visitors shows that five had attended a Cambridge College and two were from the area.[32]

Students at Trinity and Cambridge generally linked to Lambert, 1630-39

| name | county | college | admitted/ matriculated | link to Lambert |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Christopher Lister | Yorks | Trinity | 30 May 1630 | son of Sir William Lister |
| Henry Lister | Yorks | Trinity | 30 May 1630 | son of Sir William Lister |
| Christopher Lancaster | | Trinity | matric 1634 | Rector of Burnsall |
| Martin Topham | | Trinity | matric 1638 | related to the Tophams* |
| Ralph Freeman | | Trinity | 25 May 1639 | buys land in Coverdale with Lambert |
| William Swifte | Yorks? | Trinity | matric 1639 | Lambert's secretary |
| Henry Liddell | Cumb | Peter-house | 3 May 1636 | 3rd son of Sir Thomas, committed prisoner to Lambert's house |
| John Belasyse | Yorks | Peter-house | 28 March 1636 | related to Lambert through Lister |

* both John and Thomas Topham, who had been linked to the Lambert family from the late 1500s, had been to Cambridge. John Topham set up a grammar school in Kirkby Malhamdale with Lambert's uncle Benjamin.

The Mr Hall listed as Lambert's tutor was one Henry Hall. Hall himself had been a student at Trinity. Admitted in 1620, he became a Scholar in



1624, received his B.A. in 1624/5, was elected a Fellow in 1627, received his M.A. in 1628 and his B.D. in 1638. From 1640 to 1644 Hall held the position of Vicar of Kendal in Cumberland, a living that was in the gift of Trinity College.[33] Evidence suggests, however, that Hall never actually went to Kendal. In January 1640/41 Hall was preaching in the parish of St Andrew's, Norwich. St Andrew's was controlled by the magistrates and councilmen of Norwich. Evans described it as 'one of the most famous nonconformist strongholds in East Anglia since the mid-Elizabethan period, and invariably they had sponsored Puritans.'[34] In 1644 Hall resigned his Kendal living.[35]

Hall as a tutor would be in a position of strong influence over his students. Curtis has shown how far all aspects of a student's life at university could be directed by his tutor.

> In addition to their teaching duties, tutors supervised the moral and spiritual welfare of their charges - a major responsibility which made the choice of the right tutor, with an approved religious outlook, more important to parents than the choice of a college. There is no doubt that tutors could, and did, exercise great influence on the beliefs of their students.[36]

The rule that pupils should go to their tutor for nightly prayers simply reinforced the possible influence a tutor could have. Unfortunately little of real substance can be recovered of Hall's views while he was at Trinity. Some evidence of his religious persuasion comes from a sermon he delivered to the House of Commons at their monthly fast on 29 May 1644.[37] Whilst there are dangers in using later evidence, the sermon's content would suggest that Hall during his time at Trinity was unlikely to have favoured Laud's view of the Church and that he desired further reformation.[38]

Hall entitled his sermon *Heaven Ravished: or A Glorious Prize, achieved by an Heroicall Enterprize*. Taking as his text Matthew 11:12, 'And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force', Hall argued that the rule of Christ was imminent. Hall told the Commons that those who wanted to be included in Christ's rule had to be 'earnest and violent in pursuance of it'. On the subject of 'Christ's enemies' Hall also sarcastically commented on the royalists' justification for taking up arms. Finally, if it was Major-General Lambert that attended Trinity, his military activism would have earned the seal of a tutor who could state so forcefully

> This cause of God is of that Nature, that if a man do not appear in it, and gather with Christ, he scattereth from him, there being no middle condition possible in which a man can close or side with any other than the devill, who joynes not with Christ.[39]

Lambert's Kin at Gray's Inn, November 1635 to March 1640/1

| name | admitted | kinship link |
|---|---|---|
| Thomas Morley | 13 Nov. 1635 | son of Cassandra Morley, Lambert's step-sister |
| Thomas Heber | 2 Feb. 1638/9 | Lambert's mother was Anne Heber, Thomas's aunt |
| John Bright | 18 June 1639 | married widow of Sir William Lister's eldest son, also William. Involved in trusts with Lambert |
| Christopher Lister | 13 Aug. 1639 | son of Sir William Lister |
| Ralph Ashton | 13 Aug. 1639 | related through Nicholas Assheton and the Greenacre family |
| Thomas Lister | 2 Nov. 1639 | Westby branch of the Lister family |
| John Balasyse | 16 March 1640/1 | related through Sir William Lister |
| Thomas Fairfax | 16 March 1640/1 | Menston branch. Related through Sir William Lister |
| Charles Fairfax | 21 March 1640/1 | Son of Ferdinando. Related through Sir William Lister |

Whitelocke's statement, however, specifically referred to Lambert having attended one of the Inns of Court. The admission registers of the four Inns do not contain an entry for a John Lambert in the 1630s or 1640s. Sir William Lister's son, Christopher, who had entered Trinity in 1636, is listed as having been admitted to Gray's Inn in August 1639. This fits the



Lister family history. Sir William Lister's grandfather entered Gray's Inn in 1578 and his eldest son, also called William, entered Gray's Inn in March 1628/9.[40] Other relations of Lambert are also prominent in the admissions register of Gray's Inn, including Thomas Morley, Thomas Heber and John Belasyse.[41] There is also the fact that of those of Yorkshire origins admitted to the Inns in the period 1590-1639, 60% entered Gray's Inn.[42] There is, however, no tradition of Lambert having attending Gray's Inn.[43] John Lambert, the founder of the Calton Lambert family, had been admitted to the Middle Temple in 1522 and the Major-General's eldest son, also called John, was admitted to Lincoln's Inn on 24 April 1665.[44]

Without documentary evidence of Lambert's attendance, it is necessary to examine the plausibility of Whitelocke's statement. Whitelocke was a lawyer called to the bar at the Middle Temple in 1626. Given Whitelocke's self-pride,[45] the corporate pride of lawyers and Whitelocke's fairly regular presence around the Inns during the period 1636-42, he was in a position to know if Lambert attended the Inns.[46] There is the fact that Lambert and Whitelocke definitely met each other at least a year before Whitelocke's statement about Lambert's education, for on 12 May 1646 Whitelocke records that whilst at Oxford he was admitted to the councils of war of Fairfax, Cromwell, Ireton, Lambert, Fleetwood and the other 'great commanders'.[47] On 29 June 1646 Whitelocke wrote

> The general commanded a select council, Cromwell, Ireton, Lambert, Fleetwood and myself, to consult about disposing part of the army to several places and sieges where there was need of them; and also about reducing of Wallingford, and what conditions to send to them.[48]

As well as this, there was the continued presence of both men in government in the 1650s and examples of friendly, informal meetings between them.[49] This is important because Whitelocke transcribed his 'Annales', which were to be edited and appear as the *Memorials*, after 1660. Thus his continued presence with Lambert in office would have given him the opportunity to change the entry concerning Lambert's presence at the Inns if it was wrong.[50] Furthermore, notice needs to be taken of Lambert's role in efforts to reform the law generally and more particularly of his attempt at establishing a Court at York.[51] On 15 December 1659 Whitelocke was present at a General Council of Officers. Here a colonel launched a bitter verbal attack against Whitelocke and his profession. Whitelocke noted in his diary that it was Lambert who defended him and his profession.[52]

Whitelocke was certainly correct in his statement with regard to Henry Ireton. On 24 November 1629 Ireton had been admitted to the Middle Temple.[53] This also suggests that he is likely to have been correct with regard to Lambert. The absence of any entry for Lambert in the admissions registers to the four Inns should not be taken as conclusive proof that he had not attended any of them. Rather, it should be considered in line with Prest's finding 'that quite a few cases of bona fide members who escaped the admissions registers altogether have come to light'.[54]

If Lambert attended one of the Inns, it was likely just to provide him with a basic sense of the law rather than with the intention to practise it like Henry Ireton, and it is probable that at some point Lambert returned to the north to manage the family estates.[55] The lack of any detail concerning Lambert, until his marriage to Frances Lister in 1639, is simply a reflection of his relative unimportance and the everyday nature of his life at that time, in much the same way as very little is known about Cromwell's life between entering Sidney Sussex in 1616 and his marriage in 1621.[56]

Evidence concerning the nature of Lambert's education is suggestive rather than conclusive. The effect that a university and law education would have had on Lambert's political and religious opinions is virtually impossible to quantify given the limits of the source material. Clearly whatever kind of education he did receive would have had some impact on his role in the treaties, declarations and organisation of the Northern Association Army, the New Model Army and in government during the 1650s.

One of the most obvious examples of this was Lambert's central role in the establishment of Durham College. Although not in total control of the project, Lambert was very much the guiding influence in the fulfilment of the long held desires of northerners for their own college and alongside him as one of the Durham Visitors were men closely connected to him.[57] The other clear link to education during his time of prominence was the dedication to Lambert of a criticism of the universities made by John Webster in *Academiarum Examen*. In his dedication of the work to Lambert, as well as seeing him as an instrument of religious toleration, Webster regarded Lambert as a force to

> endeavour for the purging and reforming of Academies, and the advancement of Learning, which hitherto hath been little promoted or look'd into. And I am more imboldened in this confidence, having experimental knowledge and trial, not onely of your Honours Abilities that way, but also of your sincere affection and unparalleled love to Learning, and to all those that are lovers and promoters therof.[58]



Alongside the evidence of his public role in the 1640s and 1650s, Lambert's private actions also hint at his intelligent and enquiring mind. Requesting books, purchasing paintings, and noted for his interest in botany and astrology and even fishing, Lambert has also been recorded as taking on the role of physician. Lambert was very much 'a soldier, aesthete and statesman'.[59]

If there is no precise detail concerning what education Lambert received or the role Sir William Lister played in his education, the link with Lister had more long term consequences for Lambert than the funds for an education.[60] The Lister network was essential to Lambert's social and ideological development and crucial when it came to the moment of war in 1642. The kinship ties of his family, and after 1639 those of his father-in-law, were extremely important for Lambert, not only at a personal level but in terms of his future standing and as a motivation for some of his actions during the height of his powers in the 1650s.[61]

Notes

1. B Whitelocke, *Memorials of English Affairs from the Beginning of the Reign of Charles the First to the Happy Restoration of King Charles the Second* (4 vols, Oxford, 1853), II, 254.
2. PRO, Ward 5/49, 6 Nov. 1632.
3. PRO, Ward 9/218, p. 271, 9 Sept. 1632. Clarendon believed that 'As a result of the exactions of the Court of Wards all the rich families of England, of noblemen and gentlemen, were exceedingly incensed, and even indevoted to the Crown', W Dunn Macray (ed), *Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* (6 vols, Oxford, 1992), I, 99. Lambert would be, as Cliffe commented, one of the 'twenty heads of parliamentarian families [in Yorkshire that] had once been wards of the Crown', J T Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (London, 1969), p. 350.
4. J Foster (ed), *Pedigrees Recorded at the Visitations of the County Palatine of Durham in 1575, 1615 and 1666* (London, 1887). The Claxtons continued to be connected with the Lamberts. The son, or grandson, of this William acted as one of Lambert's adjutants and as his steward at Wimbledon. The link between the two families continued, for in an examination of the estate of Lambert's eldest son in 1695 entitled 'A Perticular of the Estate of John Lambert, Esquire', taken by his 'brother' John Hooke, it was recorded that land in Calton worth £27.13.4 had been let to a 'Mr Claxton', Yorkshire Archaeological Society [hereafter YAS], Ms. 731d, Belsay Mss.
5. Both Cassandra Lambert and her husband Francis Morley of Wennington were Catholics. Francis fought for Charles I against John

Lambert before he switched his allegiance to parliament. F R Raines (ed), *The Visitation of the County Palatine of Lancaster, 1613* (Chetham Society, 82, 1871), p. 68. For the involvement of the Morleys and Claxtons in Lambert affairs see YAS, Ms. 731d. For the long term consequences of this on Lambert in the 1650s see D Farr, 'The Military and Political Career of John Lambert, 1619-57', (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1996), pp. 121-23. Some of these findings were presented in a paper given at the Institute of Historical Research in May 1995 on 'Kinship, Catholics and cavaliers in the career of John Lambert' and to be further developed in forthcoming work.

6. British Library, Harleian Ms. 1487, f. 354.
7. K Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680* (London, 1982), p. 187; C Hill, *Liberty Against the Law* (London, 1996), p. 266. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry*, p. 76 quotes the example of the widowed mother of John Robinson who was a ward in 1622. The Court had allowed her £30 a year, £10 more than Lambert's mother was granted ten years later, which she claimed was insufficient, 'he being nowe 15 yeares of age and a fellowe Commoner in Cambridge where he cannot be well mainteyned under 100 markes per annum'.
8. J W Morkill, *The Parish of Kirkby Malhamdale in the West Riding of Yorkshire* (Gloucester, 1933), p. 155. From this it appears that John Lambert was a younger son and that his mother was Anne. Because of the lack of evidence surrounding Lambert's elder brother no conclusions can be drawn on the likely influence of being a younger son. For issues involving younger sons see M Finch, *The Wealth of Five Northamptonshire Families, 1540-1640* (Northants Record Society, 19, 1956), J Thirsk, 'Younger sons in the seventeenth century', *History*, 54 (1969), pp. 358-77, and L Stone, 'Social mobility in England 1500-1700', *Past & Present*, 33 (1966), pp. 16-56.
9. Thomas Heber was the father of Josias's wife, Anne. Josias Lambert's inquisition includes John Topham, Richard Tempest and Thomas Heber, PRO, C142/486/120. The Heber family had long been connected with the Lamberts. In 1519 a Thomas Heber was acting as an attorney for John Lambert, the founder of the family, YAS, Calton Deeds, DD203/154. The relatively equal economic standing of the two families is suggested by their respective payments in the subsidy rolls from 1563 to 1597-8, R W Hoyle, 'Land and Landed Relations in Craven, Yorkshire, c 1520-1600', (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1986), table 2.5. See also PRO, E179/207/188. In 1579 Heber's son was described as a freeholder, Hoyle, 'Craven', p. 12. In 1611 Thomas Heber's descendant, of the same name, granted with Josias Lambert long term leases of land they held in Airton, Skipton Public Library, Raistrick Ms. 366. The leases, for 1000 years and 5000 years, are again examples of Josias's disadvantageous financial policy. On



5 Sept. 1616 Josias granted all his lands to nine men, including Martin and Michael Lister, Thomas Heber and Thomas Tempest 'of Stelley in Bishopric of Durham', another member of the Tempest family. The nine would hold the lands 'on behoof of said Josias Lambert and heirs lawfully begotten, and in default of such issue to behoof of Samuell Lambert naturall brother of said Josias', YAS, Ms. 731d, 1 Nov. 1618, Belsay Ms. Box 7/I/7. Another man included by Josias in this grant was William Lowther. His daughter, born 21 Nov. 1600, was the wife of Thomas Heber. See J Foster (ed), *Pedigrees Recorded at the Herald's Visitation of the Counties of Cumberland and Westmorland 1615, 1666* (Carlisle, 1891), p. 83.

10. PRO, C142/486/120.
11. Foster (ed), *Durham Visitation*, Robert Lambert of Owlton married Anne, daughter of Robert Tempest of Stella and sister of Sir Thomas Tempest.
12. See also PRO, Ward 5/49, 1619, 'The confession of Thomas Heber of the estate of Thomas Lister...'. For some of Lister's pre-war involvement with Tempest, see M A E Green (ed), *Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, 1643-60* (5 vols, London, 1889-93), p. 2432. M E Lancaster, *The Tempests of Broughton* (Broughton Hall, 1987), p. 50.
13. Both families had married members of the Banister and Bankes families.
14. H L L Denny, *Memorials of an Ancient House: A History of the Family of Lister or Lyster* (Edinburgh, 1913), p. 164. This was the second son of William Lister, not Sir William's father.
15. Borthwick Institute, York, wills, 6 Feb. 1548, proved May 1549, vol. 13, f. 510. Christopher Lister was the great-grandfather of Sir William Lister.
16. Borthwick Institute, York, wills, 20 Aug. 1609, proved 9 Dec. 1609, vol. 31, f. 209.
17. YAS, MD234/67; Hoyle, 'Craven', pp. 27, 32-3, 51; YAS, MD234/209-10; YAS, MD234/69, 198-9. For a detailed consideration of the Lambert family and its connections from 1515 to 1642 see Farr, 'John Lambert', pp. 11-42.
18. F R Raines (ed), *The Journal of Nicholas Assheton of Downham, in the County of Lancaster, Esq, for Part of the Year 1617 and Part of the Year Following* (Chetham Society, 14, 1848), p. 74.
19. PRO, C3/365/41.
20. M. Slater, 'The weightiest business: marriage in an upper gentry family in seventeenth century England', *Past & Present*, 72 (1976), pp. 25-54, especially p. 27.
21. *The Parish Register of Kirkby Malhamdale, vol I, 1597-1690* (Yorkshire Parish Register Society, 106, 1938), p. 89.
22. Slater, 'The weightiest business'. Age was not seen as a problem. The bride selected for Sir Ralph Verney was only thirteen. Thus it is possible

that Lister and Josias Lambert had discussed marriage between their two families. Lambert had just turned twelve when his father died in 1632.

23. H M Margoliouth (ed), *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell* (2nd edn, 2 vols, Oxford, 1971), II, 304-5, 377. Financial concerns usually played some part in marriage negotiations amongst the gentry. This can be seen, for example, in relation to Cromwell's part in the marriage negotiations of his son Richard; see D Farr, 'Oliver Cromwell and a 1647 case in Chancery', *Historical Research*, 71 (1998), pp. 341-6.
24. YAS, Calton papers, DD203/159-62.
25. PRO, C3/365/41; Sheffield City Library Archives, Bright Papers, BR86(a), passim.
26. Slater, 'The weightiest business', p. 31.
27. W W Rouse Ball and J A Venn, *Admissions to Trinity College, Cambridge* (2 vols, London, 1913), II (1546-1700), 351. W H Dawson also mentions this entry in the admission register and Whitelocke's statement in *Cromwell's Understudy: The Life and Times of General John Lambert* (London, 1938), pp. 15-16. He does not, however, explore the question of Lambert's education any further. That Lambert did not graduate was not unusual. Curtis has stated that 'Many of the young gentlemen who came to the universities had no intention of taking a degree. Frequently they came only for one or two years before they went down to read at the Inns of Court, to travel abroad, or to return to their homes and estates.' M H Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition, 1558-1642* (Oxford, 1959), p. 127.
28. L Stone, 'The age of admission to college in seventeenth century England', *History of Education*, 9 no. 2 (1980), pp. 97-9.
29. J Venn (ed), *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (10 vols, Cambridge, 1922-54), III, p. 89.
30. In 1635 Laurence Lister, another of Sir William's sons, entered Kings College, Cambridge, where he became a Fellow before he died in 1639. Again this suggests that if Sir William Lister funded Lambert's education anywhere, it was likely to be Cambridge. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, III, p. 90; L P Smith (ed), *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (2 vols, Oxford, 1907), I, 350.
31. See the table of 'Student at Trinity and Cambridge generally linked to Lambert, 1630-39', p. 12 above.
32. J Twigg, *The University of Cambridge and the English Revolution, 1625-88* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 177, n. 123.
33. R S Ferguson, *A History of Westmorland* (London, 1894), p. 180.
34. J T Evans, *Seventeenth Century Norwich. Politics, Religion and Government, 1620-90* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 85, 129. When Hall was a prominent member of the Westminster Assembly, he was described as 'of Norwich', A F Mitchell and J Struthers (eds), *Minutes of the Sessions*



*of the Westminster Assembly of Divines* (London, 1874); J Reid, *Memoirs of the Westminster Divines* (Edinburgh, 1892).

35. B Nightingale, *The Ejected of 1662 in Cumberland and Westmorland: Their Predecessors and Successors* (2 vols, Manchester, 1911), II, 677.
36. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642*, pp. 80, 98, 107-9, 113-14.
37. H Hall, *Heaven Ravished: or A Glorious Prize, achieved by an Heroicall Enterprize* (London, 1644).
38. *Ibid*, pp. 23-4, 28. The invitation to Hall to preach came from Francis Rous, MP. The choice of Rous might be related to his representation of the same or neighbouring location to where Hall held office. Rous's religious convictions, his drift from presbyterianism to independency in 1649, are a close reflection of the views expressed by Hall at the Westminster Assembly and in his sermon. Also, Rous himself was a member of the Assembly. This may provide the link between the two. Nevertheless, the fact that Rous extended the invitation does not necessarily signify any correlation between his and Hall's views. This similarly applies to the fact that Hall was thanked and requested to print his sermon by Rous. In this task, though, he was partnered by a Mr Harman, *Commons Journal*, III, 468, 24 April 1644. This was the Norwich MP Richard Harman, who had lived and had several of his children baptised in St Andrew's parish. On 2 Dec. 1646 Harman was buried at St Andrew's. It is likely that Harman was chosen for his geographical link to Hall rather than his lukewarm support for parliament. For Harman see Evans, *Norwich*; T Hawes (ed), *An Index to Norwich City Officers, 1453-1835* (Norfolk Record Society, 52, 1986); M Keeler, *The Long Parliament, 1640-1. A Biographical Study of its Members* (Philadelphia, 1954), pp. 203-4; D Brunton and D H Pennington, *Members of the Long Parliament* (London, 1954), p. 81; B Cozens-Hardy and E A Kent, *The Mayors of Norwich 1403 to 1835* (Norwich, 1938), p. 80. The debates of the Westminster Assembly provide further information concerning Hall. Robert Baillie recorded that Hall was against 'ruling elders' and that he regarded him as one of the ablest divines in the Assembly, D Laing (ed), *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie* (3 vols, Bannatyne Club, 1841), II, 110; J Reid, *Memoirs of the Westminster Divines* (Edinburgh, 1982), p. 5; R S Paul, *The Assembly of the Lord. Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'Great Debate'* (Edinburgh, 1985), p. 164. Baillie also notes that a Dr Smith is against ruling elders. The only Smith in the Assembly was Peter 'Brocket' Smith. Smith had also preached to the Commons on 29 May 1644 in the morning before Henry Hall's sermon. Hall and Smith were probably chosen together for the closeness of their views. In an account of some of the proceedings of the Assembly, Hall's part in the debates on ruling elders is remarked upon, J Rogers Pitman (ed), *The Whole*

*Works of Rev John Lightfoot* (13 vols, London, 1824), XIII, 66. Hall made this speech on Monday 27 Nov. 1643. Mr Seaman was Lazarus Seaman, B.D., of All Hallows, Bread Street, London, then Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge. It appears that, in 1644 at least, Hall was not necessarily against the concept of bishops: 'I am inclinable to believe that ther hath been 2 sorts of presbiters de facto in the church but then they have been both preaching presbiters', Paul, *Assembly*, p. 170. Another possible source of information concerning Hall is that relating to his role as a preacher in London while a member of the Assembly. On 12 July 1645 the inhabitants of Westminster petitioned that those who preached the weekly morning lecture at the Abbey should receive adequate maintenance. Hall is listed with five other members of the Assembly - Edmund Stanton, Stephen Marshall, Herbert Palmer, Philip Nye and Jeremiah Whitaker, S W Carruthers, *The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly* (Philadelphia, 1943), p. 137. Whether Hall, like so many others, adapted his views to changing circumstances is unknown. By 9 Feb. 1646/7 he was dead. Mitchell and Struthers, *Minutes*, p. 327; J Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament. Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640-48* (Princeton, 1969), p. 101.

39. Hall, *Heaven Ravished*, pp. 56-7.
40. J Foster (ed), *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889* (London, 1889), p. 223; Foster's transcript index of 'Entries at Inns of Court to 1800', pp. 133-4, Cambridge University Library, Additional Mss. 6694-98. There is no record of either individual in the admissions registers of Oxford or Cambridge. See the table for a fuller evaluation of Lambert's kin admitted to Gray's Inn, p. 14 above.
41. Foster, *Admissions to Gray's Inn*, pp. 210, 221, 223, 229. John Bright, who later was a colonel in the parliamentary army and married the widow of William Lister, the eldest son of Sir William killed at Tadcaster on 7 Dec. 1642, was also admitted to Gray's Inn on 18 June 1639. See the table of Lambert's kin admitted to Gray's Inn.
42. W R Prest, *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640* (London, 1972), p. 33. These figures are calculated from Prest's table of regional origins of members admitted 1590-1639. For Yorkshire the figures for the four Inns are: Gray's Inn 59.72%, Inner Temple 15.28%, Lincoln's Inn 15.74%, Middle Temple 9.26%.
43. Despite the lack of an entry in the Gray's Inn registers for Lambert, G H Brown, 'The Place of Sir Arthur Hesilrige in English Politics, 1659-60' (unpublished B.Litt, University of Oxford, 1949), p. 8, had no doubts about Lambert's attendance at Gray's Inn.
44. Foster, transcript index, p. 107; *The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, Admissions from AD 1402 to AD 1799* (Lincoln's Inn, 1896), p. 296. Lincoln's Inn Archives, DIb 14-15, lease dated '26th 1688', mentions a John Lambert as one of the senior members of Furnival's



Inn. It is not clear if this is Lambert's eldest son. I would like to thank Guy Holborn, Librarian at Lincoln's Inn, for this reference.

45. R Spalding, *The Improbable Puritan. A Life of Bulstrode Whitelocke 1605-75* (London, 1975), p. 13; Whitelocke, *Memorials*, II, 204, 244.
46. Spalding, *Improbable Puritan*.
47. Whitelocke, *Memorials*, II, 204.
48. *Ibid*, II, 244.
49. R Spalding, *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke 1605-75* (Oxford, 1990), p. 390.
50. Spalding, *Improbable Puritan*, preface; Spalding, *Diary*, pp. xix-xx.
51. N L Matthews, *William Sheppard, Cromwell's Law Reformer* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 39-42, 55-6, 129, 160, 187, 199-200.
52. Spalding, *Diary*, p. 550.
53. J L Dean, 'Henry Ireton, the Mosaic Law, and Morality in English Civil Politics from April 1646 to May 1649' (unpublished M.Litt., University of Cambridge, 1991), p. 55.
54. Prest, *Inns of Court*, p. 10; G E Aylmer, *The State's Servants. The Civil Service of the English Republic, 1649-60* (London, 1973), pp. 187-88.
55. Dean, 'Henry Ireton', p. 51.
56. P Gaunt, *Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford, 1996), p. 32; J Morrill (ed), *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London, 1990), pp. 23-4; R Tong, 'Cromwell and Cambridge', *Cromwelliana*, (1984-5), pp. 22-30.
57. For the central role played by Lambert in the establishment of Durham College see C Webster, *The Great Instauration. Science, Medicine and Reform 1626-60* (London, 1975), p. 233; Farr, 'John Lambert', pp. 218-20. In 1604 there were plans for a college at Ripon. In 1641 parliament received a petition calling for a university in Manchester in which the Fairfaxes were involved, see Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 208.
58. J Webster, *Academiarum Examen* (1653), dedication.
59. R Hutton, *The British Republic 1649-60* (London, 1990), pp. 122-3.
60. In 1640 Lambert and Lister were partners in a land transaction, Green, *Calendar of the Committee for Compounding*, p. 2771.
61. For their importance in Lambert's life post-1660 see D Farr, 'New information with regard to the imprisonment of Major General John Lambert, 1662-84', *Cromwelliana*, (1998), pp. 44-56; D Farr, 'John Blackwell and Daniel Cox: further notes on their activities in Restoration England and British North America', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, (July 1999), pp. 227-33.

David Farr is Head of History at Norwich School and author of a number of articles concerning various aspects of the career of John Lambert.

# WRITINGS AND SOURCES III
# CROMWELL'S DEATH AT CHEPSTOW, SUMMER 1648

*by Peter Gaunt*

In summer 1648 Cromwell, as second-in-command of the New Model Army, was dispatched westwards to crush the serious rebellion which had broken out in South Wales. In fact, the main rebel army was defeated by local forces at St Fagans on 8 May, before Cromwell had arrived. Instead, he led and co-ordinated operations to mop up in southern Pembrokeshire, especially the long and bitter siege of the rebel-held walled town and castle of Pembroke, which eventually surrendered on 11 July. Cromwell then hurried away to engage the Scottish-royalist army of invasion in northern England. His route to and from Pembrokeshire was along the main south coast road, passing through Gloucester in both directions. There is no doubt that he visited Chepstow. As the first objective of his Welsh campaign, he captured the walled town with minimal opposition on 11 May, though the rebel-held castle offered more resistance, and Cromwell and most of his troops marched on three days later, leaving a unit under Colonel Ewer to continue the operation; after a heavy bombardment breached the outer walls, Ewer and his men stormed the castle, capturing it and killing most of the royalist garrison in the process. Cromwell may have passed through again very briefly during the latter half of July, for he was back in Gloucester by 24 July. According to tradition, he lodged on 11-14 May in a much renewed late medieval house in Bridge Street.

The pamphlet reproduced here gives an account of Cromwell's supposed death and death-bed pronouncements at Chepstow during summer 1648. George Thomason acquired his copy of the pamphlet, now in the British Library, on 27 July, suggesting that - assuming it made any attempt at factual connections - it might be tied to Cromwell's second, later visit to the town. Indeed, in giving advice to the officers gathered around his death-bed, Cromwell is made to refer to the various 'overtures...[and] interchanges of fortunes and events we have met with, since our first advance here in Wales', to the fact that the Welsh appeared 'utterly defeated', and to the weariness of the parliamentary troops through 'long and continued service', implying that the Welsh campaign was substantially over, though he warns the officers of continuing Welsh threats and dangers and gives them advice about suitable terrain for any future field engagements. Cromwell was supposedly expiring at Chepstow of an undefined affliction or illness - 'his growing infirmity' - compounded by the effects of a wound 'he had lately received'. In reality, he appears to have been in good health at this time and there is no reference in surviving



accounts to Cromwell being wounded during his Welsh campaign. He lived for a further ten years and did not, of course, die until September 1658. This is, then, a fabricated and false account.

The pamphlet is rather curious. Its whole premise is completely fictitious and on some points of detail it is also factually ill-informed. For example, Commissary General Henry Ireton was serving under Fairfax in Kent and Essex during the summer and could not have been present at Chepstow. The text begins and ends as a third person account, allegedly related by an eye-witness to the events. However, the central part of the text is written as a first person account, apparently quoting or closely paraphrasing Cromwell's own words. In places, the pamphlet comes across as rather unsubtle anti-Cromwell and anti-Independency propaganda, much of it apparently written from a perspective sympathetic to the king and to settlement with him. Thus Cromwell confesses that he had sought to create anarchy under the 'stile of Independancy' and to acquire 'personal Soveraignty', and that in order to thwart any possible constitutional settlement with the crown he had engineered the king's flight from Hampton Court by spreading false rumours of assassination plans while at the same time expressing insincere concern for the king's well-being. References to secret discussions and agreements with Saye and Sele and Skippon hint at murky 'plots and designes...long time in hatching', in the latter's case perhaps an agreement as early as 1645 to work to remove king and monarchy. And yet opportunities further to damn Cromwell are not taken. He is portrayed as dying bravely, with some dignity, entrusting his soul to God, and there is no attempt to show a particularly gory, humiliating or troubled death. Again, although the pamphlet opens by promising to reveal the contents of Cromwell's will, it does not, in fact, do so, and the opportunity to concoct a spiteful, mean, pathetic document is not taken. Some of Cromwell's supposed utterances are sound and rational. The assessments of Fairfax and Manchester have generally been supported by historians and the advice to be wary of a Welsh revival and to avoid being lured into the mountains is sound and sensible. The request to his officers to allow his weary troops time for 'refreshment', the desire that in the circumstances the outward show and ceremonial of funeral rights be dispensed with as they 'might prejudice you...[and] could do me no good' and the cool assessment that 'if the wheel turne, it [his estate] will be disposed of by Others for me' are not only realistic but also have a genuine Cromwellian ring to them, consistent with his character and outlook. In short, while this is clearly a fictitious account written from a biased perspective in an attempt to blacken Cromwell's reputation and perhaps to undermine the objectives and the faction for which he stood, this is not simply a crude royalist or presbyterian rant.

**********

Lieutenant Generall Cromwell's last Will & Testament
with
The Military Directions he gave his Field-Officers
a little before his Death.
London. Printed the year 1648.

Lieutenant Generall Cromwell's last Will & Testament.

To return a full Satisfaction to all Such as have wondred, why in all this time and torrent of agency & imployment, wherein so subtile and serious a sconce[1] as Lieutenant Generall Cromwell's might have been of such infinite concerne; He was never heard of either by Letter, or any other intervening Message. He, who was an Eye-witnesse of his Death and Buriall, shall briefly relate in every Circumstance, both truly and punctually where and how He died: in what manner he intended to have his Estate disposed: whom he principally intrusted: with the expresse directions communicated to his Commanders and Field-Officers for the better management of their Military affaires before he died.

Lieutenant Generall Oliver Cromwell, being then at Chepstow where his Head-quarters lay, and finding himself every day weaker then other, upon his growing infirmity, aggravated by the Wound he had lately received, and despairing of all means of recovery; having the night before been tormented with grievous and those incessant Convulsions: The very next Morning early, he was pleased to call unto him Commissary Ireton, Colonel Horton, Col Lewis, Captain Jones, Capt Read and Capt Griffiths, with others, in whose intimacy and secrecy he principally confided. These Gentlemen desirous to know his Commands, came towards his Bed, and drawing aside the Curtains: at the very first, fetching a deep sigh, he discovered unto them all his incurable condition, and that his approaching end did not so much trouble him, (though Death were the greatest Summons of terror to all Flesh) as his leaving the World, before his intended Designes arrived their wished period. He ingenuously acknowledged, that it was his absolute aime ever, by the assistance and incouragement of the L. Say,[2] to introduce an Anarchy, under the implicite stile of Independancy: yet he must confesse withall, that there were some rising thoughts of personall Soveraignty in him, which though he shrowded and smothered for the time, yet he hoped (had not Death abridged his hopes) to have advanced to their full height.

How his continued successe in the whole pursuit and carriage of his actions had begot in him both love and feare. Neither did he feare much the



emulation of the Generall:[3] nor Opposition of any other, in his quest after honour. For he knew well, how the Generall, though he had priority in Command: yet so long as they managed the Military affairs of the Kingdom together, he would never take in hand to plough without his Heyfer: Being such an active Foe, as the Enemy might stand in more feare of his hand, then his head: and that his practise partak'd more of prowesse then advice: So as, such Corrivals[4] were not much to be feared, who would fight without feare, and without deliberation fight. For Manchester,[5] he held him a Man, neither to be much lov'd nor fear'd; should He once faile, he knew not who would support him.

For his part, he held no Commander more securely guarded, then he who made choice of his owne for his Guard. This he observed, and by enjoyment of his own Allyes so secured: as the confidence he reposed in those about him and intrusted by him, acquitted his thoughts of feare. He vow'd that he never pursued task with more care nor assiduity, then in labouring to spin out time about that Treaty, intended betwixt the Parliament and His Majesty. His presence might turn the scale. This moved me (said he) to labour His remove from Hampton Court,[6] being, as I conceived, seated too neer London: where affections were so variously disposed, as I knew not well whom to trust, excepting those City Grandees whose deep interests had made them Ours: so as, the very feare they had of suffering in their fortunes, obliged them to be our inseparable Favourites.

Neither could the Isle of Wight, whereto His Majesty was designed, free me from all jealousies touching His escape; unlesse I had procured Him to be His Keeper who was so nearly allyed and really indeared to me, as I could be no lesse then confidently assured of his trust; that neither price could corrupt him, nor prayer perswade him, nor power over-awe him to falsifie that trust imposed on him.[7] Yet to colour His remove[8] with a pretensive semblance of favour, I caused it to be suggested, that my zeale to doe Him service, and desire I had to study the safety and security of His Person, induced me to intimate by Letter to such as were nearest about Him, That a Designe was lately discovered, and to me privately imparted, that certain Persons of inferiour and mercenary quality, in hope of reward, or occasionall discontent, had joyntly practised His Death. To prevent which hatefull Design, I advised them to intimate so much to the King, to the end He might decline His danger, by a timely Escape: Which wholsome counsell begot in Some a constant opinion of my loyalty: and that, whatsoever I held touching this tenet of Independency, was no breach nor violation at all in the object of my loyalty. Which, whosoever should oppose, might be quickly evinc'd, by this apparent desire I had to procure His safety. But he deserves not the name of a Commander, who laies himself open to every censure, or discovers his aimes to every credulous

Intelligencer. Beames dart out the clearest, when they break forth of Clouds: and glorious events the braveliest, when they issue from dark and infolded thoughts. I will not arrogate to myself, but I verily believe, I was second to none in this Lesson of State.

Now to you, Gent. Commanders, who behold me here nearly arriving the Shore: you know well what overtures we have had, and what interchanges of fortunes and events we have met with, since our first advance here in Wales. They are an hote and implacable kind of people. And what is strange, though teechy and spitefull, yet in their waies infinitely subtile: never further from being lost, then when they seem utterly defeated. For your honours sake, be circumspect and wary, that you present them not with the least advantage. That bloud of theirs which we have already shed, and those Captives which we have despicably sold, have stamp'd in them impressive intendments of revenge: and their industry is not small in the pursuance of it. If you face the Enemy, and Picquiere[9] with him till your approaching Forces advance, it will not be amisse: Many of those Common Soldiers which you have here with you, are with long and continued Service much wearied and wasted; so as a little intermission will be requisite to give them breathing and refreshment. But if you come to a set Battle, let me advise you, to trie the issue of it, if your endeavours may possibly effect it, in a champion[10] part of the Country; for the Mountains, by reason of their long acquaintance and habitation in them, may conduce much to their advantage.

I must be short, for the weaknesse I feel, tels me you must not heare me long. Conceale my Death with as much secrecy, as you may: the report of it, as I am their Commander, might discourage Ours, and imbolden our Foes. Let my Buriall be as obscurely performed and as covertly carried [out] as you may. Solemne Obsequies be more properly observ'd in times of peace then warre. These might prejudice you; they could do me no good. Present these my dying words, with my long-professed Service, to the L. Say. 'I wish all happy Successe to his prudent Counsels.' And that his Honour would remember the private Discourse which we two had at our last being together in S[p]ring Garden. I know well his Secretary to be both Discreet and Secret; yet I could wish that none might partake of those Secrets which he reserves in his blew Cabinet, but himself. He knows my meaning.

I must not forget Major Generall Skippon;[11] Remember me to him: and wish him withall, to be mindfull of that mutuall Vow which we made one to the other. 'He must break his faith, if he be Caesar's friend.' It has been my opinion ever: wherein if I mistook, it was my mis-guided judgment that trac'd me to that Errour. 'That it suits not with the Constitution of



the best Government to establish a Monarchy.' This he held with me. Let not a Daies mis-fortune alter his opinion. He knows what we resolv'd upon after our Victory at Nasebe. He is too ripe in years, too wel-seasoned with discretion, for any overture to change his resolution. He knows what plots and designes have been long time in hatching: let him carefully nurse them at home: and couragiously manage them abroad. Hee's in a City, where he may be both lov'd and fear'd: and where he may have those Principles receiv'd, which he himself maintains. Be it his work to negotiate there; for there Springs the Fountain-Head. By obliging the Grandees, he may with more indifferency look upon the Commons.

Lastly, for the disposall of my Estate amongst Such who by the Law of Nature have an interest in me: if the wheel turne, it will be disposed of by Others for me: But if there be a continuance of this Government, which by means of that harmony betwixt the two Houses of Parliament and the City, may be long time preserved: I deliver to you Gent. here a Codicill in trust: wherein is contained my Will: This is all, save a friendly farewell to you all: with my Soule to Him who is all in all.

With which words he expired. His Corps were removed in the Silence of the Night towards his own House at Graffam Lodge;[12] where it was with all privacy interred: though Some report Gloucester; others (and not without Some probability) that at the instancy of the Independent Party, it was conveyed to Westminster, and there privately but solemnly on the Night time buried.

But let not this difference of Opinions touching the Place of his Buriall beget in any One the least mis-beliefe touching this Principle: He has pay'd his Debt to Nature, but died in great arrears of allegiance to his Master.

O benigna cespes, patriae sospes, quae talem mereberis Hospitem![13]

*finis*

Notes.

1. A jocular term meaning (a person of) ability, good sense, wit.
2. William Fiennes, 1st Viscount Saye and Sele (1582-1662), a leading critic of Charles I, and an active and prominent parliamentarian soldier and politician during the civil war. He was a political ally and friend of Cromwell, but effectively retired from public life in the wake of the trial and execution of the king.
3. Sir Thomas Fairfax, 3rd Baron Fairfax (1612-71), parliament's Lord General 1645-50. Historians generally support the criticisms levelled

here, that he was a good and brave soldier but was out of his depth in politics and political manoeuvring.

4. Rivals, especially those in positions of equality.
5. Edward Montagu, 2nd Earl of Manchester (1602-71), Cromwell's commander in the Eastern Association army in 1644, with whom he clashed bitterly in parliament during the following autumn and winter.
6. The escape of Charles from captivity at Hampton Court in November 1647, which (for a time) ended the constitutional negotiations which had been dragging on for months and which had provoked or exacerbated divisions within the parliamentarian army and cause.
7. Robert Hammond (1621-54), parliamentary soldier, a friend and distant relative of Cromwell, had been appointed governor of the Isle of Wight in summer 1647. In that capacity he was the king's gaoler November 1647-November 1648, a role which he did not relish and in which he was mistrusted by many fellow-parliamentarians.
8. That is, the flight of the king from Hampton Court.
9. To skirmish, to engage in minor acts of hostility.
10. Level, open country, unbroken by hills or woods.
11. Philip Skippon (d. 1660), a very experienced soldier, whose distinguished civil war record included several spells as commander of troops in and around London. He was appointed one of the king's judges, but did not sit. He was a member of Cromwell's Council during the Protectorate.
12. Presumably one of the Cromwell family properties at Grafham in Huntingdonshire, around 5 miles west-south-west of Huntingdon.
13. Which might be roughly translated as the sarcastic comment, 'Oh bountiful soil, oh fortunate country, that you should merit such a guest!' It should be noted that this pamphlet was not the only one to spread rumours and reports of Cromwell's death in Wales during summer 1648. In the latter half of May the royalist newspaper *The Parliament-kite* contained a much cruder and more obviously mock and mocking account of Cromwell's death at the hands of the Welsh: 'lately with huffing, puffing, snuffing and Gun-ne-pow-deer, [he] went stinking out in a pittifull fear: DEAD! shot in the *Nock-Andrew* with a *Welch Pullet*'. This account, one of the earliest to make fun of Cromwell's supposed background as a brewer, is noted and discussed by L L Knoppers, '"Sing old Noll the Brewer": royalist satire and royalist inversion, 1648-64', *The Seventeenth Century*, 15 (2000).

Peter Gaunt is Reader in History at Chester College and Chairman of The Cromwell Association.



# STOKE NEWINGTON IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

*by Jane A. Mills*

The original parish of Stoke Newington only measures 3.2 km by 1.6 km, and is encircled by Tottenham to the north, Islington (see 'Cromwellian Britain XII' in *Cromwelliana* 1999) to the south, and to the east Hackney. In 1965 Stoke Newington became the north-western part of the London Borough of Hackney.

In 1086 the area was recorded in the Domesday inquest as 'Neutone' and later from about 1104 it was recorded as the Prebendary Manor of Stoke Newington, belonging to the estate of St Paul's Cathedral and worth about 41 shillings. By the early 1300s the parish had been divided up amongst tenants and lord's demesne (land kept by the lord of the manor for himself). The lease for the demesne eventually passed to the Earl of Leicester's kinsman, John Dudley, in 1569; on his death in 1580 the lease was held in trust for his widow, Elizabeth, and daughter, Anne. Queen Elizabeth I probably visited them, as there is a thoroughfare called Queen Elizabeth's Walk nearby.

In 1582 Elizabeth Dudley married Thomas Sutton, who became one of the wealthiest men in the country, through investing in Durham coal mines and land. He is chiefly remembered as the founder of Charterhouse hospital and school in Clerkenwell. Elizabeth died in 1602 and in 1605 Sutton moved to the parish of Hackney, to an old tanhouse next door to the present day Sutton House. Now owned by the National Trust and open to the public., Sutton House was built in 1535 for Sir Ralph Sadleir, a Privy Councillor to Henry VIII. Ralph's father, Henry, had been a good friend of Thomas Cromwell and sent his son Ralph to live in Cromwell's Fenchurch home, where he was educated and later became Cromwell's secretary and married Cromwell's cousin, Helen, in 1533.

John Dudley's daughter, Anne, married Sir Francis Popham, son of Sir John Popham (Speaker of the House of Commons and Lord Chief Justice), in 1590 at the age of 15 and the lease passed to them the following year. Their second son, Alexander, purchased the manor through sequestration in 1649 and after the Restoration, when the manor was restored as a Prebendary, Alexander secured the lease in 1661. Alexander used his home at Littlecote as a parliamentary garrison and mostly fought in the west country during the civil war. He was a member of the Council of State during the transition between Richard Cromwell and Charles II.

Another member of parliament who found Stoke Newington an ideal location, within easy reach for Westminster and the City, was John Dryden's cousin, Sir Edward Hartopp, who purchased land in 1628 and proceeded to build a superb mansion of red brick, completed in 1635. Hartopp was also a parliamentarian who raised a regiment to fight for the cause. Hartopp died in 1658, leaving a widow, Dame Mary, and two children, John and Mary. In 1664 Dame Mary married Charles Fleetwood, widower of Cromwell's daughter, Bridget, at St Anne's, Blackfriars. Two years later two of Fleetwood's eldest children from his first marriage married two of Dame Mary's children.

Charles Fleetwood and the Hartopps were part of the congregation at Leadenhall Street, where Dr John Owen was the minister. It was not very far from Stoke Newington and it was probably here that Fleetwood had met Dame Mary, who became his third wife. Dr John Owen was the leading dissenter and had been chaplain to Cromwell in Ireland and Scotland; he was vice-chancellor of Oxford University and had quite an influence on university life and on Cromwell and the Commonwealth government. He preached at Ireton's funeral. At the Restoration he survived due to influential friends.

At the beginning of the civil war Fleetwood had started his army career as a bodyguard for the Earl of Essex; as the war progressed, he rose to command a regiment at the battle of Naseby and was wounded, and by 1650 he had become Cromwell's Lieutenant-General of Horse at the battle of Dunbar. Fleetwood's appointment as commander-in-chief in Ireland on the death of Henry Ireton caused speculation and controversy, as Lambert was a strong candidate for the position. He was given the temporary Lord-Lieutenancy appointment in January 1652; when parliament later abolished the position Lambert turned down the lesser role and had to be compensated for his disappointment and out of pocket expenses. Fleetwood married Ireton's widow, Bridget; this marriage was viewed as a marriage of convenience in order to re-establish Bridget's position in society, a view not helped when bride and groom had both been widowed some three months earlier. In her *Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson*, Lucy Hutchinson tells the story of how Lady Lambert snubbed Lady Ireton while walking in St James's Park:

> Colonel Fleetwood being then present in mourning for his wife, who had died at the same time her lord did, took occasion to introduce himself, and was immediately accepted by the Lady and her father, who designed thus to restore his daughter to the honour she had fallen from.



Fleetwood, a fervent Baptist, disliked the Irish and pushed forward his plans for transportation, which led to his disagreement with Cromwell and his recall back to England; he was replaced by Cromwell's son, Henry. In 1655 he returned to London after spending his last year in Ireland as Lord Deputy. He was made Major General for the eastern counties and in 1657 he became member of the new 'House of Lords' due to his ownership of Woodstock. He died in 1692 and was buried in Bunhill Fields (the dissenters' Burial Ground) in a Baroque tomb with his third wife, who had died in 1684. The City Corporation restored this tomb in 1869. Fleetwood House changed ownership and use over the next hundred years; it was finally demolished in 1872 and replaced by Fleetwood Street. Bricks and materials from Fleetwood House were used to build nos. 64-78 Church Street.

During the civil war in 1643 the Common Council passed an act for the defence of the City for the building of redoubts and fortifications. Due to its close proximity to the City, Hackney had civil war defences; starforts or redoubts were built at both Kingsland Road and Hackney Road, just north of Shorditch church.

Stoke Newington became an important haven for religious dissenters during the late seventeenth century, mainly due to the support they received from the Fleetwood/Hartopp families who were important in the area. Newington Green became the main site for dissenting academies; the north side belongs to the Stoke Newington parish. In the 1570s the London butcher Richard Heard owned land on the north side and it was here that he grazed cattle and sheep to feed the increasing population of London. Edward Newens, the builder of Church Street, lived on the north side in the 1730s; Abraham Price, the first manufacturer of wallpaper in England, lived here too.

The parish rector, William Heath, was a royalist and was replaced by Dr Thomas Manton, a presbyterian deacon, a very popular non-conformist preacher who had been one of Cromwell's chaplains. He was rector of Old St Mary's from 1645 until 1657. He preached before the Long Parliament six times and he was privileged to give the blessing at the inauguration of Richard Cromwell as Lord Protector. He had been against the execution of Charles I, and he was chosen to be a member of the deputation which travelled to Breda to see Charles II; after the Restoration he became the king's chaplain. He was later imprisoned as an active dissenter and was buried inside Old St Mary's church in 1677. It was due to the friendship between Manton and John Lilburne that Lilburne's son was baptised in the parish, even though he did not live there. The old church is also the final

resting-place of some of the children from the marriage of Charles Fleetwood and Bridget Cromwell.

(In a later age, William Wilberforce, the anti-slavery abolitionist, had many Quaker abolitionist friends in Stoke Newington, and his sister is buried in Old St Mary's churchyard; he wanted to be buried here, too, but due to his importance he was buried in Westminster Abbey.)

The Quakers first met here in 1698. In 1824 Fleetwood House was a Quaker Girl's school, but by 1838 it was a private residence again. It was not until 1828 that a permanent Quaker meeting house was established. Dr Isaac Watts was educated at Rev Thomas Rowe's Nonconformist Academy in Newington Green and he is remembered for his hymns ('Our God, Our Help in Ages past') and sermons. He was employed as tutor to Hartopp's son. He went on to become tutor and chaplain to Lady Abney. Abney House occupied over 32 acres, though the house has long since been demolished and the land, together with the land from Fleetwood House, became the Abney Park cemetery.

During the nineteenth century, when small churches could no longer cope with the demand for burials, commercial cemeteries were set up. The Abney Park Cemetery Company was set up in 1840 especially for non-conformists. It boasted a magnificent arboretum, a legacy from the Fleetwood and Abney Houses, containing 2,500 species, which was more than Kew Gardens.

Daniel Defoe came from a non-conformist family and was educated at Charles Morton Academy in Newington Green. In 1684 he married a local girl called Mary Tuffley and, with money borrowed from her mother, he set up a civet cat farm for musk for perfume production. He got into debt and the cats were repossessed and his mother-in-law lost the £590. He was declared bankrupt in 1706. In 1709 he was living in a house on the north side of Stoke Newington Church Street; later he moved over the road. The site is now on the corner of Defoe Road and there is a commemorative plaque, though the original house was demolished in 1875. It was here that he wrote his *Robinson Crusoe* (the real Crusoe was Robert Drury whose father owned land in Stoke Newington) and *Moll Flanders*.

Another later resident of Church Street was Benjamin D'Israeli, a poet and historian, who was also the father of the nineteenth century Prime Minister.

The New River passed through Stoke Newington and served as an area of research for seventeenth century Quaker botanists such as Thomas



Lawson; this continued with William Curtis, Quaker botanist advisor to George III. The profits from the New River were spent on a national tree collection.

At the top of Church Street is Clissold Park, which was originally a mansion in superb grounds built by Joseph Woods, a botanist and architect in 1790 for his uncle Jonathan Hoare, brother of Samuel, a slavery abolitionist. They were Quakers from an Irish family of bankers, who later became part of Lloyd's bank. It eventually opened as a park in 1889 by the Earl of Rosebery and became one of the first municipal public parks to have animals. Birds and animals can still be seen in the park.

Jane A Mills, MISM, is a member of The Cromwell Association and its council. She is a regular contributor to *Cromwelliana*, *English Civil War Notes & Queries* and other historical journals.

# CROMWELL AND THE HUGUENOTS: ETHICAL FOREIGN POLICY OR STRATEGIC REALPOLITIK?

*by Timothy Venning*

In view of the current debate about 'ethical' foreign policy, it is perhaps ironic to consider that Cromwell was in a sense the forerunner of Tony Blair's government in this as in the creation of a nominated Second House. Cromwell's consuming sense of moral imperatives did not only extend to his role within England as a godly parish constable who kept order, promoted virtue and lectured the assembled representatives of the nation in parliament on their Christian duty, or to 'civilising' the Scots and the Irish. His sense of providence led him to consider how he could utilise his position to benefit Protestantism abroad as well as at home. As he told his Council of State in 1654: 'God has not brought us hither...but to consider the work that we may do in the world as well as at home'.[1]

Cromwell's formative years having been at a time of international crisis involving the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War in 1618, the failure of the hopes invested in Frederick and Elizabeth of the Palatinate and the resulting parliamentary agitation to assist them, and James I's unpopular attempt to create a rapprochement with Spain, his Elizabethan nostalgia coincided with a fear of international Catholic conspiracy. He and many of his contemporaries saw the situation in Europe in terms of black and white, Catholic versus Protestant, even after the end of the main conflict in 1648, while the continuing Franco-Spanish conflict provided a strategically useful scenario for the beleaguered, unrecognised Commonwealth of the two most dangerous Catholic monarchies at war with each other.

Cromwell's attitude to France, as commander-in-chief of the victorious New Model Army and from 1653 head of government, combined practical strategy with idealism. The Huguenot community, the parliamentarians' fellow-Protestants, were technically protected from harassment by their Catholic government, but their position had worsened following the suppression of revolt at La Rochelle and other fortified havens by Louis XIII and Cardinal Richelieu in 1627-9 at the time of the previous Anglo-French war. Charles I and the Duke of Buckingham, supporting them for their own reasons, had abandoned them; Buckingham's perceived incompetence or worse had led to popular rejoicing at his murder. The fate of the Huguenots had been the cause of disquiet at the time, and seems to have made an impact on Cromwell. When he dispatched one of his agents, Jean-Baptiste Stouppe, the minister of the Huguenot congregation in London, to France to investigate the chances of a revolt in February 1654,



he 'exhorted him strongly to make the voyage and declared with passion...that England had ruined that party and it fell to England to re-establish them'.[2] Similarly, those advisers of the Council of State advocating intervention knew to stress the moral duty which England had. In their policy document of March 1652, *A Brief Information of the Present Condition of those of the Religion in France and the way to provide for their redressment in the Present Juncture*, they called for a 'protector' to mobilise the Huguenots against the threats of the French clergy, the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor, clearly with Cromwell in mind, and reminded people of the 'unparalleled cowardice' that the English had shown in 1627-8 and could remedy now circumstances provided the opportunity.

The aid that the French regency government under Cardinal Mazarin had given to Charles II's Scottish expedition led to calls for Cromwell to take revenge with his victorious army, or to prevent another invasion with a pre-emptive strike, using the Huguenots. The *Declaration of the Army in England upon their march into Scotland* of 19 July 1650 accused Charles II of 'commissioning the French...to the end that they might destroy the people of God and the peace of the three nations'.[3] Cromwell's reputation as an enemy of monarchies and Catholicism led the Venetian ambassador in France, Michael Morosini, to mock the foolishness of aristocratic French rebels in seeking Cromwell's aid.[4] Intervention in France was not only feared by the royalist ambassador in Paris, Sir Richard Browne,[5] but by Mazarin's own advisers.[6] Thus Mazarin found time even when fighting for his political life against the *Fronde* to send envoys to England, and persuaded Louis XIV to reissue Henri IV's decree of toleration, the Edict of Nantes.

The Spanish ambassador in London, Alonso de Cardenas, ironically in view of Cromwell's later propaganda against Spain, had good relations with the Commonwealth, despite the earlier assassination of its ambassador Ascham in Madrid, and continued to assist French rebel representatives in London, as both nobles and south-western towns defied Mazarin. In February 1651 Cromwell was involved in the dispatch of the arch-intriguer, Leveller and republican, Colonel Edward Sexby, a former agitator in the army who was later to turn against Cromwell as Protector, to France to examine the chances of a successful rebellion which England could assist. He became deeply involved with the part-separatist, part-republican faction of the *Ormée* that seized control of rebel Bordeaux. The rebels even issued an *Accord du Peuple* in imitation of the New Model Army, calling for parliamentary government, suffrage and religious toleration, and in summer 1652 the Council of State - where Cromwell as commander-in-chief had the ultimate authority in military matters - sent four ships containing 1200 Irish mercenaries to aid the city.

In view of unofficial French aid to the royalists and continuing piracy by both exiled royalist and French privateer captains, unofficial English aid to French rebels was pursued in retaliation. The rebel Prince of Condé's emissary, the Chevalier de la Riviere, is believed to have approached Cromwell after the battle of Worcester, and in his euphoria Cromwell light-heartedly suggested sending 40,000 foot and 12,000 cavalry to reduce France to the same state as England.[7] To this same time belongs a mysterious account in the memoirs of the French intriguer Cardinal de Retz, Mazarin's arch-enemy, who claimed that Sir Henry Vane, a Councillor, visited him in Paris bringing 'a wonderfully civil and complaisant' letter from Cromwell saying that the sentiments he had expressed in his *Defence of Public Liberty* had induced him to enter into the 'strictest friendship'. Retz answered it 'as became a true Catholic and an honest Frenchman', seeing Cromwell's proposals as hostile to Catholicism and the French monarchy.[8]

In October 1651 Count Daugnon, pro-Condé governor of La Rochelle, was considering rebellion, and a burgess, Conan, brought Cromwell an offer to accept English rule. Cromwell was not to be drawn, having carefully studied the town's layout on a map.[9] Condé's agents also offered possession of the strategic island of Oleron off La Rochelle, failure to secure which had ruined Buckingham in 1627-8, and in April 1652 Condé's agent Barriere brought the Bordeaux burgesses' offer of a port on the Garonne. Condé claimed that Cromwell had offered Count Daugnon 10,000 infantry and 4,000 cavalry before December 1652, though nothing materialised; any commitment was prevented by the Dutch war. Cromwell, however, made it clear who he would rather be fighting, opposing the Council of State's tough line on their fellow-Protestants and backing the unofficial mission of Balthazar Gerbier, Buckingham's former agent, to The Hague in August 1652 to secure peace.[10] He also supported the radical preacher Hugh Peter's petition for peace in July, telling its organisers, 'I do not like the war and I commend your Christian admonition. I will do everything in my power to bring about peace.'[11]

At the same time, Cromwell was, however, prepared to pursue negotiation with Mazarin to secure a strategic advantage that would give England control of the Straits of Dover, overawing other powers and discomfiting pirates. Around December 1651 a former royalist officer turned Commonwealth agent, Colonel John Fitzjames, was sent to the beleaguered French garrison in Dunkirk concerning a prisoner exchange. According to his own account, Cromwell asked him to approach Governor D'Estrades about English troops taking over the town to prevent it falling to Spain. On 15 February D'Estrades informed Mazarin that Cromwell had sent Fitzjames back to offer £2 million, fifty vessels and



15,000 infantry if Dunkirk was handed over.[12] 5,000 troops were indeed waiting in Dover.[13] In the end the Council of State decided to order Admiral Blake to prevent the French supplying the garrison of Dunkirk under the excuse of pursuing reprisals against French shipping, and D'Estrades had to surrender. But Cromwell was to remain interested in the question of a Flanders port, not least to enable quick aid to European Protestants, auctioning his services to France and Spain in 1654 on the basis of which was the better offer.

Cromwell was able to initiate peace talks with the Dutch once he had assumed power on 20 April 1653, but the war continued and a choice of alliance between France and Spain was delayed for the interim. It was still important to prevent the French government aiding Charles II, with resistance continuing in the Scottish Highlands. Cromwell's military power was such that although Mazarin knew of his dealings with the rebels, the French ambassador, Antoine de Bordeaux, continued the negotiations which he had opened with the Rump late in 1652. Barriere boasted that Louis XIV 'treats with the Council as tributary kings formerly did to the Roman Republic',[14] and Bordeaux reckoned:

> It is not that the regime wants an alliance, but it fears our power and will be very glad if we could always be occupied in our kingdom... the more prosperous England becomes, the more they will stir up the party of Monsieur le Prince [Condé].[15]

As Mazarin started to gain the upper hand against the rebels, Cardenas sought to recruit more Irish mercenaries to defend the city of Bordeaux. Cromwell offered the rebel citizens' delegation forty ships and 5,000 troops if Bordeaux would accept English rule,[16] and in their extremity the rebel leaders agreed, until talked out of it by the Abbe de Cosnac.[17] In the absence of agreement, Cromwell would only offer six to eight ships,[18] and Bordeaux surrendered on 3 August.

English aid to the remaining rebels would still keep France weak, and Sexby used this argument in appealing to Cromwell for assistance on his return.[19] Talks with Condé's emissaries continued into 1654, and Cromwell utilised it as a threat to hold over Mazarin's ambassadors and raise their offers of financial assistance and a port for England in exchange for an alliance. Technically constrained under the Instrument of Government from December 1653 to act only with the advice and consent of his Council, a body divided between pro-French an pro-Spanish factions, on making war and treaties, Cromwell was still looked to for aid by would-be rebels. When an emissary from the Languedoc Huguenots, the Scots physician Dr More, failed to gain much notice in London,

Barriere persuaded the better known Jean-Baptiste Stouppe, resident in the capital, to approach Cromwell. Cromwell asked him to find out the likelihood of a Huguenot revolt and whether Condé would loan his lieutenant, the Prince of Tarente, to command them. Cromwell also held secret meetings with Barriere and visiting Spanish general Marcin, and asked them detailed questions about the city of Bordeaux and the layout of La Rochelle, evidently determined to avoid Buckingham's mishaps,[20] while the English spy Joachim Hane travelled through France down to the Garonne, assessing the vulnerability of coastal defences.

From the accounts of the rival French and Spanish ambassadors that spring, Cardenas had better hopes of success in the parallel talks. Stories of 6,000, later reduced to 3-4,000, English soldiers being sent to Guienne if Spain would pay the expedition circulated that April,[21] an action without a declaration of war that was excused on the grounds that France had not stopped its citizens aiding the Dutch against Spain in peacetime. But quite apart from the advisability of giving France an excuse to aid Charles II, Spain's offer of finance for the expedition - £15,000 per month - was too small,[22] and even Sexby reckoned in his recommendations that an open war with France was 'unfeasible and dangerous, England not being settled'. He preferred sending ships under a commission from Spain or Condé to seize La Rochelle and its off-shore islands and control the lucrative trade to Bordeaux,[23] recommending that Cromwell insist on Spain paying £300,000 at once. With talks with France deadlocked, Cromwell sent a message to Cardenas on 9 May that he would accept that sum but could only loan thirty ships and would not declare war. The terms were later refined to an overall total of £1.2 million, of which Spain should signify how much it could pay immediately, in return for thirty ships, 12,000 infantry and 7,000 cavalry - a proposal balanced by a similar demand for money from France. The most that Cardenas could offer was £300,000, two-thirds at once, and it soon became apparent that Spain was having trouble paying its Irish mercenaries in Flanders. Their officers' petitions to Cromwell for assistance warned him of Spain's unreliability, as did Condé's envoy, Mazerolles's, empty-handed return from Flanders late in June.

Hane had written from France as early as December 1653 that there was no likelihood of imminent revolt, and vigilant French officials had caught and questioned him. He now returned to confirm this, and on 12 July Stouppe also met Cromwell and reported on the quiescence of Languedoc.[24] With no unrest and Spain's financial viability dubious, Cromwell's thoughts for an economically advantageous and ideologically justifiable target now turned to the Spanish empire and on 20 July the Council held its first debate on the feasibility of the 'Western Design'. Cromwell's attitude to



the missed opportunity of intervention in France remained one of regret, coupled with a mixed attitude to Condé. At one point he is said to have exclaimed 'stultus est, et garrulitur, et venditur a suis Cardinali' ('He is stupid, and talked of too much, and has been sold by his followers to the Cardinal'),[25] but that winter he declared regretfully that he was the greatest captain of the age and should have converted to Protestantism.[26]

Cromwell's use of the Huguenots as a counter to a hostile France combined genuine concern with practicality; in the end he accepted that it would be counter-productive to intervene. But the price of his friendship and eventual alliance with France was their continued good treatment. The fact that French Catholic troops en route to Italy assisted the 'Vaudois Massacre' of Protestant villagers in the valleys of the Duchy of Savoy in April 1655 both revived popular resentment of France that had been apparent in the army a year before[27] and led to fears that the crisis was the prelude to general massacre and revolt within southern France. Accordingly, although Cromwell had already attacked the Spanish empire, Cardenas found it worth his while to try to undermine Cromwell's confidence in Mazarin, who in turn bribed Stouppe to reassure Cromwell. Public indignation in England was whipped up by the government's declaration of a fast-day on 14 June and collection of funds for their persecuted brethren - a reaction unprecedented since the Massacre of St Bartholomew in 1572. Given the close links between France and Savoy, a naval demonstration against Savoy's only port, Villefranche, could have been a retaliatory measure and embroiled England with France. But Cromwell, firing off a battery of indignant letters to other Protestant heads of state, chose in his missive to Mazarin to reassure him:

> we make no doubt but that such Tyranny, inhumanities, so rigorously inflicted upon harmless and indigent People, are highly displeasing and offensive to the Most Serene King [Louis].

He declared that French toleration was 'one main Reason why this Republic so ardently desired the friendship and alliance of the French people'.[28] Accordingly, instead of sending Blake with ships, he requested Mazarin's diplomatic assistance in restoring public toleration of the Savoyard Protestants, sending his own representatives, George Downing and Samuel Morland, to assist the French and Dutch ambassadors in reaching a settlement. Mindful of what terms the English might require, Mazarin arranged for his representatives to secure a treaty between the Protestants and the Duke in Turin more satisfactory to the latter before Cromwell's men arrived; Cromwell duly condemned it as 'brought on by the menaces of the French ambassador'.[29] Thurloe promised Morland that the Anglo-French treaty would not be signed 'until His Highness have

satisfaction in this business',[30] but Cromwell accepted that he could do no more. The crisis, however, strengthened Cromwell's prestige as a leader of European Protestantism, as did the relief funds which Morland distributed; his 'gallant proceedings' were approved of by Protestants, even in Rome.[31] At home, his daughter Bridget's husband, Charles Fleetwood, zealous Lord Deputy of Ireland, declared:

> I confess I am not without hopes that His Highness may be particularly raised up for such a day as this, in being a shelter unto these poor persecuted Protestants in foreign parts...[32]

Thurloe wrote that Huguenot toleration was intended as the 'cement of this union' in the Anglo-French treaty of November 1655.[33] When Cromwell's first ambassador, his niece Robina's husband, William Lockhart - a presbyterian sympathetic to the Huguenots, as ambassador Bordeaux noted - was sent to Paris in April 1656, his instruction made it clear that he was to keep an eye on the Huguenots.[34] Oppression, whether officially sponsored or just due to local zeal, was duly reported to Cromwell and complaints made to Mazarin, as over a minor incident at Montauban in summer 1657 at which Lockhart protested.[35] At this point the only result was to annoy the French government, but Cromwell put his co-religionists first. They formed part of that grand scheme in which the Anglo-Spanish war was treated as a Protestant crusade, Charles X of Sweden was exhorted to forget his commercial quarrels with the Dutch and attack the Habsburgs, and, according to Burnet, Cromwell considered setting up a Protestant rival to the Pope's college 'De Propagatione Fidei'.[36]

The Anglo-French alliance was the best guarantee of Huguenot security, together with Mazarin's pragmatic nature. Ironically, the Huguenots' greatest foe was to be that young king in whose name Mazarin allied with Cromwell in 1657-8, and Louis's cousin Charles II was distinctly less willing than Cromwell to put pressure on him. What Cromwell would have made of French policy in the 1670s and 1680s, had he reached a comparable age to his mother or to his son Richard, is another matter.

Notes

1. C H Firth (ed), *Selections from the Papers of William Clarke* (4 vols, London, 1891-1901), III, 207-8.
2. British Library [hereafter BL], Additional Ms. 35252, Barriere to Condé, 10 Feb. 1654.
3. M A E Green (ed), *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1650-1* (London, 1877), pp. 242-7.



4. A B Hindes (ed), *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1647-52* (London, 1927), p. 258, Morosini to Senate, 14 Oct. 1651.
5. BL, Additional Ms. 12186, f. 221b.
6. Public Record Office [hereafter PRO], SP 31/3/90, 'Avis Touchant les Affaires D'Angleterre', 3 and 14 Feb. 1651.
7. S R Gardiner, 'Cromwell and Mazarin in 1652', *English Historical Review*, 11 (1896), pp. 501-2.
8. Cardinal de Retz, *Memoires de Cardinal Retz* (Paris, 1956), p. 375.
9. National Archives, Madrid, Simancas Ms. 2034, Cardenas to Philip IV, 8 Nov. 1651.
10. S R Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* (4 vols, 1988), II, 288.
11. *Ibid*, II, 287-8.
12. Gardiner, 'Cromwell and Mazarin', pp. 501-2.
13. National Archives, Madrid, Simancas Ms. 2569, Cardenas to Philip IV, 13 April 1652.
14. BL, Additional Ms. 35252, f. 74, Barriere to Condé, 25 March 1653.
15. PRO, SP 31/3/91, Bordeaux to Count Brienne, 27 May 1653.
16. M A E Green (ed), *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1652* (London, 1878), p. 340, Theodorus to Conway, 19 May 1653.
17. Daniel de Cosnac, *Memoires* (13 vols, Paris, 1882-93), I, 66-9.
18. PRO, SP 31/3/91, Bordeaux to Brienne, 7 Aug. 1653.
19. Bodleian Library, Rawlinson Ms. A 60, ff. 126-9.
20. BL, Additional Ms. 35252, Barriere to Condé, 5 Dec. 1653.
21. *Ibid*, Barriere to Condé, 7 April 1654; PRO, SP 31/3/94, Baas (de Batz) to Mazarin, 13 April 1654. Fear of Cromwell no doubt caused that improvement in the treatment of Huguenots by local authorities which led English agent Petit to report on 5 May that they 'had cause to make continual prayer' for Cromwell and hoped for his agreement with Mazarin on toleration being written into a treaty, T Birch (ed), *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esquire* [hereafter *TSP*] (7 vols, London, 1742), II, 262.
22. BL, Additional Ms. 35252, Barriere to Condé, 7 April 1654.
23. Firth (ed), *Selections from the Papers of William Clarke*, III, 197-202.
24. PRO, SP 31/3/95, Bordeaux to Mazarin, 13 July 1654.
25. Gilbert Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, ed. O Airy (2 vols, Oxford, 1896-7), I, 134.
26. BL, Additional Ms. 35252, f. 277, Barriere to Condé, 15 Dec. 1654.
27. F Guizot, *History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Civil War*, trans A R Scoble (2 vols, London, 1854), II, appendix viii, no 3, Patt to Mazarin, 17 April 1654.
28. W C Abbott (ed), *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (4 vols, Cambridge, Mass, 1937-47), III, 727.

29. R Vaughan, *The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell* (2 vols, London, 1839), I, 260-1, Thurloe to Pell, 10 Sept. 1655.
30. Abbott, *Writings and Speeches*, III, 818.
31. *TSP*, III, 568, Rome intelligence, 4 June 1655.
32. *TSP*, III, 468, Fleetwood to Thurloe, 23 May 1655.
33. PRO, SP 103, vol 12, f. 68.
34. C H Firth, 'Cromwell's instructions to Colonel Lockhart, 1656', *English Historical Review*, 21 (1906), pp. 743-6.
35. *TSP*, VI, 487, 490, Lockhart to Thurloe, 31 Aug. and 7 Sept. 1657.
36. Burnet, *History of My Own Times*, I, 139-40.

Dr Timothy Venning, a freelance historical research and author of *Cromwellian Foreign Policy* (1996), is currently working for the *New Dictionary of National Biography*.



# A SHORT GUIDE TO 'THE FLANDRIC SHORE'

*by Thomas Fegan*

In '"The Flandric Shore": Cromwellian Dunkirk', which appeared in the last issue of *Cromwelliana*, I outlined the 1657-8 Flanders campaign and the English acquisition of Dunkirk. To supplement the article, I thought a short guide to the sites in French and Belgian Flanders associated with the campaign might be helpful to anyone venturing over or under the Channel. Time and space prevent me from presenting a more comprehensive guide, so I apologise for not including, among other places, Menen, Oudenaarde and Montmédy. However, concentrating on those sites closer to Dunkirk and the 'Flandric shore' (as Marvell termed it) makes common sense for an initial visit, and there's certainly plenty to occupy the visitor for a week should he or she wish to see all the sites mentioned below, which, after Dunkirk and the site of the Battle of the Dunes, are presented in alphabetical order. I should also add that I have written this presuming the visitor will be touring by car, hence the road directions and distances (the latter in km, as per road signs on the Continent). Although Dunkirk and other towns are accessible by public transport from Calais, a car is more convenient, and is essential for out of the way places.

## The Historical Background.

In March 1657 an Anglo-French treaty was negotiated between Cromwell's ambassador, Sir William Lockhart, and Cardinal Mazarin for a campaign in Spanish Flanders where Charles Stuart and a royalist force were gathered. France was to provide 20,000 men, and England 6,000 men and her fleet for the campaign, England to receive Dunkirk, the most important port in Flanders, and nearby Mardyke in return for its assistance. Six regiments were raised for the campaign, all infantry as the French were weak in foot, and composed of a mixture of veterans and raw recruits. Sir John Reynolds commanded them, and Thomas Morgan (afterwards, Sir) was Major-General - all under the illustrious French Marshal Turenne. During 1657 these helped in the capture of Montmédy and St Venant inland, and Mardyke on the coast, before quartering for the winter. The rigours of campaigning and the season took a heavy toll of the English, and supplementary troops had to be sent across; and Lockhart succeeded Reynolds, who was lost at sea. Campaigning resumed in May the following year and Dunkirk was besieged. A Spanish army that included the Duke of York and several regiments of English, Irish and Scottish royalists attempted to relieve Dunkirk. Turenne drew off most of his forces to meet

the threat and the two armies faced each other in the dunes east of Dunkirk on 14 June 1658 at what became known as the Battle of the Dunes. A precipitate charge by English troops on the left flank routed the Spanish right wing of veteran infantry, while at the centre and right, Spanish advances were halted and pushed back. The Spanish fled the field in disarray, and the victorious Anglo-French force returned to the siege of Dunkirk. Despite stiff resistance, the town fell ten days later on 24 June and was handed over to the English. While Lockhart, as governor, garrisoned the town, four of the English regiments remained with Morgan and the French field army, participating in further successful sieges in the surrounding area until campaigning ended in September. An anxious peace followed next year, culminating in the Treaty of the Pyrenees. Dunkirk remained in English hands until 1662 when the impecunious Charles II sold it to France.

## Dunkirk (Dunkerque).

Dunkirk was well fortified when the Anglo-French force under Turenne besieged it on 25 May 1658, but it was poorly provisioned and had only a small garrison of 3,000 against Turenne's 25,000. The English were stationed on the western and south-western sides of the town, and although they were less experienced in siege warfare than the French troops, they acquitted themselves ably, and were prominent in repelling sorties made by the garrison. After the Battle of the Dunes (see below), the English and French increased their pressure on Dunkirk, the English capturing Fort Leon and bombarding the town with mortars. Following the loss of their governor, Lede, the Spanish surrendered on 24 June. The next day, Dunkirk was handed to Lockhart who became governor. Lockhart's (formerly Reynolds's) and Alsop's regiments now garrisoned Dunkirk while Morgan kept the field with his own regiment and those of Cochrane, Clarke and Lillingston.

The focus in the next four years of English rule was to secure the town. To this end, Lockhart and his successors fortified Dunkirk as money allowed. The Spanish fortifications were revetted with masonry, the dunes on the eastern side of town were razed and replaced with a system of ramparts designed to confuse the enemy, a citadel was raised on the site of Fort Leon, and outlying forts were constructed south of Dunkirk (see Fort Louis below). Under subsequent French rule, these fortifications were much added to: a mile long mole replete with forts was built to guard the harbour, the outworks were extended and a military camp constructed south of the town.[1] Unfortunately, these impressive works are no longer extant, having been razed in 1714 following the Treaty of Utrecht. A population boom in the eighteenth century meant much rebuilding of



domestic buildings, and wars in every century removed what little was left of the seventeenth century, most damage being caused in June 1940 when 90% of the town was destroyed. It is not surprising, then, that there are few specific sites to see in Dunkirk, but that there are any at all is a miracle.

One important site to have survived (with restoration) is the gothic church of St Eloi, in the centre of Dunkirk. Its cure at the time of the English take-over, Jacques Van der Cruyce, was the only inhabitant of the town to refuse the oath of fidelity to Cromwell, for which he was expelled. It was probably in this church that English soldiers offended the Catholic inhabitants of Dunkirk by their ill behaviour during the first weeks of occupation - they threatened to pillage church riches 'and their insolence went to that hight, that one of them lighted his pype of tobacco at one of the wax lights on the altar, where a priest was saying masse.'[2] Fortunately, Lockhart soon stamped such provocation out.[3] Inside the church today may be found a memorial to Pierre Faulconnier who was Grand Bailly of Dunkirk during and after the English occupation, and father of the historian of Dunkirk of the same name. It was Faulconnier senior in 1662 who was forced to distribute his own money to the English garrison to encourage them on their way when Dunkirk was sold to the French. A memorial to Louis XIV's pirate, Jean Bart, may also be found in the church.

Opposite the church is the Beffroi (Belfry), built in 1440 and originally joined to St Eloi until a fire separated them in 1558. This tower contains tourist information and provides excellent views in summer. North of St Eloi and the Beffroi is the Hotel de Ville, which was rebuilt in Flemish Renaissance style a century ago, but occupies the site of the seventeenth century town hall where Protestant worship was held during the English occupation. 200 yards further north is the Tour du Leughenaer, the only remains of the medieval Burgundian walls.[4] West of the Tour du Leughenaer is the harbour and the area where the citadel once stood. Retracing one's steps, south-east of St Eloi is La Porte du Parc de la Marine (Marine Gate), built in 1686. Originally the entrance to Vauban's naval dockyard, it is now the gateway to public gardens. South and east of the centre is the tree bordered Exutoire des Wateringues that follows the course of the seventeenth century ramparts and fosse.

While here, if you do not have time to visit the memorials to the British and allies who fell in the 1940 retreat, take a look at the beach of Malo-les-Bains from which they were evacuated in Operation Dynamo. This lies east of the centre, en route to the site of the Battle of the Dunes.

## Site of the Battle of the Dunes.

During the Anglo-French siege of Dunkirk, on 13 June 1658 a Spanish army under Don Juan, consisting of 8,000 horse and 6,000 foot, took up position in the sand-hills east of the town. Turenne resolved to give battle, and at 8 am on the following sunny day, 6,000 horse and 9,000 foot of the French and English marched to meet the Spanish whose foot were drawn up on a crescent-shaped range of dunes, their horse under Don Juan behind (having been forced away from the shore by fire from the English men-of-war), and their horse under the Prince de Condé on their left between the sand-hills and the meadows by the Canal de Furnes. Turenne tried to move his army forward in a straight line, but the English who were on his left wing pressed ahead, eager to engage the enemy. In two lines - the regiments of Lockhart, Lillingston, Alsop and Cochrane to the fore, those of Morgan, Clarke and Pepper behind - these charged the highest sand-hill where Boniface's regiment of veteran Spanish foot was stationed. Despite the advantage of the ground, the Spanish were forced back and routed. The Duke of York and his horse guards managed to inflict some casualties on the Cromwellian English, but he too was forced back as French cavalry came to the Cromwellians' aid. Elsewhere on the battlefield, Turenne forced back the Spanish centre, while the French right wing of horse under the Duc de Crequy checked and repulsed Condé's cavalry. The battle was over by midday, the Spanish fleeing the field, the English and French returning to their siege of Dunkirk.[5]

The site of the battle is roughly 5-6 km east of the centre of Dunkirk, between the sea and the Canal de Furnes. To get there, drive along the seafront road from Dunkirk/Malo-les-Bains till it reaches and ends at the beginning of the dunes, close to a seaside tourist office (parking is possible all the way along this seafront road). It was on the dunes bordering the seaside that the English regiments marched forward and attacked Boniface. One can walk along the strand and over the dunes that today are thickly overgrown, but beware! Along the strand are numerous ruins of a more recent conflict, the broken concrete emplacements of the Second World War German Atlantic Wall. Much of this is therefore *terrain militaire*, and should be approached with care - there are plenty of notices warning of the dangers of explosives; though local children ignore these, I would advise you not to. When your feet are tired of walking in sand, you can return to your car and follow the road between the dunes and the meadows bordering the Canal de Furnes, in the direction of Zuydcoote, a route that takes you across the centre of the battlefield.



## Bergues.

Turenne and his Anglo-French force that included the English regiments of Morgan, Cochrane, Clarke and Lillingston invested Bergues on 27 June 1658. The siege lasted several days, during which time the English distinguished themselves, Lt.-Col. Hughes of Cochrane's regiment being killed as he lodged his men on the counterscarp. When the garrison surrendered all except the governor and three of his companions were taken prisoner.

This pretty town is less than 8 km south of Dunkirk on the D 916. Its fortifications, which were enhanced by Vauban, still encircle the town today. Bastions, gates, demi-lunes and a fosse remain, particularly concentrated on the eastern side of the town. In the centre, above the tourist office, the town belfry offers good views over the coastal plain.

## Bourbourg.

English troops were garrisoned here in the winter of 1657, where they suffered terrible privation. When they left, the French garrisoned it. Little of antiquity remains here today - its defences were destroyed after the Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) and its medieval parish church was reconstructed in the 1960s. Bourbourg is roughly 6 km south east of Gravelines, or 15 km from Dunkirk, just off the A 16 - E 40.

## Diksmuide (Dixmude).

Diksmuide capitulated on 9 July 1658 to the Anglo-French forces, who then spent a fortnight putting its defences back into order. This century, the unfortunate town had to be completely reconstructed after it was levelled in the First World War, but a very good job was made of it. The Grote Markt is the handsomest part, with authentic looking seventeenth century gabled houses. Diksmuide is 17 km west of Veurne on the N 35.

## Fort Louis.

Begun by the Spanish, when it was known as Fort Royal, only its foundations had been built by the time Turenne captured it when he encircled Dunkirk. Subsequently under English rule, in 1658 it was renamed Fort Oliver and its four bastions were completed. The following year 'four half moons...with a false bray and a countercharge' were ordered built.[6] Under Louis XIV the fort became Fort Louis and its outworks were greatly extended by Vauban, but it was ordered destroyed by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, before being reconstructed in 1783. Because of

all this, it is hard to say how much of the English fort remains, although we may presume the four earth bastions standing today are at least based on those of the English Fort Oliver. A water-filled moat surrounds these ramparts, which are grown over with trees, and a children's playground occupies the centre of the fort where the garrison once lodged. Fort Louis (Fort Castelnau on some maps) stands in a pleasant wooded park beside the Canal de Bergues on the Rue des Forts, 2 1/2 km south of the centre of Dunkirk on the way to Bergues (on the opposite side of the canal from the D 916).

The English built a smaller fort, Fort Manning, halfway between Dunkirk and Fort Oliver, but nothing remains of that today. Two kilometres further south of Fort Louis, however, stands Fort Vallieres. This is a brick-faced construction from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, on the site of the earlier Fort Francois, which was also an unfinished Spanish fort taken by Turenne on his approach to Dunkirk. One can walk around the moat, but there is no access to the fort's interior.

## Gravelines.

Gravelines was one of the strongest Spanish-held towns in the Low Countries, well fortified and surrounded by three tide-filling ditches. In April 1658, Morgan took a force of 400 foot and 50 horse from Mardyck, doubled his numbers with French troops from Bourbourg, and marched towards Gravelines to capture and destroy two nearby stone forts and a sluice with which the Spanish were intending to inundate the land around Bourbourg. At the end of July, Marshal la Ferté besieged the town with 10,000 men while two English frigates and smaller vessels blockaded the harbour. Turenne with 7,000 horse and 3,000 foot covered the siege and the newly won towns of Bergues, Veurne and Diksmuide, and blocked a relief force led by Don Juan and Condé. Though English foot were not involved in the siege, Scottish regiments in French service were prominent in the approaches, storming a half-moon on 17 August. The town was fiercely defended because of hopes of relief, only capitulating on August 27.

Gravelines is one of the prettiest places in this itinerary, and well worth a visit all by itself. There are numerous walks to be had atop its walls, along firestepped ramparts and over bastions - its fortifications being among the best preserved in the area. An excellent model of Gravelines' fortifications after Vauban may be seen in the museum in the eighteenth century arsenal within the citadel. The model is a copy of one of the plans-reliefs originally commissioned by Louis XIV's war minister Louvois.



Gravelines is less than 20 km west of Dunkirk on the N 1, and can also be reached via the less straight, but quicker A 16 - E 40.

## Ieper (Ypres).

Immediately after the fall of Gravelines, Turenne went against Oudenaarde which fell on 9 September, then routed the Prince of Ligny who was marching from Ieper to Tournai with 4,000 men on 3/13 September, the day of Cromwell's death.[7] A day or two later Menin opened its gates, then Ieper was besieged. The town was stoutly defended but the English distinguished themselves once more, Morgan and his men taking the counterscarp and outworks. Morgan's account of the assault unsurprisingly places him and his troops to the fore - not only do the irrepressible English, falling on 'Happy-go-lucky', sweep the Spanish before them but they rescue the French when they get into difficulty.[8] Whatever the veracity of Morgan's account, the Spanish soon surrendered on 26 September. There the campaign ended, the English field regiments marching off to winter quarters at Amiens in Picardy.

Ieper's ramparts owe much to the work of Vauban, and half of them remain today. These walls (since restored) were unique in surviving the First World War intact - something you will only appreciate if you see photos of how devastated the town was in 1918. The Grote Markt has been reconstructed to its medieval and Renaissance appearance, and the tourist office is located in the magnificent Cloth Hall (Lakenhalle). While here, one should obviously make a pilgrimage to the Menen Gate, St George's Memorial Church, and Flanders Fields museum (upstairs in the Cloth Hall) to remember the dead of the Great War. Ieper is 50 km from Dunkirk if you take the A 25 - E 42 south, then, at junction 13, follow the D 948/N 38 west. If you are travelling there from Veurne, it is 30 km south-east on the N 8.

## Mardyck.

In the 1650s, Mardyck had one of the best harbours on the coast and was defended by a square, four-bastioned stone and earth fort, as well as a wooden fort built on piles jutting out into the sea. The Anglo-French army arrived here on 29 September 1657, and entrenched between Dunkirk and Mardyke to prevent its relief. The wooden fort fell after three days of siege, the main fort on the fourth, and the whole was handed over to the English. In October, a Spanish force that included Charles Stuart and the Duke of York attempted to retake the place but only managed to level some of the new entrenchments. A second, seaward, attack came ten days later when 12 shallops attempted to enter the harbour to seize the

English frigates 'Rose' and 'True Love'. An alert seaman raised the alarm, however, and the attackers were frightened off by musket fire.

Because of the problems in defending Mardyck (labour was constantly required to keep the harbour and works clear of shifting sand), Turenne suggested it should be razed and abandoned. The English were determined to hold the place, however, so Turenne left troops nearby who could relieve it in case of assault. As a measure of goodwill, Mazarin sent some of his own guard as well as the king's musketeers to help garrison the town, as well as engineers. However, the soldiers stationed here suffered terribly from lack of shelter, and tensions rose between the allies. In April 1658, English soldiers killed some of the king's guards, and allegedly were neither punished nor apprehended by Morgan who was in charge of Mardyck.[9]

The fort of Mardyck was eventually demolished under Louis XIV, and nothing remains of either the fort or of the old village of Mardyck. The areas of Fort-Mardyck and Mardyck are now unappealing suburbs and industrial zones to the west of Dunkirk.

Veurne (Furnes).

Turenne approached Veurne with several squadrons of horse and a party of foot on 3 July 1658. The town surrendered without a fight, most of the garrison having fled. Today, Veurne's ramparts are no more (only canals follow their former jagged course on the south side of the town) but the town boasts splendid seventeenth century civic and domestic architecture. Around the Grote Markt are situated the early seventeenth century Town Hall, the oak furnished former Court of Justice built in 1617 (the tourist office is on the ground floor), the sixteenth century Spanish Pavilion which housed the officers of the garrison, and the Guard House of the night-watchmen, built in 1636. Traditional gabled Flemish houses abound throughout the town, and there are medieval delights too, such as St Walburga's church, behind the Court of Justice. Veurnes is just over 20 km east of Dunkirk on the A 16 - E 40 or N 1.

Notes

1. Dunkirk, as well as other towns in this itinerary - Gravelines and Bergues - formed part of Vauban's 'Pre Carré' or 'Square Field' policy of the second half of the seventeenth century. This consisted of two lines of fortified towns to guard the area conquered by Louis XIV, which stretched from the coast inland to the Ardennes.



2. T Birch (ed), *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esquire* [hereafter *TSP*] (7 vols, London, 1742), VII, 197, Lockhart to Thurloe, 3 July 1658. See also *TSP*, VII, 178, Lockhart to Thurloe, 17/27 June 1658.
3. On the whole, the English garrison and the native inhabitants got on well together, and the citizens gave Lockhart few problems. See *TSP*, VII, 215, Lockhart to Thurloe, 9 July 1658.
4. The medieval walls ran in two lines to form a triangle with the harbour and water channel. They proceeded from the Leughenaer Tower, south along what is now the rue Henri Terquem, down to the rue du Président Poincaré (the Post Office is situated where the right angle of the walls would have stood), then west along this road and the rue de l'Amiral-Ronarc'h to the harbour.
5. The English suffered more losses than their allies in the battle (of an allied total of 400), but the royalists in the Spanish army were so badly reduced there was no longer the threat of a royalist expedition to England.
6. *TSP*, VII, 668, Alsop to Fleetwood, 6 May 1659.
7 Marvell referred to this in 'Upon the Death of his late Highness': 'And the last minute his victorious ghost/ Gave chase to Ligny on the Belgic coast.'
8. Sir Thomas Morgan, *A True and Just Relation of Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Morgan 's Progress in France and Flanders, with the Six Thousand English, In the Years 1657 and 1658: At the Taking of Dunkirk and Other Important Places* (London, 1699), p. 14. Morgan himself was slightly hurt in the attack, by a shot in his calf.
9. See C H Firth, *The Last Years of the Protectorate 1656-1658* (2 vols London, 1909), II, 179, quoting a letter from Bordeaux, 4 May: '"He thinks", said Mazarin, "that the matter is settled when he has said it is the result of the hatred which the English have for the French", an explanation that was more convincing than satisfactory.'

Thomas Fegan is completing an MA in heritage interpretation, which included a placement at the Cromwell Museum, Huntingdon. He and his French wife, Sophie, have undertaken several Anglo-French expeditions to Flanders and would urge others to do the same.

# 'INVISIBLE COLLEGE'

*by Jane A. Mills*

During the sixteenth century there were some very clever people who started to question the established view on life, especially the nature and origins of the universe. Through experiments and observation they began to come up with other ideas. This threatened the Catholic Church's established views, and challenged the status quo; science promoted experimentation and inquiry, thus turning its back on theology. Among these people was Giordano Bruno, who was burnt at the stake, and Galilei Galileo - they suffered torture and imprisonment, all because of their beliefs in the universe as infinite space filled with planets - and above all Leonardo Da Vinci whose brilliant inventions suffered from the need to have a better understanding of scientific principles. It was, therefore, left to the Protestant countries to take up the quest for knowledge and thus guarantee the future progress of science. Whereas the Continent followed the deductive and theoretical approach, England favoured the Bacon emphasis on experimentation and collecting of facts before drawing conclusions in order to avoid hypothesis.

Francis Bacon was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and he was ahead of his time; he felt that knowledge was limited by the concentration on Aristotle. If Aristotle was excluded, knowledge would be expanded and therefore advances would be made in learning. Bacon was a prolific writer of more than thirty philosophical works and others of a legal, historical and popular nature. He published in 1605 *The Advancement of Learning* which he dedicated to King James I, calling upon him to help steer people away from the ancients and go out and make discoveries. James I was himself an intelligent and intellectual king. In 1620 Bacon published *Novum Organum*, which set out the plan to reorganise knowledge and a method to replace Aristotle. It was part of a proposed six volume series, which was never completed, as was the six volumes of natural history. Many of his projects were ambitious undertakings and as he held high office (Attorney General, Lord Keeper of the Seal, Lord Chancellor) his time was limited. He even died as a result of trying to further knowledge, for in March 1626 he was on his way to dine at Highgate when he decided to purchase a fowl and stuff it with snow in order to conduct a experiment on the effect of cold on decaying meat. He caught bronchitis and died a week later. Though his works are fragmentary, he did pave the way and greatly influenced some remarkable people who would go on to create great changes.



It was during 1645 that a group of like-minded men got together to discuss 'New Philosophy' or 'Experimental Philosophy', meeting once a week at the lodgings of Dr Jonathan Goddard (Oliver Cromwell's physician and a botanist) or at the Bull's Head Tavern in Cheapside to exchange scientific ideas and conduct experiments. By 1646 Robert Boyle, one of the founder members, was writing in his letters calling the group 'Our Invisible College of the Philosophical College'. He was from an aristocratic background, unlike the other members, so he was able to use his wealth to maintain several laboratories with trained staff to further the cause of science. He believed passionately in Bacon's belief that theories needed to be supported by a firm foundation of facts. He was very important because his genius gave the organisation a professional basis, with his emphasis on accurate recording of experimentation laying the foundation for laboratory science. It is Boyle we have to thank for changing the thinking of chemistry and laying the foundations for modern chemistry and chemical analysis. Boyle, together with the more senior scientists, created an environment where the younger members, such as Wren and Hooke, became grounded in the correct procedure for scientific analysis and paved the way for the important future advances in science.

In 1648 Dr John Wilkins was appointed Warden of Wadham College, Oxford; he was a mathematician, who had been chaplain to Lord Saye and Sele and later to Charles Lewis, Elector Palatine (Prince Rupert of Rhine's father). Although not a scientist himself, he was a firm believer and promoter of experimental philosophy and an enthusiastic member of the Invisible College. So in 1649 he revived the experimental philosophical club at Oxford. Christopher Wren was admitted as a gentleman scholar at Wadham in 1649 and in the same year Seth Ward, another member of the London group, was appointed Professor of Astronomy. The enthusiastic Wilkins gave Wren and Ward the large Warden's room in the gatehouse for them to transform into an astronomy chamber; the equipment they built themselves.

There were other members of the London group who also took up appointments at Oxford - John Wallis (mathematician and Professor of Geometry) 1649-50, William Petty (Professor of Anatomy at Brasenose College) and Dr Jonathan Goddard, who became Warden of Merton in 1651. In 1653 the eighteen year old Robert Hooke became a student at Christ Church, Oxford. He had an outstanding brain, and straightaway Robert Boyle recognised his potential. Together they worked on the construction of Boyle's air pump. This led to Boyle's study of the vacuum, respiration and combustion. Hooke's expertise in optics enabled him to make discoveries in astronomy, and with the improvements he made to microscopes, advances were made in biology, notably by identifying the

details on fish scales and the structure of flies, gnats and fleas' eyes. He also applied his talents to clocks (anchor escapement), watches (spiral spring balance), and thermometers, setting the freezing point as zero. In 1662 the Royal Society appointed him Curator of Experiments with the responsibility for their setting up and evaluation. In 1665 he became Professor of Geometry at Gresham College and between 1677 and 1683 he served as Secretary of the Royal Society. It was while at the Royal Society that he developed his law of elasticity, an early theory of gravitation and the idea of light waves. Isaac Newton worked on gravity and light waves and received the credit. After the Great Fire of London 1666 he worked closely with Christopher Wren in the important role of City Surveyor for the re-building programme. He designed and constructed Montague House, new Bethlehem Hospital and a new Royal Exchange.

The Royal Society was very keen on improving horticulture and John Evelyn, who is chiefly remembered for his diary, was invited to join due to his expertise in this field including landscape gardening. During the late 1650s he had dedicated himself to setting up magnificent gardens at his home at Sayes Court. The first book the Society published in 1664 was John Evelyn's *Sylva or a Discourse of Forest Trees and the propagation of Timber in his Majesty's Dominions*. The Royal Society also published experiments in 'Philosophical Transactions', the oldest scientific journal in the world.

Charles II utilised Evelyn's talents after the Restoration by appointing him to serve on commissions for foreign plantations, land drainage, manufacture of saltpetre and the Mint. While working on the commission to improve London streets, he published a book on city planning and smoke abatement. He even submitted a master plan for the rebuilding of London after the Great Fire. His plan was for London to become a garden city with public parks; unfortunately at the time nothing came of it. In the 1830s John Loudon, an architect, publisher and horticulturist, resurrected the idea. During the 1650s Evelyn had corresponded with Boyle on various matters, including a permanent site for the Invisible College.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century there was not a specific separation between the different arts and sciences, so people experimented and had knowledge of several areas. Thus medical sciences, such as anatomy and chemistry, were making great strides, together with inventions for industry. Therefore pumps produced for clearing water from mines led to air pressure and the anatomy of the heart as a pump. Christopher Wren is a good example of this crossover, for he is well known as an architect, yet at the age of fifteen he invented and patented a device for simultaneously writing with two pens and devised a deaf and



dumb sign language. He studied medicine and assisted at anatomical experiments, made water clocks, sundials, and looms for multiple weaving, pumps and musical instruments. He was a pioneer of anaesthetics and blood transfusions, and became Professor of Astronomy at Gresham College in London and later at Oxford.

The Society has had some noteworthy members from abroad. John Winthrop, the founder of Saybrook, Connecticut, was a physician and scientist and the first fellow of the Royal Society to be resident in America. Cotton Mather, the famous American puritan, was the first American-born member. He was incredibly talented and published books in many subjects, including medicine and science. He was involved in social welfare and believed in smallpox inoculation.

In the 1650s the Medicis founded a Scientific Society in Florence and King Louis XIV founded the French Academe. But it was the pioneering work of the Invisible College's early groups which set the pattern for the future, enabling scientific thought and experiments to be taken seriously and confirming its place in the shaping of the country. The Royal Society still remained the most important and influential, its overriding belief in the practical application of science in order to benefit human life enabling it to create the technology which would help industry and the country become an important nation. By the end of the century, the various branches of the natural sciences had been well and truly established, headed by the brilliant minds of Boyle for chemistry, Harvey for medicine and Newton with mathematics and physics. Once again the destruction of the civil war and the relative calm of the interregnum proved to be conducive to encouraging the formation of ideas which laid the foundation for the future.

Jane A Mills, MISM, is a member of The Cromwell Association and its council. She is a regular contributor to *Cromwelliana*, *English Civil War Notes & Queries* and other historical journals.

# MONUMENTS TO THE REGICIDES AT VEVEY, SWITZERLAND

*by John Bromilow*

Following the restoration of Charles II, the new government took their revenge on those who had been involved in the trial and execution of the late king. Several of these regicides escaped abroad, some going to America, where they live on at least in folk memory, and others to the continent of Europe. Of the latter, some made their home in Switzerland, where they were given an honourable welcome, and the monuments to five of these men are to be seen in St Martin's Church, Vevey. John Lisle, who assisted the president of the court, John Bradshaw, at the trial, later moved to Lausanne where an Irish royalist murdered him one morning on the way to church. He was buried in a church of that town but I have not yet ascertained if a monument to him exists.

I visited Vevey recently to see if these monuments, which are reported in Ludlow's *Memoirs*, still exist, what form they take and if the transcriptions of the epitaphs are accurate. St Martin's Church is on the edge of town and looks across Lake Geneva.

Those commemorated at Vevey are:

1. Edmund Ludlow (1617-1682) of Wiltshire, lawyer, Member of Parliament, soldier and staunch republican, who was appointed Commissioner for the trial and signed the death warrant, his name being second on the fifth row.
2. Nicholas Love (1606-1682) of Winchester, lawyer and Member of Parliament, who was appointed Commissioner for the trial and attended most of the sittings although he did not sign the death warrant.
3. William Cawley (1602-1666/7) of Chichester, Member of Parliament, who was appointed Commissioner for the trail and attended every sitting, signing the king's death warrant. His name is the seventh on the fifth row of this document.
4. Andrew Broughton (c 1603-1687) of Maidstone, who was appointed by the Commissioners clerk to assist John Phelps. He was the second choice for this post, the original choice, one Mr Greaves, being unable to serve. He read out several times the formal demand for the king to plead.
5. John Phelps (1619- ?) of Salisbury, who was appointed clerk by the Commissioners and took the notes of the trial. His date and place of death are unknown.



The monuments to Andrew Broughton, William Cawley and Nicolas Love are fixed together on a wall of the chapel west of the north transept. They are similar in form - grey stone slabs with incised lettering. From their size and form it is likely that these slabs originally covered the interment; in fact *The Dictionary of National Biography* states that in the nineteenth century a tomb was found below the boarded floor of the church bearing an inscription to William Cawley, which certainly refers to the slab. The floor now consists of stone slabs, probably of the last century, with no monuments. The inscriptions to Andrew Broughton and Nicholas Love are somewhat crudely incised, possible by the same hand. The inscriptions are as follows:

DEPOSITORIVM

ANDRÆ BROVGHTON ARMIGERI
ANGLICANI MAŸDSTONENIS
IN COMITATV CANTŸ

VBI BIS PRÆTOR VRBANVS
DiGNATVSQVE ETIAM FVIT SEN-
TENTIAM REGIS REGVM PROFARI
QVAM OB CAVSAM EXPVLSVS PATRIÂ SUÂ
PEREGRINATOINE EIVS FINITÂ
SOLO SENECTVTIS MORBO AFFECTVS
REQVIESCENS A LABORIBVS SVIS
IN DOMINO OBDORMIVIT ·

23º DIE FEB · ANº DOMINI · 1687
ÆTATIS SUÆ 84 ~

---

HIC IACET

TABERNACVLVM TERRESTRE
GVLIELMI CAWLEY
ARMIGERI ANGLICANI
NUP. DE CICESTRIA
IN COMITATV
SVSSEXIÆ

*[Shield with arms]*

QVI POSTQVAM ÆTATE
SVA INSERVIVIT
DEI CONCILIO
OBDORMIVIT

6º IAN 1666
ÆTATIS SUÆ 63 ~

D O M S

HIC IACET

CORPVS NICOLAI LOVE ARMIG·
ANGLICANI DE WINTONIA IN
COMITATV SOVTHAMPTONIAE
QVI POST DISCRIMINA RERVM
ET PVGNAM PRO PATRIA
TANDEM IN DOMINO REQVIEVIT
A LABORIBUS SVIS SPE RESVRGENDI
GLORIOSE IN ADVENTVM DNI
NOSTI IESV CHRISTI CVM OMNIB·9
SANCTIS SVIS ·
5·to DIE NOV· AN· DOM 1682
AETATIS SVUÆ 74 "

---

The monument to Edmund Ludlow is to be found on the north wall of a chapel off the north transept. This is a large, skilfully executed, rectangular wall monument of black marble, presumably in situ, the letters being incised and gilded. It has moulded surrounds. The inscription is thus:

*[Shield with arms]*
SISTE GRADVM ET RESPICE

HIC IACET EDMOND LVDLOW, ANGLVS NATIONE,
PROVINCIÆ WILTONIENSIS FILIVS HEN -
RICI EQVESTRIS ORDINIS, SENATORISQVE PARLAMENTI,
CVIVS QVOQVE FVIT IPSE MEMBRVM, PATRVM STEM -
MATE CLARVS, ET NOBILIS, VIRTVTE PROPRIA NOBILIOR,
RELIGIONE PROTESTANS, ET INSIGNI PIETATE CORRVS-
CVS ÆTATIS ANNO 23 TRIBVNVS MILITVM, PAVLO POST
EXERCITVS PRÆTOR PRIMARIVS ·

TVNC HYBERNORVM DOMITOR ·
IN PVGNA INTREPIDVS, ET VITÆ PRODIGVS, IN VICTORIA
CLEMENS, ET MANSVETVS, PATRIÆ LIBERATIS ~
DEFENSOR, ET POTESTATIS ARBITRARIÆ, OPPVGNATOR
ACERRIMVS ·



CVIVS CAVSA AB EADEM PATRIA 32 ANNIS EXTORRIS
MELIORIQVE FORTUNA DIGNVS APVD HELVETIOS
SE RECEPIT IBIQVE ÆTATIS ANNO 73 MORIENS, OMNIBVS SVI
DESIDERIVM RELINQVENS SEDES ÆTERNAS
LÆTVS ADVOLAVIT ·

HOCCE MONVMENTVM IN PERPETVAM VERÆ, ET SINCERÆ
ERGA MARITVM DEFVNCTVM AMICITLÆ ~
MEMORIAM DICAT, ET VOVET DOMINA ELIZABETH DE
THOMAS EIVS STRENVA ET MŒSTISSIMVS ~
TAM IN INFORTVNIJS QVAM IN MATRIMONIO CONSORS
DILECTISSIMA QVÆ ANIMI MAGNITVDINE, ET
VI AMORIS CONIVGALIS MOTA, EVM EVM IN EXILIVM AD
OBITVM VSQUE CONSTANTER SECVTA EST

ANNO DOMINI 1693

---

These monuments are contemporary but that to John Phelps is not, having been erected in the nineteenth century. In fact, it is not known if he died or was buried at Vevey. This wall monument is to be found on the west wall of the chapel that houses the monument to Edmund Ludlow. Its text is as follows:

IN MEMORIAM
OF HIM WHO BEING, WITH ANDREW BROUGHTON,
JOINT-CLERK OF THE COURT
WHICH TRIED AND CONDEMNED
CHARLES THE FIRST OF ENGLAND,
HAD SUCH ZEAL TO ACCEPT THE FULL
RESPONSIBILITY OF HIS ACT,
THAT HE SIGNED EACH RECORD WITH HIS FULL NAME
JOHN PHELPS
HE CAME TO VEVEY AND DIED,
LIKE HIS ASSOCIATES WHOSE MEMORIALS
ARE ABOUT US, AN EXILE IN THE CAUSE
OF HUMAN FREEDOM.

---

THIS STONE IS PLACED AT THE REQUEST OF
WM WALTER PHELPS OF NEW-JERSEY AND
CHARLES A. PHELPS OF MASSACHUSETTS
DESCENDANTS FROM ACROSS THE SEAS.

There is a tradition, reported in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, that the body of William Cawley was returned to England and buried in a vault under the chapel of the hospital he had founded; this was opened in 1883 and a lead case containing a male skeleton was discovered but there was no inscription. There is a wall monument to William Cawley and his father John in Chichester Cathedral; it was formerly in the redundant St Andrew's Church of the City.

Sources

C V Wedgwood, *The Trial of Charles I* (London, 1954)
C H Firth (ed), *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow* (2 vols, Oxford, 1894)
L Stephen and S Lee (eds), *The Dictionary of National Biography* (22 vols, Oxford, 1921-2)

John Bromilow is a part-time dentist, artist, amateur historian and physicist. He is Honorary Publicity Officer to the Church Monuments Society.



# OBITUARY
# BARON FOOT OF BUCKLAND MONACHORUM, 1909-99

Lord Foot, a long-serving Vice President of The Cromwell Association and a son of the principal founder of the Association, died on 11 October 1999, aged 90. Born John Mackintosh Foot in February 1909, one of the sons of the Rt. Hon. Isaac Foot, the distinguished West Country lawyer and politician, he was brought up in an environment of West Country non-conformity and active Liberalism. After studying law at Balliol, Oxford, where he became president of the Union, he pursued a legal career, joining his father's firm and in due course becoming senior partner. A strong critic of the Munich Agreement and of the Chamberlain government, he served in the Wessex Division during the Second World War, seeing action in north-west Europe and rising to the rank of major. Although on several occasions he sought election to the Commons, contesting Basingstoke twice before the war and his father's old constituency of Bodmin twice after it, he was not successful. But he remained active and influential within the Liberal party and in 1967 was created a life peer on the recommendation of the then Liberal leader. At one stage he was one of four brothers in parliament, two in the Commons and two in the Lords. He was active in the House of Lords, speaking strongly in defence of Liberal and liberal causes. His brother Michael once described him as 'the ablest member of the family, the best speaker and an extremely radical lawyer'. He came to admire the House of Lords and to support its existing composition, complete with an hereditary element, seeing selection by God as preferable to appointment by the Prime Minister: 'When I look around this House, it seems to me that the Almighty is doing rather better'. Considered to be on the left wing of his party on many issues, he took a liberal line on cannabis and prostitution and was for a time a member of CND. During the 1970s he served as chairman of the UK Immigrants Advisory Service and sat on the Crowther Commission on the Constutution. He remained passionate about his native West Country, spending as much time as possible there, at his home not far from the Devon/Cornwall border and on the fringes of his beloved Dartmoor. He was for a time a member of the Dartmoor National Parks Committee and President of the Dartmoor Preservation Association. He vigorously opposed any planned encroachment upon the moor and to the end he listed his interests in *Who's Who* as chess, crosswords and 'defending Dartmoor'. He is survived by his wife, whom he married in 1936, and by their two children.

# CROMWELLIAN BRITAIN XIII
# WIDECOMBE-IN-THE-MOOR, DEVON

Dartmoor, like most of the upland reaches of Britain, was not actively fought over during the civil war. A high moor, thinly populated, with no significant urban centres and, despite its mineral deposits, in the seventeenth century not particularly affluent, it possessed neither the resources nor the easy lines of communication to make it attractive to rival armies. Devon as a whole was hotly contested and changed hands twice. Initially held for parliament, it fell to the king in 1643 and remained in royalist hands until 1645-6, when it was recaptured by Fairfax, Cromwell and the New Model Army. There was significant action along the roads and in and around the townships which fringed the moor. In the opening months of the war, the two sides clashed around Dunsford and, in February 1643, at Chagford, resulting in a street fight in which the royalist poet Sidney Godolphin was badly wounded and reputedly bled to death in the porch of the Three Crowns; in April 1643 local parliamentarians ambushed a party of Cornish royalists on Sourton Down and a running fight developed; and in January 1646, as part of the parliamentary reconquest of the county, Cromwell himself attacked and scattered royalists camped outside Bovey Tracey.

Although the heartlands of Dartmoor largely escaped direct fighting, they certainly contributed men who fought and in many cases were killed elsewhere. Mark Stoyle has recently portrayed early Stuart Dartmoor - along with much of mid Devon - as a somewhat isolated region of the county, far removed from the new ideas and new influences found in the ports and the main urban centres. There was a relatively static population - Stoyle found that of the 107 family names recorded in the moorland parish of Widecombe between 1600 and 1634, 51% were still there in the period 1700-34, a much higher figure than found in other parts of Devon and elsewhere in England - which was conservative in religion, resisting reformist ideas, and which retained the old customs of church ales and popular festivals. In the light of this it is not surprising to discover that this was an area of popular royalism, in clear contrast to the north, south and parts of the east of the county, which showed evidence of popular parliamentarianism. Records of those killed and maimed in the king's service suggest that many of the parishes of mid Devon in general and Dartmoor in particular contributed a much higher proportion of adult males to the royalist armies than parishes elsewhere in the county.[1]



Widecombe-in-the-Moor was and is a large parish in the eastern half of Dartmoor. Although the village itself lies in a slight valley, the land rises steeply above the settlement, and in the seventeenth century, as now, it was an area of scattered farms, with rough grazing for sheep and cattle, and tiny hamlets. At the time of the civil war the adult male population of the entire parish probably totalled less than 150. Nevertheless, there is evidence of some wealth in the area, most obvious in the surprisingly large and elegant parish church of St Pancras with its soaring, late medieval tower, probably built out of the profits of medieval tin-working in the locality. Now rather too popular for its own good during the summer months, Widecombe has become well known for its fair and associated song, and for the large numbers of tourists and coaches which converge upon it. But at heart, and particularly out of season, it remains a very attractive village, especially the small square on rising ground, framed by the church and churchyard, the Glebe House of 1527 and the Old Church House, dating from the sixteenth or early seventeenth century, which has served at different times as alehouse, poorhouse, schoolhouse and almshouses.

Although there is no record of fighting here during the civil war, Widecombe acquired considerable fame or notoriety in the mid seventeenth century because of the terrible storm which hit the village in autumn 1638. News of the events quickly spread through England and within a week or so of the storm, a pamphlet describing 'those most strange and lamentable accidents' was published in London. It quickly sold out and a second, larger account was produced.[2] Together, they provide a graphic and at times gory description of the events which occurred in Widecombe on Sunday 21 October 1638, during divine service, as allegedly recounted by eye-witnesses who had 'now come to London'. The authors justified the pamphlets by pointing to the lessons which all might learn from God's dramatic intervention in the world:

> GODS visible judgements, and terrible remonstances...comming unto our knowledge, should be our observation and admonition, that thereby the inhabitants of the earth may learn Righteousnesse, for to let them pass by us...unobserved, argues too much regardlessnesse of GOD in the way of his Judgements...But to heare and feare and to doe wickedly no more, to search our hearts and amend our waies is the best use that can bee made of any of GODS remarkable terrors manifested among us. When GOD is angry with us, it ought to be our wisdome to meete him, and make peace with him...Except wee repent, wee shall likewise perish...Therefore this should awe and humble our hearts before the LORD, rising up into more perfection in godlinesse, doing unto our GOD, more and better service then ever hitherto wee have done, reverencing and

sanctifying his dreadfull Name in our hearts, especially when his Judgements breake in upon men, even in his owne house, mingling their bloud with their sacrifices, and in that most terrible manner smiting, and wounding, and killing, as in this ensuing Relation may appeare...The Lord teach thee to profit thereby, that it may bee as a Sermon to thee from Heaven by the Lord himselfe.

The two accounts which followed described how the sky darkened strangely during the Sunday service, so that the congregation could not read their books and could barely see one another, closely followed by 'a mighty thundering' and 'terrible strange lightening'. The lightening struck the church tower, badly damaging it and causing one of the corner pinnacles to collapse through the roof of the nave. Either that bolt or a second strike entered the nave itself in the form of ball lightening, and some of the congregation recalled seeing 'a great fiery ball come in at the window and passe through the Church', accompanied by fire, smoke and a strong smell of brimstone. Most of the congregation threw themselves to the floor amidst great cries 'of burning and scalding'. The minister, George Lyde, was in the pulpit when the lightening struck, but even though it passed close by, leaving one of the faces of the pulpit 'black and moist as if it had beene newly wiped with Inke', he was unhurt. However, 'the lightening seized upon his poor Wife, fired her ruffe and linnen next to her body, and her cloathes, to the burning of many parts of her body in a very pitifull manner'. A friend sitting next to her was also 'much scalded' and another unnamed woman ran out of the church with her clothes on fire and was left not only 'strangely burnt and scorched, but had her flesh torne about her back almost to the very bones'. Two male members of the congregation were killed, Roger Hill and Robert Meade, warrener to Sir Richard Reynell, both apparently by being thrown back so violently by the lightening that their heads were smashed against the church wall. The accounts describe in detail how the unfortunate warrener has his skull smashed open so that his brains were thrown out and a bloody indentation made in the wall. Many others were injured, some of whom subsequently died: a woman who 'had her flesh so torne and her body so grievously burnt' died the following night and a man sitting close to the warrener was burnt all over and lingered 'in great misery' about a week. On the other hand, there were remarkable escapes, of people whose hats or clothes were burnt off but their bodies left untouched, of small children forgotten and abandoned in the ensuring chaos who wandered out of the ruins unharmed some hours later: 'but it pleased GOD yet in the midst of judgement to remember mercy, sparing some and not destroying all'.

The church itself was badly damaged by the lightening. The ball lightening within the body of the church burnt or overturned pews, scorched the



stonework and caused one of the main beams to collapse, though it fell harmlessly to the floor between the minister and the clerk. The tower was also badly damaged and its partial collapse in turn damaged the roof of the nave. The following day two volunteers ventured up the wrecked tower, despite the 'loathsome smell beyond expression, as it were of Brimstone pitch and sulphur', to inspect the damage. One turned back in fear and the other was violently sick that night. On the Monday, too, the minister conducted a joint service for the first two victims, Hill and Meade, who were buried side by side at the east end of the nave; when Lyde threw some earth onto the coffins, the sudden noise caused those attending the funeral to 'runne out of the Church, tumbling over one another supposing that the Church was falling on their heads'.

The lightening strike at Widecombe church was referred to nearly twenty years later, in a pamphlet addressed to the Protector and the second Protectorate Parliament, attacking 'the Idolatrous High-places which are still kept up, under pretence of usefulness and convenience of Worship'. The pamphlet, which George Thomason dated 10 December 1656,[3] comprises an outspoken attack upon church towers and steeples and the bells housed within them, as 'useless...unprofitable...idolatrous', 'to be utterly destroyed'. 'Are they [steeples] not the Pope's pillars? for they were erected by the Catholic Papists, in honour of their Popish gods...Down with them and their Babylonish Bells, to the very ground, and let not a stone of them remain upon another'. The anonymous author, possibly Samuel Chidley, notes with approval that the year before God had caused a thunderbolt to strike 'Sin Botolphs Steeple at Boston'. Although the events at Widecombe are not discussed in the main text, the pamphlet opens with a verse -

Protectors, Parliaments, and all, see, hear,
And quake for fear: O do not jeer, nor swear
'Gainst God, who roars from Sion on your sin,
'Gainst such High-places which you worship in.
J[ehov]ah with his burning blasts of lightening quells
The Peoples Idols-Temples-Steeples-Bells

- below which is reproduced a crude engraving of the lightening strike on Widecombe church on 21 October 1638, with the note 'A most prodigious & fearefull storme of winds lightening & thunder, mightily defacing Withcomb-church in Devon, burneing and slayeing diverse men and women all this in service-time'. The engraving shows one bolt hitting the church tower, causing a pinnacle to collapse, and another fiery ball heading for the nave. The near wall of the nave has been removed so that the illustrator can depict the chaos inside. There is fire and smoke in the nave,

members of the congregation are in disorder, a male figure lies face down in the foreground and part of a pillar or beam is falling close to the pulpit, in which the minister stands.

Widecombe church, which is generally unlocked and open to visitors, contains several echoes of the great storm. The village schoolmaster at the time, Richard Hill, wrote a long poem about the storm, which was painted on boards in the church. The present set of boards, now hanging in the base of the tower, are replacements made in the 1780s. At the east end of the nave, close to the chancel, can be seen the gravestone of one of the victims, which bears a still legible Latin inscription showing that it is the resting place of Roger Hill, gentleman, who died on 21 October 1638, and of his widow Anne, who died ten years later. A similar gravestone next to it, without an inscription, probably marks the burial place of Robert Meade, the warrener. Two other features of the splendid, principally Perpendicular church should be noted. Although the upper part of the wooden screen and its rood loft have long gone, the lower part, probably of the early sixteenth century, survives, complete with paintings of various saints and martyrs. Several have had their faces scored through or scraped away. Although such defacement is invariably ascribed to civil war iconoclasm, there is here, as in so many churches, no evidence to link it to the mid seventeenth century. The iconoclasm of the opening stages of the sixteenth century English Reformation, or post-early modern vandalism, might just as easily be to blame. And on the north wall of the nave is an inscribed tablet to Mary, third wife of John Elford of Sheepstor. Married in February 1641/2, she died in February 1642/3, shortly after the birth of her twin daughters, and was buried here. The elaborate tablet, erected in 1650, commemorates her in verse. The inscription notes that her name, Mary Elford, is an anagram of 'Fear My Lord', and includes within it various characters which, read as Roman numerals, give her age at death (25) and the year of her death and burial (1642 old style).

Notes.

1. Mark Stoyle, *Loyalty and Locality. Popular Allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter, 1994).
2. *A True Relation of those most strange and lamentable Accidents, happening in the Parish Church of Wydecombe in Devonshire* and *A Second and Most Exact Relation of those Sad and Lamentable Accidents which happened in and about the Parish Church of Wydecombe neere the Dartmoores*. Both have been reprinted with a brief introduction and notes by M Brown, *The Great Storm at Widecombe, 21 October 1638* (Plymouth, 1996).
3. British Library, Thomason Tract, E 896 (9). The British Library catalogue lists the pamphlet as a work of Chidley.



# SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PUBLICATIONS

I. BOOKS


E Allman, *Jacobean Revenge Tragedy and the Politics of Virtue* (Delaware UP, 2000)

P Almond, *Adam and Eve in Seventeenth Century Thought* (Cambridge UP, 1999)

I Atherton, *Ambition and Failure in Stuart England: The Career of John, 1st Viscount Scudamore* (Manchester UP, 1999)

S Barber, *Revolutionary Rogue: Henry Marten and the Immoral English Republic* (Sutton, 2000)

T C Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland* (Oxford UP, new edn, 2000)

M Bennett, *The Civil Wars Experienced* (Routledge, 2000)

R Blake, *Anthony Van Dyke* (Constable, 2000)

L Botelho (ed), *Churchwardens' Accounts for Cratfield, 1640-60* (Suffolk Record Society, 42, 1999)

J Broadway, *William Dugdale and the Significance of County History in Early Stuart England* (Dugdale Society, occasional paper 39, 1999)

D A Brooks, *From Playhouse to Printing House* (Cambridge UP, 2000)

S Brown, *Women's Writings in Stuart England* (Sutton, 2000)

M Burke, *Women, Writing and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain* (Syracuse UP, 1999)

P Cansfield, *The Battle of Alton* (Peter Cansfield, 1999)

J Catty, *Writing Rape, Writing Women in Early Modern England* (Macmillan, 1999)

J H Chandler, *Travels Through Stuart Britain: The Adventures of John Taylor, the Water Poet* (Sutton 1999)

W L Chernaik, *Marvell and Liberty* (Macmillan, 1999)

Chichester District Museum, *Civil War and Seventeenth Century Chichester* (Chichester District Museum, 1999)

K Chorlton, *Women, Religion and Education in Early Modern England* (Routledge, 1999)

J Clare, *Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority: Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship* (Manchester UP, 1999)

A Clarke, *Prelude to Restoration in Ireland* (Cambridge UP, 1999)

J Coffey, *Religious Toleration in Seventeenth Century England* (Longman, 1999)

S Coote, *Royal Survivor: The Life of Charles II* (Sceptre, 2000)

T N Corns, *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge UP, 1999)

D Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford UP, 1999)

E Cruickshanks, *The Stuart Courts* (Sutton, 2000)

D R Danielson, *The Cambridge Companion to Milton* (Cambridge UP, 1999)

D N Dickey, *A Study of the Place of Women in the Poetry and Prose Works of John Milton* (E Mellen P, 2000)

S A Dippel, *The Professionalisation of the English Church from 1560 to 1700* (E Mellen P, 1999)

S B Dobranski, *Milton, Authorship and the Book Trade* (Cambridge UP, 1999)

F E Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender and Seventeenth Century Print Culture* (Cornell UP, 1999)

F D Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland* (J Donald, new edn, 1999)

K L Edwards, *Milton and the Natural World* (Cambridge UP, 2000)

L A Ferrell and P McCullough (eds), *The English Sermon Revised: Politics and Culture in Early Modern Britain* (Manchester UP, 2000)

G Finaldi, *Orazio Gentileschi at the Court of Charles I* (Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao, 2000)

A Finkelstein, *An Intellectual History of Seventeenth Century English Economic Thought* (Michigan UP, 2000)

D C P Fisk, *The Cambridge Companion to the English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge UP, 2000)

M C Fissel, *English Warfare, 1511-1642* (University College London P, 2000)

A Flather, *Politics of Place: A Study of Church Seating in Essex, c 1580-1640* (Friends of the Dept of English Local History, 1999)

A J Fletcher, *Drama, Performance and Polity in Pre-Cromwellian Ireland* (Cork UP, 2000)

E Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England* (Longman, 1999)

S Frye, *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens* (Oxford UP, 1999)

E Fudge, *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture* (Macmillan, 1999)

M Gaskill, *Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2000)

P Gaunt (ed), *Cromwell 400* (The Cromwell Association, 1999)

M W Gelber, *The Just and the Lively: The Literary Criticism of John Dryden* (Manchester UP, 1999)

J Glete, *Warfare at Sea, 1500-1650* (Routledge, 2000)

J Goodare, *State and Society in Early Modern Scotland* (F Cass, 1999)

J Goodare and M Lynch, *The Reign of James VI* (Tuckwell P, 2000)

G B Harrison, *Elizabethan and Jacobean Journals* (Routledge, 1999)

S Hindle, *State and Social Change in Early Modern England* (Macmillan, 1999)

D Hirst, *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth Century England* (Cambridge UP, 2000)



R Hudson, *The Grand Quarrel: Women's Memoirs of the English Civil War* (Sutton, 2000)

R Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort, 1642-46* (Routledge, 2nd edn, 1999)

S James, *Passion and Action: Emotions in Seventeenth Century Philosophy* (Oxford UP, 1999)

D M Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth Century England* (Rochester UP, 1999)

G Kennedy, *Just Anger: Representing Women's Anger in Early Modern England* (Illinois UP, 2000)

J N King, *Milton and Religious Controversy* (Cambridge UP, 2000)

L L Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait and Print, 1645-61* (Cambridge UP, 2000)

L C Labriola, *Milton Studies* (Pittsburgh UP, 2000)

T B Leinwand, *Theatre, Finance and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 1999)

S Lenihan, *Confederate Catholics at War, 1641-48* (Cork UP, 2000)

K Lindley & D Scott, *The Journal of Thomas Juxon, 1642-47* (Cambridge UP, 2000)

R Loretelli, *Narrating Transgression: Representations of the Criminal in Early Modern England* (P Lang, 1999)

H F McMains, *The Death of Oliver Cromwell* (Kentucky UP, 2000)

J Macleod, *The Stuarts, 1560-1807* (Sceptre, new edn, 2000)

B Manning, *The Far Left in the English Revolution, 1640-60* (Bookmarks, 1999)

B Manning, *Contemporary Histories of the English Civil War* (Caliban, 1999)

A F Marotti, *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in the Early Modern English Text* (Macmillan, 1999)

V Massey, *James Naylor, 1618 to 1660* (Session P, 1999)

R Matz, *Defending Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 1999)

S H Mendelson, *Women in Early Modern England, 1550-1720* (Oxford UP, new edn, 1999)

M Morgan, *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641* (Four Courts, 2000)

R Morris, *The Storming of Sudeley Castle, 1643* (Stuart P, 2000)

R Morris, *Women on the Farm, 1580-1660* (Stuart P, 2000)

N Murray, *World Enough and Time: The Life of Andrew Marvell* (Little Brown P, 1999)

M O'Callaghan, *Shepheard's Nation: Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-25* (Oxford UP, 2000)

H O'Sullivan, *John Bellow: A Seventeenth Century Man of Many Parts* (Irish Academic P, 2000)

J Parkin, *Science, Religion and Politics in Restoration England* (Royal Historical Soc, 1999)

A M Patterson, *Marvell* (Longman, new edn, 1999)

C Patterson, *Urban Patronage in Early Modern England* (Stanford UP, 2000)
S Peachey, *Book of Boiled Meats, 1580-1660* (Stuart P, 2000)
S Peachey, *The Husbandman, 1580-1660* (Stuart P, 2000)
D Petegorsky, *Left Wing Democracy in the English Civil War* (Sandpiper, reissued, 1999)
P Platt, *Wonders, Marvels and Monsters in Early Modern Culture* (Delaware UP, 2000)
K Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton* (Cambridge UP, 1999)
D X Powell, *Sir James Whitelocke's 'Liber Famelicus', 1570-1632* (P Lang, 2000)
M Power, *Liverpool Town Books, 1649-71* (Record Society of Lancashire & Cheshire, 1999)
R Pritchard, *Shakespeare's England* (Sutton, 1999)
A Pyle, *Dictionary of Seventeenth Century British Philosophers* (Thoemmes P, 2000)
B Rajan, *Milton and the Imperial Vision* (Duquesne UP, 1999)
S Reid, *Scots Armies of the English Civil War* (Osprey, 1999)
G Reynolds, *Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Miniatures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (Royal Collection, 1999)
J Richards, *Aristocrat and Regicide. The Life and Times of Thomas, Lord Grey of Groby* (New Millennium P, 2000)
R Rizzoli, *Representations and Ideology in Jacobean Drama* (E Mellen P, 1999)
M Roberts, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Wales* (Wales UP, 2000)
S K Roberts (ed), *The Letter-Book of John Byrd, Customs Collector in South-East Wales, 1648-80* (South Wales Record Soc, 1999)
P Roberts-Miller, *Voices in the Wilderness: Public Discourse and the Paradox of Puritan Rhetoric* (Alabama UP, 1999)
P Salzman, *Early Modern Women's Writing: An Anthology* (Oxford UP, 2000)
M C Schoenfeldt, *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2000)
S Scholz, *Body Narratives: Writing the Nation and Fashioning the Subject in Early Modern England* (Macmillan, 1999)
J Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth Century Political Instability in a European Context* (Cambridge UP, 2000)
J Sharpe, *The Bewitching of Ann Gunter* (Profile, 1999)
K Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (Yale UP, 2000)
K Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2000)
A Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558-1660* (Cambridge UP, 1999)
R M Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Pennsylvania UP, 1999)



J P Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-40* (Longman, 1999)
M Spufford, *Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Sutton, new edn, 1999)
M Spufford, *Figures in the Landscape: Rural Society in England, 1500-1700* (Valorium, 1999)
L Thompson, *Newmarket, From James I to the Present Day* (Virgin P, 2000)
S Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1648* (Yale UP, 2000)
T L Underwood, *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and other Early Muggletonian Writings* (Oxford UP, 1999)
D J Vicus, *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England* (Columbia UP, 2000)
A Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford UP, 1999)
J Walter, *Understanding Popular Violence in the English Revolution: The Colchester Plunderers* (Cambridge UP, 1999)
N Wheale, *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print and Politics in Britain, 1590-1660* (Routledge, 2000)
J S Wheeler, *The Making of a World Power: War and Revolution in Seventeenth Century England* (Sutton, 1999)
J S Wheeler, *Cromwell in Ireland* (Gill & Macmillan, 1999)
A P Williams, *Images of Manhood in Early Modern Literature* (Greenwood P, 1999)
A Wilson, *Safe Deliverance: Childbirth in Seventeenth Century England* (University College London P, 1999)
D Wilson, *The King and the Gentleman: Charles Stuart and Oliver Cromwell* (Pimlico, 2000)
A Wood, *Politics and Social Conflict: The Peak Country 1520-1770* (Cambridge UP, 1999)
J Wroughton, *Unhappy Civil War* (Lansdown P, 1999)
N Yates, *Buildings, Faith and Worship: The Liturgical Arrangement of Anglican Churches, 1600-1900* (Oxford UP, 2nd end, 2000)
M B Young, *James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality* (Macmillan, 1999)
P Young, *The English Civil War* (Osprey, new edn, 2000)

II. ARTICLES

J Adams, 'Sir William Petty: scientist, economist, inventor, 1623-87', *The Historian*, 62 (1999)
D Allan, 'Reconciliation and retirement in the Restoration Scottish church: the neo-stoicism of Robert Leighton', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50 (1999)
anon, 'Exhibition: Civil War. The Great Rebellion in Charles I's three kingdoms, 1638-53', *Bodleian Library Record*, 16 (1999)

S Barber, '"Nothing but the first chaos": making sense of Ireland', *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999)
P Barnes, 'The adaptation of open field farming in an east Nottinghamshire parish: Orston, 1641-1793', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire*, 101 (1997)
S K Baskerville, 'Puritans, revisionists and the English civil war', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (1999)
D Beaver, 'The great deer massacre: animals, honor and communication in early modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 38 (1999)
R A Beddard, 'A traitor's gift: Hugh Peter's donation to the Bodleian Library', *Bodleian Library Record*, 16 (1999)
S Birtles, 'Common land, poor relief and enclosure: the use of manorial resources in fulfilling parish obligations, 1601-1834', *Past & Present*, 165 (1999)
P T Bradley, 'English views of the Indians of Peru', *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999)
J Broad, 'The fate of the Midland yeoman, 1620-1800', *Continuity and Change*, 14 (1999)
J Broadway, 'John Smyth of Nibley: a Jacobean man of business and his service to the Berkeley family', *Midland History*, 24 (1999)
M Brod, 'Politics and prophesy in seventeenth century England: the case of Elizabeth Poole', *Albion*, 31 (1999)
G Burgess, 'Was the civil war a war of religion?', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (1999)
A Button, 'Royalist women petitioners in south-west England, 1655-62', *The Seventeenth Century*, 15 (2000)
P Carter, 'Parliament, convocation and the granting of clerical supply in early modern England', *Parliamentary History*, 19 (2000)
J Coffey, 'Puritanism and liberty revisited: the case for toleration in the English Revolution', *The Historical Journal*, 41 (1998)
J R Collins, The Restoration bishops and royal supremacy', *Church History*, 68 (1999)
D Como, 'Women, prophesy and authority in early Stuart puritanism', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (1999)
D Como and P Lake, 'Puritans, antinomians and Laudians in Caroline London: the strange case of Peter Shaw and its contexts', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50 (1999)
P Crawford, 'Women's dreams in early modern England', *History Workshop Journal*, 49 (2000)
D Cressy, 'Conflict, consensus and the willingness to wink: the erosion of community in Charles I's England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (1999)
A Cromartie, 'Harringtonian virtue: Harrington, Machiavelli and the method of the *Moment*', *The Historical Journal*, 41 (1998)



A Cromartie, 'The constitutionalist revolution: the transformation of political culture in early Stuart England', *Past & Present*, 163 (1999)
D R Dickson, 'Thomas Vaughan and the Iatrochemical revolution', *The Seventeenth Century*, 15 (2000)
J Doelman, 'Born with teeth: Christopher Brooke's *The Ghost of Richard the Third* (1614)', *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999)
B Donagan, 'Family and misfortune in the English civil war: the sad case of Edward Pitt', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (1999)
S G Ellis, 'The collapse of the gaelic world, 1450-1650', *Irish Historical Studies*, 31 (1999)
K Fincham, 'William Laud and the exercise of Caroline ecclesiastical patronage', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 51 (2000)
M Fissell, 'Imagining vermin in early modern England', *History Workshop Journal*, 47 (1999)
A Fletcher, 'Manhood, the male body, courtship and the household in early modern England', *History*, 84 (1999)
E Foster, 'Foxenton Hall in the seventeenth century', *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, 95 (1999)
A Fox, 'Remembering the past in early modern England: oral and written tradition', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, sixth series, 9 (1999)
H R French and R W Hoyle, 'The land market of a Pennine manor, 1650-1780', *Continuity and Change*, 14 (1999)
J Gibson, '*King Lear* and the patronage system', *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999)
S D Glover, 'The Putney debates: popular versus elitist republicanism', *Past & Present*, 164 (1999)
P Griffiths, 'Meanings of nightwalking in early modern England', *The Seventeenth Century*, 13 (1998)
K Gucer, '"Not heretofore extant in print": where the mad Ranters are', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61 (2000)
B Harris, 'Scotland's herring fisheries and the prosperity of the nation, c1660-1760', *Scottish Historical Review*, 79 (2000)
M Havinden, 'The increase and distribution of the resident gentry of Somerset, 1500-1623', *Southern History*, 20/21 (1998-99)
S Hipkin, 'The maritime economy of Rye, 1560-1640', *Southern History*, 20/21 (1998-99)
M Hodgetts, 'The Owens of Oxford', *Recusant History*, 24 (1999)
R Hole, 'Incest, consanguinity and a monstrous birth in rural England, January 1600', *Social History*, 25 (2000)
V Holyoak, 'Civil war monuments project, Newark on Trent, Nottinghamshire: rediscovery of civil war redoubt "Z"', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire*, 101 (1997)

A Hopper, '"Tinker" Fox and the politics of garrison warfare in the West Midlands, 1643-50', *Midland History*, 24 (1999)
A Hopper, 'The clubmen of the West Riding of Yorkshire during the first civil war', *Northern History*, 36 (2000)
A Hopper, '"The Popish army of the north": anti-Catholicism and parliamentarian allegiance in civil war Yorkshire, 1642-46', *Recusant History*, 25 (2000)
A Howe, 'English actors in Paris during the civil wars: Samuel Speede and the Prince of Wales's company', *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999)
R Kenny, '"In these last dayes": the strange work of Abiezer Coppe', *The Seventeenth Century*, 13 (1998)
M G Kirkus, 'Great aunt and great niece: two 17th/18th century members of the Bedingfield family', *Recusant History*, 25 (2000)
L L Knoppers, '"Sing old Noll the brewer": royalist satire and social inversion', *The Seventeenth Century*, 15 (2000)
P Lake and D Como, '"Orthodoxy" and its discontents: dispute settlement and the production of "consensus" in the London (puritan) "underground"', *Journal of British Studies*, 39 (2000)
N Lloyd, 'Rhys Prichard, c1579-1644/5', *The Carmarthenshire Antiquary*, 34 (1998)
F Luttmer, 'Persecutors, tempters and vassals of the Devil: the unregenerate in puritan practical divinity', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 51 (2000)
A Maddock, 'Watercourse management and flood preventions in Alt level, Lancashire, 1589-1779', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 148 (1999)
J L Malcolm, 'Doing no wrong: law, liberty and the constraint of kings', *Journal of British Studies*, 38 (1999)
N Malcolm, 'The titlepage of *Leviathan*, seen in a curious perspective', *The Seventeenth Century*, 13 (1998)
J Mardock, 'The spirit and the muse: the anxiety of religious positioning in John Taylor's pre-war polemics', *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999)
S Mastoris, 'A newly discovered perambulation map of Sherwood Forest in the early seventeenth century', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire*, 102 (1998)
M C McClendon, 'A moveable feast: Saint George's day celebrations and religious change in early modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 38 (1999)
J F Merritt, 'Puritans, Laudians and the phenomenon of church building in Jacobean London', *The Historical Journal*, 41 (1998)
H Morgan, 'Overmightly officers: the Irish Lord Deputyship in the early modern British state', *History Ireland*, 7 (1999)
J Morrill, 'Oliver's army', *History Today*, 49 (1999)



M Morrissey, 'Narrative authority in spiritual life-writing: the example of Dionys Fitzherbert (fl. 1608-41)', *The Seventeenth Century*, 15 (2000)
J Nauman, 'The publication of *Thalia Rediviva* and the literary reputation of Katherine Philips, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (1999)
D Newton, 'Sir Francis Hastings and the religious education of James VI and I', *The Historical Journal*, 41 (1998)
K Nicholls, 'Celtic contrasts: Ireland and Scotland', *History Ireland*, 7 (1999)
D Norbrooke, 'A republican verse manifesto, 1653: John Ward's "The Changes"', *The Seventeenth Century*, 13 (1998)
A J S Nusbacher, 'Civil supply in the civil war: supply of victuals to the New Model Army on the Naseby campaign, 1-14 June 1645', *English Historical Review*, 115 (2000)
M O'Callaghan, 'Literary commonwealths: a 1614 print community, *The Shepheards Pipe* and *The Shepherds Hunting*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 13 (1998)
M O'Dowd, 'Women and the Irish chancery court in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century', *Irish Historical Studies*, 31 (1999)
J Ohlmeyer, 'Driving a wedge within gaeldom: Ireland and Scotland in the seventeenth century', *History Ireland*, 7 (1999)
D Oldridge, 'Protestant conceptions of the Devil in early Stuart England', *History*, 84 (1999)
T Osborne, 'Abbot Scaglia, the Duke of Buckingham and Anglo-Savoyard relations during the 1620s', *European History Quarterly*, 30 (2000)
T Osborne, 'Van Dyke and his patrons', *History Today*, 49 (1999)
K Parker, 'Mid seventeenth century Radnorshire reconsidered', *Transactions of the Radnorshire Society*, 68 (1998)
J T Peacey, 'Nibbling at *Leviathan*: politics and theory in England in the 1650s', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (1999)
C B Phillips, '"Lord of the towne": urban identity and culture in later Tudor and Stuart Stockport', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 148 (1999)
D R Ransome, 'An instrument of early Stuart sea power: the armed merchantman *Abigail*, c1615-39', *The Mariner's Mirror*, 85 (1999)
D Rollison, 'Exploding England: the dialectics of mobility and settlement in early modern England', *Social History*, 24 (1999)
I Roots, 'The 1650s', *The Historian*, 65 (2000)
J Rudolph, 'Rape and resistance: women and consent in seventeenth century English legal political thought', *Journal of British Studies*, 39 (2000)
C Russell, 'Why did people choose sides in the English civil war?', *The Historian*, 63 (1999)
C Russell, 'Parliament, the royal supremacy and the church', *Parliamentary History*, 19 (2000)

D Scott, 'The "Northern Gentlemen": the parliamentary independents and Anglo-Scottish relations in the Long Parliament', *The Historical Journal*, 42 (1999)

P R Seddon, 'The Nottingham elections to the Protectorate Parliaments of 1654 and 1656', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire*, 102 (1998)

D L Smith, 'Oliver Cromwell, the first Protectorate Parliament and religious reform', *Parliamentary History*, 19 (2000)

B Southgate, '"White's disciple": John Sergeant and Blackloism', *Recusant History*, 24 (1999)

B Stapleton, 'Patterns of inheritance in Odiham, 1525-1850', *Continuity and Change*, 14 (1999)

G F Steckley, 'Litigious mariners: wage cases in the seventeenth century admiralty court', *The Historical Journal*, 42 (1999)

M Stoyle, 'The dissidence of despair: rebellion and identity in early modern Cornwall', *Journal of British Studies*, 38 (1999)

A H Sturgis, 'Prophesies and politics: millenarians, rabbis and the Jewish Indian theory', *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999)

K W Swett, '"The account between us": honor, reciprocity and companionship in male friendship in the later seventeenth century', *Albion*, 31 (1999)

C C Taylor, 'The Bulwark, Earith, Cambridgeshire', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, 87 (1998)

T Thornton, 'Dynasty and territory in the early modern period: the Princes of Wales and their western British inheritance', *Welsh History Review*, 20 (2000)

R Tittler, 'Early modern British history, here and there, now and again', *Albion*, 31 (1999)

M Todd, 'Profane pastimes and the reformed community: the persistence of popular festivities in early modern Scotland', *Journal of British Studies*, 39 (2000)

D Trim, 'Sir Horace Vere in Holland and the Rhineland, 1610-12', *Historical Research*, 72 (1999)

R K Turvey, 'NLW Roll 135: a seventeenth century pedigree roll from Herefordshire', *National Library of Wales Journal*, 30 (1998)

B Tyson, 'The Whitehaven pier saltpans 1632-86 and their accounts 1675-77', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, 99 (1999)

A Veenhoff and M Smolenaars, 'Hugh Goodyear and his papers', *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, 95 (1999)

C Walker, 'Prayer, patronage and political conspiracy: English nuns and the Restoration', *The Historical Journal*, 43 (2000)



A Walsham, '*Vox Piscis: or The Book-Fish*: providence and the uses of the Reformation past in Caroline Cambridge', *English Historical Review*, 114 (1999)

B Weiser, 'Owning the king's story: the escape from Worcester', *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999)

I L Williams, 'The Commonwealth marriage register of St Mary, Marlborough', *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, 92 (1999)

M P Winship, '"The most glorious church in the world": the unity of the godly in Boston, Massachusetts in the 1630s', *Journal of British Studies*, 39 (2000)

A Wood, 'Custom and the social organisation of writing in early modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, sixth series, 9 (1999)

N Zahedieh, 'Making mercantilism work: London merchants and the Atlantic trade in the seventeenth century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, sixth series, 9 (1999)

The spate of 350th anniversaries that the 1990s produced is drawing to a close. We are into - or more accurately perhaps are on the brink of - a new decade, a new century and a new millennium. We can now go on to commemorate the 1650s with its events and developments even more fascinating than those of the 1640s - most of all perhaps for Cromwellians, since the Oliver of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, the dynamic soldier giving way to the maturing politician and statesman, is so much more complex and patient of interpretation. This is where Derek Wilson's 'experimental' joint biography, *The King and the Gentleman: Charles Stuart and Oliver Cromwell* (Pimlico, 1999, paperback edition £12.50) fails. The career of Charles I was effectively ended by the regicide, though the image would linger on, but Cromwell, seen as more of a personal antagonist than he really was, had a long way to go yet, but Wilson dismisses that in a couple of cursory pages, '...by all accounts, [Cromwell] made a peaceful and godly end'. Not according to many royalists and lately an American professor of English Literature [H F McMains], who has him poisoned by his own doctor. Before that distressing event, there is so much to go through of men and women and movements - James Naylor, say, and 'the Other House' - that we may expect, not without trepidation, a forest or a wilderness of new interpretations and sustained old ones. I can hardly wait.

Meanwhile, books and articles about the early and mid seventeenth century continue to find publishers and readers. Some have come my way - many I miss - and seem worth bringing to the attention of *Cromwelliana*. Outstanding as a piece of historical reconstruction is David Cressy's *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford UP, 1999, £25), which teases out from a morass of sources - court records, broadsheets, sermons, ballads and so on - 'tales of discord and dissension' related to incidents and activities outside the norm, disturbing, exciting, bewildering, even frightening, challenging the peace of mind and the peace itself of communities and constituted authorities. Why, for instance, and with what consequences was the excommunicated Mrs Horseman in 1631 buried by her neighbours at night in an Oxfordshire church? The answer convincingly established by Cressy's impressive blend of documentary grasp, empathy and imagination throws a bright light upon the nature of the discipline of the established church, of dissent and the strength of the popular sense of community. Mrs Horseman's body we see 'used to proclaim a message of resistance', 'a salvo against ecclesiastical protocol', 'putting religious rigidity to shame'. Each of Cressy's episodes, seemingly trivial, starting in local, even private tensions, took on a wider, sometimes even national, dimension and concern. Almost all human life is there - 'sex



and violence, faith and folly, birth and death', the stuff of tabloids today, but like them illuminating cultural values and attitudes. Monstrous births were always news, not just 'to wonder and gaze at', but rather taken as warnings, from the very hand of God, awe underlying entertainment. Women, always of suspicious interest to men - and often to other women - play a prominent part in these tales, as mothers, midwives, seduced or seducing maids. Cross-dressing was as worrying in the seventeenth century as it was when Joan of Arc was accused of witchcraft - Philip Stubbe's *Anatomy of Abuses*, which ought to be brought back into print as, say, a Penguin Classic, denounces it as of particular offence to God, who seems ever ready to take offence. On another tack, a man who dressed 'in women's clothing', a la Monty Python, and got in among the old wives supervising a birth, excited a special horror. Nakedness, infanticide, baptism of beasts and abortion appear, all illuminating values and relationships - of men and women, lay and clerical, old and young - calling for investigation, cautious yet enterprising, of which Cressy shows himself a master.

Voluble, energetic, tough, many of Cressy's women simply refuse to take on the roles, status and attitudes assigned to them by contemporary moralists and by historians. Across the social spectrum there were women asking 'Who am I?', seeking both a social and a gender - even a political - identity. Megan Matchinske takes as examples four women writers in her *Writing, Gender and State in Early Modern England: Identity Formation and the Female Subject* (Cambridge UP, 1998, £37.50). Last of Matchinske's four is the prolific prophetess, Lady Eleanor Davies, high-born, arrogant and irascible, denounced by a disappointed Gerrard Winstanley as a false prophet, who interestingly had 'lost the trousers'. Lady Eleanor has now come right out of the periphery into the mainstream of women's studies, with a biography by Esther Cope and a selection of her writings - difficult in style and meaning, but fascinating. Matchinske's own style is in a different way difficult and a bit boring, too, but she does convince us that in wrestling with Davies's texts we can hear 'a distinctly gendered voice - a voice that delineates permissible behaviour for women, at one and the same time that it attempts to defy those strictures'. The notes to this chapter provide a sound biographic basis for further investigation of this remarkable female who predicted greatness for Cromwell on the strength of his initials and lived long enough to see him Protector.

In *Cromwelliana* 1995 I reviewed Barnard Capp's *The World of John Taylor, the Water Poet, 1578-1653* (Oxford UP), which drew from his abundant writings and perambulations insights into cultural conditions under the early Stuarts as he confronted the complex issues of his time. Now John Chandler has edited a selection of the *Works - Travels Through Stuart*

*Britain: The Adventures of John Taylor, the Water Poet* (Sutton, 1999, £25) - mostly pamphlets and verse, including accounts of a dozen journeys on foot or by boat, once in a craft 'of brown-paper from London to Quinborough in Kent', a stunt aided by inflated bullocks' bladders, involving two days and nights over forty miles. Taylor saw a tract making money as the goal of his doings. He was a hack, but not a pen for hire in the same way as (more expert and educated) professionals like Marchamont Nedham were. Taylor's production was uneven, but he had enough talent to win readers over decades. Detesting puritanism, he was an ebullient royalist who joined the king at Oxford in 1642, deploying his waterman's skills in controlling Thames traffic and churning out propaganda. Chandler stresses his good conceit of himself - reporting his journeys, he provides topographical information and commenting, often with unconcealed condescension, on encounters with the meaner sought of people - innkeepers, artisans, fishermen. Taylor has, in effect, been rediscovered in the last century, deservedly, for if much of his writing is linsey-woolsey stuff, it is marked by the vigour of his prejudices and the sharpness of his observation.

John Byrd (1594-1683) served the state under successive regimes as a customs collector for South Wales, based in Cardiff. From 1648 to 1680 he kept a letter-book, now lodged in the Glamorgan Record Office, in which he brought together a multiplicity of interests, governmental and private, financial and social, an unusual record for an official of his time and standing. Stephen K Roberts has edited a full transcript of the text for the South Wales Record Society, producing a volume - *The Letter Book of John Byrd* (1999, £20) - which makes a worthwhile contribution to a number of aspects of the administrative, economic, social and political history of the area around the Bristol Channel. From a cache of sources, personal, local and national, he has enhanced the previous 'meagre' background knowledge of Byrd's career - his Bristol origins, his Welsh marriage, his land acquisition and whatever - bringing into life a minor figure, certainly, but one who over the years got on a little more than somewhat. Roberts's Introduction provides a clear account of the management of the customs, whether under the Great Farm of the early Stuarts or the Commissioners of the Long Parliament and beyond. There is a great deal of continuity of personnel and practices to be discerned here, confirmed in administration generally by G E Aylmer's *The State's Servants*. Byrd was not on the threshold of a fortune from his office, for the Cardiff customs turnover was 'lamentably small'. He had to look and act elsewhere - in agriculture, horse-breeding, marrying, even considering during the 1650s getting into excise farming. There were useful contacts, too, with local and regional men of substance, who certainly influenced what went on in administration through a network of patronage. Byrd may have considered



himself piously as 'an officer of the state' but his other interests were too strong and diffuse for him to be regarded as a professional *tout court*. Yet somehow he managed to exude the ethos of a public servant. Concern for his income did not of itself hinder his ability and effectiveness in his job. He kept his post, anxious to do so, in the immediacy of the Restoration, but lost it within two years as the comptrollership, like other posts in the service, became politically sensitive. Taking it altogether, Roberts concludes safely that in Byrd's case, as surely in so many others, 'private profit and state service could dovetail as neatly as for any modern free marketeer'. Meticulously edited, with a text *in extenso*, annotated and supplied with references and a glossary, this is an exemplary local record publication, with a more than local interest, as for example reference to that egregious London entrepreneur and crook Edmund Harvey demonstrates.

*An Unhappy Civil War* - a 1643 comment on the burial of soldiers on both sides scrawled in a Somerset parish church register - provides John Wroughton with the title of his substantial survey of 'the experience of ordinary people in Gloucestershire, Somerset and Wiltshire' during 1642-46 (Lansdown Press, 1999, paperback £14.99). The emphasis is on people being forced by circumstances beyond their direct control to do or to submit to a plethora of unpleasant things - to decide between king and parliament, to pay heavy extraordinary taxation, to serve in the armies, to provide free-quarter, to face up to the commandeering of their crops, livestock and moveables, and after the fighting was over to cope with the lingering effects. Of course, some gained from it all. Where there are losers there are always winners - enjoying the excitement of disturbed routine, exploiting economic opportunities, paying off old scores under the cover of 'the public interest'. No doubt many of these experiences could be replicated elsewhere, but each area faced different circumstances. Not every one had to cope with Lord George Goring and his gang - royalists who were parliament's best friends, 'God's sores'. Perhaps on average things may not have been so bad, but the woman left at home, seeing beds taken over by soldiers, her chickens gobbled up, could hardly be content with an average. A Gloucestershire estate manager lamented:

> I have lent money to both sides,
> Been plundered by both sides,
> Been imprisoned by both sides,
> A mad world!

Indeed. Wroughton has written a thoughtful, humane study, illustrated with maps, contemporary prints and attractive drawings by Stephen Beck,

the whole presented at a reasonable price by a local publisher - an excellent example of a welcome trend.

There is a new paperback edition of P R Newman's *Atlas of the English Civil War* (Routledge, 1998, £14.99), extending from the Ulster Rising to the Restoration. The maps are hardly overloaded with information - indeed, some, like that indicating the distribution of the area responsibilities of the Major-Generals, lacking any landmarks like major towns, are positively exiguous. True, this is to some extent made up for by textual material. But the *Atlas* seems an old-fashioned piece of work, rather expensive for what it offers. There is room for an atlas drawing on the graphical opportunities provided by hi-tech.

What was available to read, what was read and why and how it was read are questions asked both by historians and by literary specialists, who are increasingly coming together into genuine interdisciplinary studies. Prominent and productive in this field is Kevin Sharpe, who has found the use of current theoretical approaches to the meanings of texts (and pictorial representations) particularly fruitful, arguing that too cautious and sceptical an approach to what is called awkwardly New Historicism is an unnecessary austerity, since (he is quoting Hayden White) 'every approach to the study of the past presupposes or entails some version of a textualist theory of historical record'. Not so new, then. Anyway, Sharpe's the word and sharp's the action. Two challenging volumes have just appeared, commanding more attention that I have so far been able to give them. *Remapping Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2000, paperback £17.95) reprints (some slightly rewritten) a dozen articles published over the last decade or so, discrete but in theme and approach offering a view of 'the culture of seventeenth-century politics', heavily laden with critical historiography, revisionism revisited and revised, with a polemical intention but looking forward not backward, leaving behind 'stale debates' and getting on with new lines of thought and query. Map-making is in fact an apt metaphor - no map can convey a terrain *in toto*. It is at best a representation. Representations appeal to Kevin Sharpe, to the point (as in his forceful chapters on the political culture of the Stuart monarchy and the interregnum) that they seem almost to overtake the reality.

The second volume, *Reading Revolutions* (Yale UP, 2000, £25) extends a case study of a particular reader, who left a considerable archive of his reading, into a portrait of 'the politics of reading in early modern England'. The reader is Sir William Drake, MP, of Buckinghamshire, who kept diaries, including details of what he read, and commonplace books drawing and commenting upon that reading, mingled with personal and political observations. Sharpe uses these, with reference to other, better-known



readers and writers, Milton in particular, to investigate 'the politics of reading and the reading of politics'. Readers like Drake learned, it is clear, a great deal about politics and used their book learning, but it is equally apparent that Drake 'learned as much from his reading of events in England during the 1640s...as he learned from his books'. 'Reading' cannot be confined to books, however closely annotated, pored over and analysed. Men read the stars, the faces they met, the rumours on the wind, the signs of the times. If we had access to the working library of Oliver Cromwell, its contents' marked passages, doodles, annotations, we would certainly know more than we do about him, but how much closer we would be to the true inwardness of his politics it is hard to say. We would have a new map of Oliver Cromwell, a little more detailed, better projected, but after all a map is a map is a map. My reading of this clever, thoughtful, confident book, marking vital passages and all, has been cursory, as cursory perhaps as that of some seminal texts by seventeenth-century readers rushing to judgment. But I did not want to wait a year before bringing it to the attention of readers of *Cromwelliana*.

Writing as well as reading is the theme of David Norbrook's impressive study of 'poetry, rhetoric and politics, 1627-60', bearing the title *Writing the English Republic*, originally published in 1998, which has gone swiftly into a paperback edition (Cambridge UP, 2000, £15.95). It argues that republicanism in the 1650s could look back upon a long literary and political tradition - a culture, indeed - which would continue after the Restoration's 'ferocious crackdown', which still lingering, has fostered the comfortable notion that monarchy was, is and will be the natural desire of the English people. Marchamont Nedham's 1650 hope for 'an infallible experiment', like so many other prophesies of those speculative times, failed him, but it was, Norbrook suggests, not a chimerical one. The republican culture of the 1650s was at once excitingly new and as familiar as a dog-eared school book - classical, of course. The Restoration was not inevitable in 1659, even in early 1660. There was no want of serious republican political discourse in parliament, coffee houses, the Rota club, the press, high grade stuff, too. But the ideas were beyond the capabilities of the men of action to implement them. The Good Old Cause became so many things it was incapable of persuading George Monck that it was

> ...a much more honourable thing
> To save a people, than to make a king.

Nevertheless, the experience of republicans and anti-republicans alike in the 1650s had ensured that the returning monarchy was in many ways a new one, which is why Charles II did not go on his travels again, dying comfortably in (surprisingly enough) his own bed after a successful reign.

Kevin Sharpe goes so far as to say 'if the English revolution never fully forged a republican culture and government, the republic nevertheless effected a radical transformation of royal culture and power'. It has to be said that Oliver Cromwell himself made his peculiar contribution to that.

Aidan Clarke's *Prelude to Restoration in Ireland* (Cambridge UP, 1999, £37.50) is an innovative monograph which considers in meticulous detail the end of the Commonwealth's rule during 1659-60 over what Henry Cromwell ruefully described as 'but a colony' still. Certainly it has seemed to many historians to have been that - the first English, not British, one - up to and beyond the civil wars, but it was also a kingdom and after the Restoration would be so again. Presently Clarke brings to a focus a work which he had started and kept going in a previous collection edited by Jane Ohlmeyer and elsewhere, in what has become an encouraging renaissance in Irish historical writing about this destructive and formative age. Here he shows that the restoration of the Stuart monarchy which Monck finally brought about in England was part of a process within each of the three main constituents of the Stuart inheritance which would bring them together again under the monarchy; together again certainly, yet in another mould from the pre-war one. Instrumental in Ireland was Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill, who had been a force in all three kingdoms in the 1650s. Sensing a restoration in England in the offing, he was determined that in Ireland at least it would not be one brought about by royalists, with or without bloodshed, and worked subtly to out-run them by bringing about a general 'Convention', elections to which revealed the diversity of Irish interests and opinions, but gave the opportunity to wrest power from extremists. Broghill wanted the existing, faltering regime done away with, but at the same time to ensure that some at least of its benefits for his Protestant lot should not be lost under the new king. Ireland might not be able to determine what happened in the large decisions affecting the triple kingdom, but it could in some measure influence how they would go down in Ireland. Clarke shows how it did in ways which would have a discernible impact during the next few decades. This is an important contribution to both Irish and British history.

Ivan Roots

*****

Hot on the heels of the decidedly revisionist account of Cromwell's campaign in Ireland, Tom Reilly's *Cromwell, An Honourable Enemy*, comes a new study by James Scott Wheeler, *Cromwell in Ireland* (Gill & Macmillan, 1999, £19.99). The author is a colonel in the US army and an associate professor at the US Military Academy at West Point, and this full



length study follows on from several briefer articles and accounts which he has written in recent years. Sadly, Reilly's interpretation is not explicitly addressed here, presumably because it appeared too late for Wheeler to take account of it. This is regrettable on several grounds, not least because an engagement with Reilly's interpretation may have caused Wheeler to pause at appropriate points and to analyse more deeply.

The author makes the excellent point that Cromwell's campaign of 1649-50 cannot be understood in isolation, but must be placed in a wider context. Accordingly, he begins his analytical narrative in autumn 1641, with the Irish Catholic rebellion, and the opening two chapters provide a sound account of the military events and manoeuvring of the period 1641-49, down to the eve of Rathmines. Similarly, the story does not end with Cromwell's departure in spring 1650, for a further three chapters explore Ireton's summer campaign of 1650, his advance upon Limerick and the conquest of Connacht and the collapse of the Catholic cause in 1651-3; a closing chapter, broader if also rather brief, seeks to assess the impact of the war and to examine the 'Cromwellian settlement' of the mid 1650s. One could argue that in order to understand Cromwell's campaign of 1649-50, to appreciate the context not only of his actions during the campaign but also of his whole approach to Ireland and the Irish, we need rather more than this, and that an account which opens in 1641 cannot fully explain the English attitude to Ireland in the (mid) seventeenth century. That said, the placing of Cromwell's campaign within the context of the mid seventeenth century 'wars of the three kingdoms' is helpful and to be welcomed.

At the heart of the book are four chapters which examine Cromwell's campaign. Wheeler provides a clear, crisp, fast-moving narrative account of the campaign, and largely eschews wider considerations. For example, the action against Drogheda in September 1649 is recounted in three pages (with an additional, full-page map), and the subsequent assessment of Cromwell's approach occupies less than a page. There is no sustained analysis of the rights and wrongs of the action. Instead, Wheeler notes that 'over the next two days [after the fall of the town] any remaining prisoners were murdered, closing the curtain on the blackest episode in Cromwell's career', and comments that 'there is no justification we can make today for a soldier, even in the violent seventeenth century, to have refused to accept the surrender of enemy soldiers', an assertion supported by a brief quotation from Cromwell's letter to Lenthall, which 'suggests possible feelings of unease', and an even briefer quotation from Gardiner. That's that. Altogether, the analysis of Drogheda is rather thin and black or white - in this case, decidedly black. In a work devoted to 'Cromwell in Ireland', a reader might have expected rather more. Wheeler's account of the fall of Wexford in October 1649 is in a similar style. He notes that the context of

the massacre was different from that at Drogheda, for the sudden and unexpected fall of the castle and town meant that 'Cromwell lost control of his soldiers once his troops scaled Wexford's walls', though 'worse, he made no efforts to regain control and enforce discipline until after the slaughter of at least 1,500 soldiers and townsmen'. The author concludes that 'unquestionably, and with no moral or military justification, hundreds of non-combatants were killed by the rampaging troops', an event which Wheeler claims harmed army discipline and may have stiffened the resolve of other Catholic towns and their garrisons to resist.

If this work is sometimes a little shallow in its broader assessments and analysis, it is at its best in providing a clear, readable military account. The campaigns of the period are retold crisply and effectively, and the author is particularly strong at exploring the logistics and supply of the campaigns; he also stresses the 'tactical and operational virtuosity' which Cromwell displayed at many points. The narrative is well supported by a selection of contemporary and modern maps and plans. The abundant endnotes make clear that the author has drawn upon an impressive range of primary source material, most of it printed - especially the newspapers and pamphlets now held in the British Library's collection of Thomason Tracts - though good use has also been made of the Carte manuscripts and (more selectively) of manuscript sources now in the Public Record Office. The views expressed in the closing words of the volume -

> Cromwell's conduct during the conquest will always be darkened by the blood shed by his soldiers at Drogheda on his orders, and by his out-of-control soldiers at Wexford. However, there was unbelievable brutality by all participants during the long war, reflecting religious bitterness and prejudices on both sides.

- are judicious and will be shared by many who have studied Cromwell in Ireland. But it is a shame that this book does not explore some of those ideas a little more fully, particularly in the broader context of the long struggle between England and Ireland in the early modern period, and that the author was unable to engage with Tom Reilly's new interpretation of Cromwell in Ireland. Had he been able to do so, it would probably have strengthened and deepened this clear and well-written military account.

Peter Gaunt



## SUMMER SEASON 2000

**********

The Cromwell Museum,
Grammar School Walk,
Huntingdon.
Tel (01480) 375830.

open Tuesday-Friday 11am-1pm 2-5pm
Saturday & Sunday 11am-1pm 2-4pm
Monday closed

admission free

**********

Oliver Cromwell's House,
29 St Mary's Street,
Ely.
Tel (01353) 662062.

open every day 10am-5.30pm

admission charge

**********

The Commandery,
Sidbury,
Worcester.
Tel (01905) 361821.

open Monday-Saturday 10am-5pm
Sunday 1.30-5pm

admission charge

# 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 0-905729-12-9