

Cromwelliana

The Journal of
The Cromwell Association



2002

The Cromwell Association

- President: Dr BARRY COWARD, PhD, FRHistS
Vice Presidents: Right Hon MICHAEL FOOT, PC
Professor JOHN MORRILL, DPhil, FBA, FRHistS
Professor IVAN ROOTS, MA, FSA, FRHistS
Professor AUSTIN WOOLRYCH, MA, DLitt, FBA
PAT BARNES
TREWIN COPPLESTON, FRGS
Chairman: Dr PETER GAUNT, PhD, FRHistS
- Honorary Secretary: MICHAEL BYRD
5 Town Farm Close, Pinchbeck, near Spalding,
Lincolnshire, PE11 3SG
- Honorary Treasurer: DAVID SMITH
3 Bowgrave Copse, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 2NL

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);
- 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 Cromwell 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 work 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.

Editor of *Cromwelliana*: Dr Peter Gaunt
Assistant Editor: David Trim

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

www.cromwell.argonet.co.uk

CROMWELLIANA 2002

editor Peter Gaunt
assistant editor David Trim

CONTENTS

Cromwell Day, 2001. By Professor Blair Worden	2
Religious Conflict and the Bermuda Islands in the Mid Seventeenth Century. By Kristy Warren	8
What was the Social and Economic Impact of the English Civil War on Catholics, 1642-48? By Simon Stevens	27
Did the Civil War and its Aftermath to 1660 Offer Any Lasting New Opportunities to Women? By Heather Delonnette	37
The Reverend Robert Ram and the Siege of Crowland, 1643. By Michael Byrd	43
John Lambert and the Roots of an Early Modern Art Collection. By Dr David Farr	46
Writings and Sources V. Cromwell the Mentor. By Jane A Mills	56
Cromwellian Britain XV. Bridgwater, Somerset. By Jane A Mills	65
Select Bibliography of Publications	73
Book Reviews. By Professor Ivan Roots & Dr Barry Coward	83

ISBN 0-905729-14-5

by Blair Worden

Last year Cromwell Day was the 350th anniversary of the battle of Dunbar. This year it is the 350th anniversary of the battle of Worcester. If Dunbar, where Cromwell's cause had stared extinction in the face, was perhaps the most remarkable of his victories, Worcester was his most conclusive one. The royalists had at last been broken. Though awkward resistance would persist in Ireland until 1652, and although the threat of royalist insurrection would endure in England and Scotland through the remainder of Cromwell's life, the civil wars were over. There are a number of experts, of whom I am far from being one, equipped to explain the military challenge and accomplishment of that fight. I want rather to place the victory within the longer perspective of his aims and career.

In the lifetime of this Association, friendly assessments of Cromwell, at least in print, have greatly outnumbered hostile ones. It was not always so. Until around the middle of the nineteenth century he was far more often villain than hero. Even now the tradition of anti-Cromwellianism persists; and within it his victory at Worcester has always had a special place. There have been two principal strands within anti-Cromwellianism. In both of them Cromwell has been represented as a ruthless, Machiavellian hypocrite, masking personal ambition beneath the external appearance of Puritan piety. First there is the royalist tradition, which goes back to Heath and Bate and then Clarendon and then Hume. Here Cromwell is the murderer who masterminded the supreme blasphemy of the civil wars, the execution of the king. And yet within royalist writing hatred has often been tempered or complemented by a reluctant but also a magnanimous admiration for the greatness of his deeds as Protector. The second strand has been without magnanimity; and it has seen the Protectorate, not as a partially redeeming feature of his career, but as a catastrophic betrayal of his cause. This is the republican strand, the voice of protest at his destruction of republican rule through the two military coups of 1653 and his assumption of supreme power under a monarchical or semi-monarchical constitution at the end of that year.

Much the most influential work of republican anti-Cromwellianism was the *Memoirs* of the parliamentary commander and regicide MP Edmund Ludlow, a book posthumously published at the end of the seventeenth century. Ludlow's text was substantially altered for publication, and it is hard to know, in reading the *Memoirs*, what to attribute to Ludlow and what to his editor. But the vividness and plausibility of the narrative gave its account of Cromwell, which to a large degree was based on conversations between Cromwell and Ludlow, an unrivalled authority. Historians would freely

borrow from it time and again: on no subject more than the aftermath of Worcester.

Ludlow was in Ireland at the time of the battle, but he took trouble later to consult men who had been close to Cromwell at that time - and who, like him, had become disillusioned by him. The *Memoirs* represent Worcester as the turning-point of Cromwell's career. They explain that hitherto, while he needed his roundhead allies in order to overcome the royalists, his ambition had been skilfully concealed. Now that his army had the country at its feet, his determination to make himself king began to become visible. The *Memoirs* recall a conversation of 1656 between Ludlow and Cromwell's confidant the pastor Hugh Peter, who, we are told, recalled having observed the Lord General 'immediately after the victory at Worcester to be so elevated, that he [Peter] began to fear what was since come to pass; and that he [Peter] told a friend, with whom he then quartered in his return to London, that he was inclined to believe Cromwell would endeavour to make himself king.' Cromwell, the *Memoirs* explain, had described Worcester as 'the Crowning Victory', a phrase of which subsequent events had revealed the sinister meaning. His intentions had been indicated too, we learn, by his treatment of the county militia regiments which had given support to his army. He had 'dismissed' the militia 'with anger and contempt', 'well knowing that a useful and experienced militia was more likely to obstruct than to second him in his ambitious designs.' After the victory, the *Memoirs* also complain, Cromwell 'took upon him a more stately behaviour, and chose new friends.'

The republican version of Cromwell's motives and career, which has been so influential, is a paranoid interpretation. It has also been a convenient one: it makes his ambition and usurpation the scapegoats on which the failure and collapse of the Puritan cause can be blamed. Cromwell's letter to parliament after Worcester referred to the battle, not as 'the crowning victory' but as 'a crowning mercy', by which he meant the supreme dispensation of divine providence on behalf of the godly party. There is nothing to support, and a good deal to question, the contentions that Cromwell adopted a more stately manner after Worcester and that he contemptuously dismissed the militia regiments. The statement that Cromwell 'chose new friends' likewise tells us more about Ludlow than about Cromwell. Ludlow belonged to the party of Puritan sectaries who interpreted Cromwell's measure of spiritual affinity with them as a commitment to their own narrow programme, and who after Worcester felt aggrieved, not for the first time, by his determination to build a broad party of support for Puritan rule.

Yet if Worcester was not a turning-point in the sense described in Ludlow's *Memoirs*, it was a turning-point in Cromwell's life nonetheless. The victory that ended Cromwell's career as a soldier presented him with new challenges.

They would prove beyond him - though one has to ask, whom would they not have been beyond? Eight months after the battle Milton's sonnet reminded him that 'Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war.' In the two years after his death it would become apparent that Cromwell, who had won the war, had lost the peace. The cause for whose permanence he had fought, though it survived during his lifetime, collapsed without him. In war, Cromwell's guiding star had been the knowledge of God's approval. How else could his unbroken, miraculous run of victories be explained? But the wishes of providence, so easy to detect in the outcome of battles, were harder to discern among the complexities of politics, amid their inevitable manoeuvres and negotiations and compromises. His republican enemies taunted him about the 'great silence in heaven' in the years after Worcester. Without the certainties brought by victories, his search for the dispensations of providence would bring him more agony than solace.

In gratitude for the outcome at Worcester parliament held a day of thanksgiving. At it Cromwell's favourite pastor, John Owen, preached a sermon before the Commons, an address for which Cromwell gave him the thanks of the House. Its title was *The Advantage of the Kingdom of Christ in the Shaking of the Kingdoms of the World*. It looked forward to the destruction of the spirit of Antichrist across Europe and the coming of Christ's kingdom in its place. Unlike the Fifth Monarchists, Owen did not expect Christ to reign personally on earth, only through his spirit, which would make of England 'a holy people'. But like Cromwell he was sure that the civil wars were a momentous episode in God's scheme of history, in which providence had not only broken established institutions but suspended the normal rules of political calculation. 'The actings of God's providence in carrying on the interest of Christ', Owen observed, have proved to be 'exceedingly unsuited to the reasonings and expectations of the most of the sons of men.' As in the Old Testament, so now in England, God had confounded the 'corrupt' and 'carnal' reasonings of great men, giving victory to instruments despised by the world. That perspective, which Cromwell shared, forbade political planning: God's servants must wait upon God, acting by any means, however unconventional, however unpopular, to which he pointed them. There could be no going back, only forward. Owen attacked 'lukewarm' and 'neutral' men who failed to recognise God's transformative purposes, men who 'under any colour or pretence whatever have lifted themselves up for the reinforcement of things as in former days'.

Cromwell would speak similar language in 1653, when he expelled the Long Parliament and summoned Barebone's Parliament, the parliament of saints, in its place. This is the side of Cromwell that is fearless of established forms, ready to destroy a king, constitutions, parliaments, to deploy the rule of the sword. By 1651, the year of Worcester, the basis of all political power in force after the destruction of the ancient constitution two years earlier was

acquiring a new recognition. The previous year Andrew Marvell's *Horatian Ode* had identified Cromwell's rise with the amoral sway of force: 'Though justice against fate complain,/ And plead the ancient rights in vain:/ But those do hold or break/ As men are strong or weak.' The poem remembers Cromwell's use of the sword to win the civil wars and reminds him: 'The same arts that did gain a power/ Must it maintain.' 1651 saw the publication of Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan*, where ultimately the sword rules all.

Yet we remember, too, Cromwell's warning to the soldiery in the summer of 1647, when the army radicals wanted to march on London against the presbyterian parliament: 'that which you have by force I look upon as nothing.' Cromwell, the revolutionary aspect of whose character led him to destroy both sides in the civil war - first the king, then the parliament which had fought him - had another, more conventional component to his personality. This was the man who in 1657 alienated John Owen by accepting the Humble Petition and Advice, that step backwards towards the ancient constitution, towards what Owen's sermon after Worcester had called 'the reinforcement of things as in former days'. Cromwell never, I think, cared for parliaments or constitutional forms for their own sake; they were, as he said, 'but dross and dung in comparison of Christ'; but he saw them, at least intermittently, as a necessary means to his ends. There is a conflict within Cromwell's personality, one which helps to explain the exasperation of men like Edmund Ludlow, who warmed to one side of the man and were repelled by the other. Cromwell, whose own aims and actions so often split the roundhead cause, alternately strove to preserve as wide a basis for its support as possible; and in parliaments and constitutional forms, and in the respect they enjoyed, he saw the instruments to its attainment.

We see the tension in his mind in the aftermath of Worcester. The previous year Marvell had portrayed him as an incipient military ruler; yet after Worcester, no less than in the summer of 1647, he strove to work in co-operation with parliament - in particular with the party which, now as then, he had built within it - and not against it. He had regretted Pride's Purge in December 1648, even though the execution of the king would have been unattainable without it, and he wanted to restore the unity of that parliamentary party which had spoken for the nation in 1640 and which the purge had, seemingly irredeemably, fractured. He would do this by persuading parliament to hold fresh elections. This was the main plank of his programme in the autumn of 1651. He adopted other conciliatory or conservative stances in the months following the battle. He engaged in discussions about constitutional settlement and offended the republicans, of whom he was never one, by proposing the restoration of a monarchical element to the constitution. He urged clemency towards the defeated royalists and opposed parliament's heavy confiscation of royalist estates. Yet all those policies would be reversed. In 1653 he attacked the Rump, in the

most vehement terms, for arranging to hold the very elections he had demanded and thus for risking the return to politics of those 'presbyterians' and 'neuters' whom he had earlier courted. He replaced the Rump not with a monarchical constitution but with another single-chamber parliamentary regime, Barebone's Parliament. In 1655 he would destroy his efforts to conciliate royalists by imposing on them the decimation tax to finance the rule of the Major-Generals.

Yet if there is inconsistency or contradiction on those fronts, there were issues on which he was consistent. What he always wanted, by whatever means, was reformation. In the aftermath of Worcester he favoured reform on three fronts, which I shall briefly describe in ascending order of his priorities. In each case we can see how, amid his intemperate vacillations of constitutional course, he adhered to a set purpose.

First there was the overhaul of the parliamentary electoral system: not the extension of the franchise, which he had opposed at Putney and which he never favoured, but the abolition of rotten boroughs and the redistribution of constituencies to end their geographical imbalance. This was an almost entirely uncontroversial proposal. The army had agreed to it, apparently under Henry Ireton's influence, in 1647; the Rump had accepted it; and the Rump's plan was incorporated in its entirety in the constitution of the Protectorate, the Instrument of Government. Even Clarendon acknowledged that it was 'generally looked upon as an alteration fit to be more warrantably made, and in a better time.' Later in the century John Locke would commend the same principle. The demise of the reform after Cromwell's death, and the absence of any significant pressure for its revival after the Restoration, indicates how far the experience of Puritan rule had destroyed the cause of reform. Not until 1832 would anything similar be achieved.

Secondly Cromwell wanted reform of the law. It was common ground among Puritans that a godly society would have a just legal system. There was widespread support among the gentry for law reform, especially if it would prevent lawyers from profiting from disputes over landed property, though in the 1650s the cause of law reform was largely discredited by the demands of extremists. Cromwell's policy in the aftermath of Worcester was far from extreme. He arranged the setting up of a parliamentary commission under Matthew Hale, an ex-royalist judge, which produced a series of concrete and moderate demands for legal reform. The Rump refused to implement it, but Cromwell then pressed it on Barebone's. The Rump had rejected it as too daring. Barebone's rejected it as not daring enough. As Protector Cromwell warily but determinedly pursued a policy of law reform essentially continuous with the Hale proposals.

But by far the most pressing issue of reform in Cromwell's mind, then as always, was the reform of religion. In many ways his thinking was, again, in line with mainstream parliamentary opinion. In common with it he believed that the civil wars had created both an opportunity and an obligation to puritanise the land; that the quality of the ministry and of preaching must be improved, the word spread in the semi-heathen remote parts of the realm, proper financial maintenance for the clergy provided, vice and profaneness scourged and eliminated. He looked to an alliance of godly magistrates and godly ministers, groups which would be trained alongside each other at the newly puritanised universities; Cromwell's appointment as Chancellor of Oxford in 1650, and Owen's as Vice-Chancellor in 1652, were decisive moments in that endeavour. But if, thus far, Cromwell's religious programme was continuous with the parliamentary Puritanism of the 1640s, his demand for liberty of conscience - on which he would never yield - was far more divisive. Again in the period after Worcester we can watch him delicately promoting his purpose. If for law reform he turned to Matthew Hale, for church reform he turned to John Owen, who produced a scheme designed to ensure both the reform of the ministry and a guarantee of liberty of conscience. Its fate ran parallel to that of Hale's scheme. The Rump rejected it for its radicalism, Barebone's for its conservatism. Yet, with some adjustments, it was implemented by Cromwell as Protector, when his system of triers and ejectors vetted the clergy while the Instrument of Government guaranteed liberty of conscience.

Of all Cromwell's peacetime achievements, this was the most striking, and apparently the one that gave him most satisfaction. Whatever he lacked in the aftermath of his great victory at Worcester it was not a vision of social and religious improvement. His tragedy was that he could not provide, and perhaps was temperamentally incapable of providing, the institutional continuity which would have given permanence to Puritan rule and Puritan reform.

Professor Blair Worden is Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Sussex and Emeritus Fellow of St Edmund Hall, Oxford. His publications include *The Rump Parliament* and, most recently, *Roundhead Reputations* (Allen Lane/Penguin, 2001).

RELIGIOUS CONFLICT AND THE BERMUDA ISLANDS IN THE MID SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

by Kristy Warren

I

The discovery that the Bermuda Islands were fit for settlement was an accident. By the beginning of the seventeenth century the islands had been bypassed for over one hundred years by Spanish and Portuguese ships. Sailors were convinced that the islands were inhabited by devils. It was this superstition that prevented the Spanish from colonising the islands after they claimed them in the early sixteenth century.

A storm in the summer of 1609 forced a small group of English travellers to look at Bermuda in a new light. The *Sea Venture*, the flagship of a fleet of nine ships bound for Jamestown, Virginia, hit the reefs surrounding the islands during what was probably a hurricane. As a result of the close proximity of the reefs to the shoreline, all the passengers survived. The castaways were relieved to find that instead of devils, the islands were inhabited by birds and hogs and that there was an abundance of fruit trees. Led by the successful merchant Sir George Somers, the marooned party quickly began building new ships in the hope of continuing their journey to Virginia.

They arrived in Jamestown almost a year later to find that the settlement was nearly deserted. Most of the Virginian colonists had been lost to sickness and attacks by Indians. Somers rushed back to Bermuda to get supplies for Jamestown, but died during the journey. His nephew, Matthew Somers, and two other sailors quickly returned to England instead of returning to Virginia. They spoke highly of the Bermudas as islands full of wildlife and fruits. The richness of the islands and their closeness to Virginia led to their settlement in 1612 by the Virginia Company. The first group of colonists, fifty in all, arrived in the islands on 11 July 1612.

The colonists set about building forts to defend the islands. The fact that the Spanish had claimed the islands meant the British colonists were especially worried about being attacked. (The preparation proved unnecessary as the Spanish never attacked). By 1615 there were eight forts throughout the tiny islands and military training was required of all men.

It was during the autumn of this year that the Virginian and Bermudian enterprises were split, because the Virginia Company had lost a lot of money on Jamestown. The Somers Island Company was created and Letters Patent

gave the Company full political and trade powers in the islands. These were enforced by a governor appointed by the Company.¹

The men who ran the Company, mostly London merchants, were determined to profit from their enterprise. It was decided that the colonists should grow tobacco as a cash crop. However, the poor quality of the soil, the humid climate and the frequent storms meant that Bermudian tobacco was inferior to that grown on the North American continent. In addition to requiring the colonists to plant tobacco, the Company also enforced a monopoly on trade, a right granted by the original Letters Patent. The colonists were not allowed to trade with ships which did not belong to the Company. This caused discontent especially when food sources on the island were low, as they often were because of the early concentration in a single cash crop, and the limited land space. The islanders quarrelled over tobacco prices and the enforced trade restrictions until the dissolution of the Somers Island Company in 1684.

Profit and physical defence of the islands were not the only concerns and even as the forts were being erected a church was also being built to guard against spiritual demise. From the beginning, matters of church and state were combined. The main executors of local or parish government were churchwardens, who were assisted by the justices of the peace (or magistrates) who in turn linked the local government to the central government which was made up of the governor, the council, and the assembly.² Ecclesiastical matters were dealt with by civil processes with the governor acting as Ordinary for the Bishop of London and the Somers Island Company chose its own ministers despite the Bishop of London's jurisdiction over the island.³

The first minister, Rev Lewis Hughes, arrived in the Bermudas soon after the construction of the church was completed.⁴ His position as religious leader was central to the society, as receiving the Lord's Supper and other religious rites were necessities not luxuries to most Bermudians. When Rev Hughes arrived in Bermuda the population had grown to about 600. At that time most of the islanders lived in St George's, the islands' only town, in huts roofed with Palmetto leaves. It was in this town that the only church stood. This church was the only building big enough to hold an assembly of people. Therefore the first parliamentary meeting on the island was held in this church on 1 August 1620. It was here that the religion, constitution and common law were decided.⁵ This occasion marked the second colonial constitution in the British Empire, the first being that of Virginia in 1619. The constitution stated that Bermudians were free denizens who had the power to make their own laws which did not deviate from those of England. Also the king of England had the right to refuse to validate laws.⁶

Although armed with weapons, religion and the law, the colonists were not equipped to fight against the lack of food. By the mid 1630s the problems of inadequate space and resources climaxed. There were more people in the islands' twenty-two square miles than could be supported. Some relocated to the West Indies to start a new settlement. However, this failed and as a result an arrangement was made for resettlement in Virginia. As the population problem was being sorted out in Bermuda, England was facing the build-up to, and the events of, the English civil war. As a result of the events in England, Bermuda was left much to itself from about 1637 to 1650.⁷ During this period governors were changed frequently and the order of the church was turned upside down.⁸

II

This paper will examine what links, if any, existed between the religious and political conflict in England and the rise of religious and political instability in Bermuda. The conflict during the period 1637-53 marks it out from much of Bermuda's history which was generally quite calm. It is interesting, to say the least, that this period of upheaval coincided with that of the English Revolution.

There are certain problems confronting the historian of Bermuda for this period. First, in looking at the connections between the events occurring in Bermuda and England it is important to remember that it took a minimum of two months for a message to be relayed by ship, and ships from England did not arrive frequently. For instance, Bermudians did not find out about the death of Charles I until summer 1649, five months after the event had occurred.

Secondly, the records are very defective. J H Lefroy, a pioneer in Bermudian history, notes that 'there is reason to think that in the distractions of the Civil War, the Plantation was left much to itself, and that some of these changes were brought about by struggles of parties on the spot, of which records are lost.' This can be seen by the lack of sources in the State Papers Colonial for this period, especially after 1647. In addition to the loss of records from Bermuda, this lack of documentation can be attributed to both the loss of records in England and the fact that the English were distracted by events in their own country. In spite of the obvious disadvantage of not having many of these documents, the fact that the civil war left the colony on its own is important in itself.

However, we are not totally without assistance. The *Calendar of State Papers Colonial* contains a number of documents which shed light on the issues of the time, while a very large body of documents has been gathered by J H Lefroy.⁹ There are also several modern histories that contain material pertaining to this period of Bermuda's history.

III

Until the mid 1630s the Church of England in Bermuda held a similar position to that of the church in England. The churches were expected to use the Book of Homilies and the Book of Common Prayer. Also 'the reverent posture of kneeing at the tyme of the receipt of the Holy Sacrament' was expected and the pastors were to use the 'accustomed prayers and Decent Caeremony of signeing with the Crosse in Baptisme'.¹⁰ In short, the church in Bermuda conformed to the vision of the church held by the reforming Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud. However, among the colonists there also ran a strong current of Puritanism. Lefroy points out that the arrival of John Oxenbridge, the first leader of the Bermudian Independents, and his cousin Josias Foster, a future governor, in about 1635 is most likely associated with the 'impetus given about that time to Puritan sentiment in Bermuda'.¹¹ When towards the end of the decade Archbishop Laud was told that a great part of the Company's members in London were not conforming to the Church of England and that the colonists in Bermuda were not worshipping according to the Book of Common Prayer, much effort was made to convince him otherwise.¹²

As is well known, from the time of his consecration as Archbishop in 1633 Laud had conducted a campaign against Puritanism. In his effort to 'supress nonconformity in all its aspects', he used both the lay and ecclesiastical courts to further his means.¹³ Thus the Somers Island Company had good reason to be worried about the unwanted attention. The Company fought hard to keep the image of the island untarnished as it did not wish to fall out of favour with Laud or the English government. As a result it took special care from that point on in selecting the ministers it sent to the islands.

However, in 1638 Nathaniel White was sent to Bermuda after he was suspended from the ministry in England. Not much is known about White's life before he arrived in Bermuda. What is known is that he received his MA before 1630, as it was in May of this year that he was appointed to Holy Trinity church, Knightsbridge in Westminster.¹⁴ According to White, the event which caused his initial banishment was a sermon he preached at Oxford University around 1637 entitled *A Pastors Charge and Cure*. (White published this sermon in 1645. The timing is significant for several reasons. Firstly it was at this time that White returned to England after about seven years. Also Laud's regime, which had repressed the writings by Puritans, had been overthrown at the end of 1640, meaning that by 1645 the press was open for men like White.) In the sermon White attacked the ministers of the church for being more interested in their own wealth and pleasure rather than their duty of shepherding their flocks:

there is a sort of dainty delicate Pastor who will seek and sue for fat Benefices, that they may attire themselves gorgeously, live idly; there is a sort also who being consecrated to God, doe devote themselves to Bacchus, the pot and the pipe are oftner in their hands then their books, and it is farre more pleasure unto them to pipe than to preach.¹⁵

White added that the 'Wicked and prophane life of Pastors' has three effects. It 'defiles the very face of God', 'seduces the flock', and 'destroyeth themselves'.¹⁶ He also attacked the actual teaching that the pastors passed on to the people.

What will become of our Ministers of the Gospel, who in their preaching publish to the world doctrine strongly favouring Pelagianisme, and who teach heterodox tenets? What will become of others, who use painting and false colouring, whereby their doctrine is adulterated, so that it cannot keep and retain its native simplicity and integrity? For either they joyn with it the traditions of men, and mingle men's decrees with God's...or else they most dishonestly flatter men, especially great men, of whom they expect profit and preferment and taking away as it were the salt of the Gospel, with which they ought to supper esse and keep down the petulance of mens itching and lusting flesh.¹⁷

It is obvious that White felt reforms were needed within the Church of England. He saw the sermon as a 'discharge of duty', and felt that his punishment was unjustified and sinful. Unjustified or not, White's position as an expelled minister meant he was not seen as ideal for a ministerial position in Bermuda. Thus he was bound over for £200 to keep the peace for three years. According to a Bermudian school teacher, Richard Beake, in a letter written to the notorious Puritan lawyer William Prynne, White 'was a man of turbulent spirit'.¹⁸ White's appointment forced him to preach more diplomatically for a time. He stuck to his bond but started speaking his mind as soon as the three years were up. This resurgence of criticism against the church began soon after the impeachment of Laud at the end of 1640. White's outspokenness was encouraged by John Oxenbridge, a fellow minister and the initial leader of those who would eventually call themselves Independents.

As noted earlier, Oxenbridge arrived in Bermuda in 1635. He was the cousin of governor Josias Foster, who arrived on the same ship, and 'was the son of a Rev Dr Oxenbridge, a prominent divine in London'.¹⁹ Oxenbridge was dismissed from a tutorship at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, by Laud in his capacity as Chancellor, for exacting an oath from his students to seek a better form of government.²⁰ He, like White, was bound over to keep the

peace for £200. However, he broke his oath of conformity to the Church of England soon after he arrived in Bermuda. He led the Independents until 1642 when he returned to London 'to agitate and influence Parliament'.²¹ In November 1643 Oxenbridge was appointed as an 'assistant' in the Congregational church in Yarmouth, Yorkshire.²²

By 1641 those who wanted reform within the church, now led by Nathaniel White, held the main sway in the government council. White, who had been appointed to the council a year earlier, was supported by other council members. Prominent among these supporters was Stephen Paynter.²³ White was also able greatly to influence the islands' governor, William Sayle. However, as time wore on the apparently increasingly tyrannical nature of White's actions shocked Captain Sayle. He was not happy about the enforcement of catechising on all citizens and imprisonment for religious offences. However, in spite of his reservations Sayle did not feel able to stop the events and instead simply wrote a letter to the Company to inform them of the activities on the island.²⁴

During this time the men who were pushing for reforms were still members of the Church of England. In fact Nathaniel White, William Golding and Patrick Copeland were Church of England ministers. The main issue of practice which separated them from the rest of the islanders at this time was their emphasis on catechising everyone. Previously, catechising had been reserved for children and ignorant people. It was Oxenbridge, 'who with his wife, especially, were the first ground work of this faction'.²⁵ Oxenbridge wrote a catechism called *Baby Milk* which was used throughout the island.

At first the attempt to enforce the new form of catechising in Bermuda was taken quietly by most of the islanders. In spite of the silence, most Bermudians saw themselves as loyal to the Church of England, and there were some who fought 'against the Independents' attempt to control the religious lives of the colonists. The major voice of opposition was that of Richard Norwood.

Norwood had been employed by the Company to dive for pearls in 1614 and was later commissioned to map out Bermuda.²⁶ He left the island in 1618 and taught mathematics in London until 1638, when he returned to the island as its first schoolmaster after becoming 'alarmed at the religious situation developing in his homeland'.²⁷ Norwood explained his feelings on the situation in England in further detail in a letter he sent to the governor and Somers Island Company in February 1642: 'the times were dangerous in England, by reason of many innovations in Religion brought in by the Bishops and at that time I was in danger my selfe to have bene called in question, which occasioned me to move the honourable Company for this place'.²⁸ Norwood also addresses the subject in another letter dated 1 March

1643. He mentions that he left England because he felt that true religion was in decline and that he felt the country was headed for ruin.²⁹

However, Norwood's attempted escape only put him in the middle of the religious conflict which was beginning in Bermuda. Soon after he arrived, Norwood became steeped in the battle between the established church and the rising group of powerful Independents. This conflict was in many ways a miniature reproduction of the conflict which was beginning in England at about the same time.

Norwood was to become the main intellectual voice during the island's religious conflict. He sent letters to the governor and Somers Island Company as well as to William Prynne, a Presbyterian pamphleteer who felt Independents were a threat to true religion, giving details of the activities of his religious opponents. Originally, it was a dispute over catechising and abuse of government power. In his first letter, which was addressed to the governor and Company and written in 1641, Norwood complained about the state of the government on the island. 'Some of our ministers have had this last year the mayne sway in the government here especially Mr Nat: White, beeing also one of the counsell. Our Governor Capt Sayle hath been I thinke wholly guided by them'.³⁰ He felt that the ministers, led by White, had too much power.

Whereby we have seene an experiment here of that which very few I suppose in England have seene namely of the superiority or government of Ministers or an assembly of Ministers, esteeming the goverment to be theyrs who have the mayne sway in it. But with what loftines, violence and severity and in what an arbitrary way they have proceeded.³¹

This letter was written while Oxenbridge was still on the island and White was still rising to power. And in addition to the letter to the Company there survives some correspondence between Norwood and Oxenbridge and Paynter.³² In a letter to Oxenbridge dated 16 April 1641 Norwood expresses his discontent with catechising: 'The manner of catechising all sorts of men and women, especially belevers that have by their lives given good testimony, of their faith, (as I understand is to be put in practise) I conceive not to be fitt nor lawfull for any reasons'.³³ Attached to this letter were a number of letters written on the same subject during the previous year. It is evident that Norwood felt that the attempt to enforce catechising island-wide was creating divisions. In another letter to the governor that same month, Norwood spoke about a good Christian couple, who, after complaining about the form of catechising, were ignored by their friends who 'would start back from them, as from some dangerous creature'.³⁴

Thus it can be seen that the early conflict was mainly between Puritans who could not agree on forms of worship, how the church should be led and whether or not mature Christians should be catechised. Although White was later labelled an independent, he had not yet left the Church of England. However, his and Oxenbridge's aim to have all islanders catechised set them against the majority. Norwood, who seems not to have had any radical religious leaning, appears then to be fighting for the status quo. He did not like the extremes he saw in White's measures just as he rejected the Laudian reforms.

It is interesting to note that White and Norwood were at odds before the conflict over the Independents arose. Both men came to Bermuda in 1638 aboard the same ship. During the trip Norwood's wife managed to get her children put into White's cabin because there was not enough room in her own. White said of the incident: 'It was my portion to goe over in the same ship with him. In the voyage it so fell out (by the malice of Satan, God permitting it) that some difference arose betwixt us and ours, as did between Abraham and Lot'. Like the bible patriarch and his nephew, White and Norwood argued over space. They seem to have regained a level of civility towards each other, but I do not doubt that this early conflict affected their relationship. A plea by Norwood in 1642 for 'all private and personall grudges or offences given or taken on either side [to be] forgotten' seems to point toward the fact that the divisions were not simply about different opinions.

By 1643 it is obvious that the dispute had moved on to a new level. An added dimension of religious separatism was added to the conflict. In addition to the clergy being accused of trying to run the government their own way, Norwood now claimed that they held no earthly power to be ruler over them, including parliament and king. This is apparent in the outline Norwood gave about the opinions surrounding the emerging Independent church in a letter dated 1 March 1643:

Some say our Ministers are as supreme heads under Christ of their severall churches here, and not subordinate to these days Ecclesiastical to Parliament or any other power on earth whatsoever; but this opinion savours too much of Anti-Christian Pride and Presumption. Others say the Parliament will establish the same form that our Ministers will set up here; but these conjectures do much wrong that honourable Assembly.³⁵

This was a time of speculation and uncertainty. The local government was in control of the ministers and the people were speculating over what the parliament in England would do. When this letter was written, those in Bermuda would have been aware of what had been happening in the English

parliament over the past year, despite the time lag between London and the island. Especially notable was parliament's attempt on 8 April 1642 to clarify where it stood on the issue of church government. Parliament decided that it would consult with the godly and learned divines but hold tightly to parliamentary control over such matters.³⁶ Another declaration that would have been known to the people of Bermuda was the vote taken in early September by the parliament to 'assure the Scots of their determination to proceed towards a unity of faith and of their resolution to abolish episcopacy in England'.³⁷ One thing was certain, though: that the majority of Bermudians wished to wait for parliament's decision on the form of government for the island. Norwood pleaded for 'all to cease from setting up any new discipline and government among us, until we have what is decreed by the Honorable Assembly of Parliament'.³⁸

The change made in the leadership of the Somers Island Company in 1643 helps mark a shift in the nature of the conflict. At this time Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, was re-appointed as governor of the Company. He replaced the Earl of Dorset who was a known royalist.³⁹ Warwick was to hold the position, which he had held twice previously, throughout most of the turmoil as his term lasted until 1650.⁴⁰ The Earl was 'a bold venturesome Puritan Englishman'⁴¹ with strong connections to Oliver Cromwell. It cannot be ascertained how fully involved Warwick was in the Company. Warwick was very important in the civil war and held important positions on parliamentary committees. As a result he would have had many other things beside running Bermuda to occupy his time. However, although it cannot be determined whether Warwick was personally involved in all Company decisions, it is at least suggestive that changes in the island came so soon after his appointment.

In January 1644 White renounced his office as a minister of the Church of England. The islands' two remaining ministers, William Golding and Patrick Copeland, also renounced their offices. Together, they set up an Independent congregation with White as pastor and Golding and Copeland as elders. 'These clergymen held themselves to be a church of themselves, but closely associated with the New England Church which they declared to be the purest church in the world'.⁴² The Bermudian church was being established at about the same time as the first Independent church was formed in Hull.⁴³ There does not seem to be any connection between the two congregations. However, the church in New England accepted the new congregation as a sister church.

The Bermudian Independents set up their church in a central area of the main island which was easily accessible by boat. This was important as most of the islanders lived in St George's and the quickest route to Pembroke was the six mile boat ride. The Independents only had a small congregation,

about forty in all.⁴⁴ The ministers refused to baptise children of, or administer the sacraments to, those who were not part of the Independent church. This meant that the majority of the island's inhabitants were without pastoral care.

It was evident that the Bermudian Independents were not as tolerant as their English counterparts, who 'professed to believe in the liberty of conscience for most Christians'.⁴⁵ The Independent congregations in England believed that, aside from Catholics, Christians should worship God according to their conscience. This was not the case in Bermuda. Although no laws were passed, the leaders of the Bermudian Independent church of Christ used their positions in government to trumpet what they saw as the truth.

In October 1644 the Earl of Warwick wrote a declaration, which shows that he was aware of the conflict on the island. His order that 'counsellors, captains, and other officers...require all due honor and respect'⁴⁶ seems to point to discontent in the island. Also, in a second declaration written only days after the first, the Earl reiterated his main argument in a more concise manner: 'in ecclesiastical and civil matters it is not intended by the Company to anticipate the determinations of Parliament. The Government, as it stands, will be continued for the present'.⁴⁷ It appears as if the Company was waiting for a decision from parliament about the island's church and/or civil law.

Nothing seems to have been done by parliament for about another year. During this period resentment at the Independents grew and Norwood's apprehensions were echoed by others on the island. As a result a petition was made to the Houses of Parliament in England in 1645, which asked for the parliament to assist the Somers Island Company in restoring their access to the rites of the Church of England.

By reason of this dutiful and obedient affection in us (to the Church of England), our children die unbaptised...ourselves are deprived of renewing ourselves with our God in using the means, the supper of the Lord. Our daughters cannot be given in marriage...That so the said company may receive such aid from your Authority as may tend to the safety and quiet of our Obedience.⁴⁸

Lack of church rites was, however, overshadowed by a larger issue, that of obedience to parliament. The reason, the petitioners say, that they had been denied the rites of the church was because they refused to take the covenant of the Independent church. They added that they refused to take the covenant because they felt the leaders of the Independent congregation had gone too far in professing that their congregation was not subject to the rule any human power. The petitioners said White had professed that 'if the King

Parliament & Synod shall command any uniformity in the church, other than this, which is here set on foot by them, they will obey none'.⁴⁹ The petitioners pleaded with parliament either to free them of their obligation of obedience or to remove the Independents from power. They obviously felt that parliament was to be obeyed but felt that the pressure put on them by the clergy and government of Bermuda was unbearable.

In 1645 the well-known Presbyterian polemicist William Prynne published the letters of Norwood and school teacher Richard Beake as an appendix to his *A Fresh Discovery of some prodigious New Wandering-Blazing-Stars*. The pamphlet is an attack on 'Independent Novelties and some seditious queries, incitations, practices, to stir up the commonalty and rude Vulgar against the Parliament, Assembly, Ministry...'.⁵⁰ Thus Norwood's and Beake's writings against the Bermudian Independent congregation fit well with the general theme of Prynne's pamphlet. Beake tells Prynne that he is writing from prison where he was sent for accusing White of acting like a demi-god. Beake then goes on to say that the Independent church began with a feast, called loblolly feasts, marked by extravagance: 'yea so extraordinary that some in few meetings were forced to sell the feathers out of their bedding for milk, butter and cream to feed them withall and to make their loblolly the more dainty and toothsome'.⁵¹ Beake went on to say that at these meetings the pastor would dictate questions, which he had thought up, for half an hour. 'These catechisings being ended they then for an hour or two discourse of neighbours that would not join them'.⁵² Beake also explained that during weekly lectures the Church of England was spoken against for its 'matter, manner, order, government, discipline, and governors'.⁵³

In his pamphlet *Truth Gloriously Appearing*, written to refute the information published by Prynne against the Bermudian Independents, White said that the church had been unfairly slandered. He first questions the character of Beake, who he says neglected the physical and spiritual needs of his family as well as seducing women other than his wife. White also said that Beake's imprisonment was as a result of his refusal or inability to pay bail arising out of an incident in which he falsely accused the Independent church. White explains: 'The Governour and Councell seeing how he has causelessly made a noise in the Islands, and troubled the councell down; they granted his appeal for England, and with all bound him to his good abearing whilst we remained there: gave him leave to go home to procure sureties: which he not procuring was imprisoned'.⁵⁴

Then on 4 November 1645 parliament passed an Act for the freedom of worship in the American plantations and in Bermuda. The Act implies that this freedom was won as a result of the colonists' former sufferings by the episcopall party during their abode in England and their extreame hardships which they have since endured by transplanting themselves, their

wives and children from their native country into strange and desolate places'.⁵⁵ This Act marks another changing point as it was at this time that the island's Church of England majority begin to find support from the Company heads in England. It was also at this time that the Independents found themselves under attack. Instead of implementing the religious liberty granted by the parliament, the island entered into a period of religious oppression against the Independent minority.

In April 1646 a new governor, Thomas Turner, was sent to the islands by the Bermuda Company. Turner had Presbyterian leanings and his appointment to the island seems to have been a conscious attempt to combat the Independents. At his arrival the tide turned against the Independents and within a year they were brought under the control of the governor. An Act was passed in the same month as Turner's arrival which discharged all public officers and magistrates who were admitted as members of the Independent Church'.⁵⁶ Thus, all Independents were dismissed from the council and with the councillors who remained Turner began to attack the Independents. They were banned from meeting in any of the nine churches or at their meeting place, Mills-House in Pembroke.⁵⁷ They were also told to discontinue administering the Lord's Supper and baptism. White would not conform and was imprisoned for two weeks. These restrictions were placed on the Independents in spite of the declaration of religious liberty.

As a result of Turner's actions, another petition was sent to parliament. It was written by William Golding and was called *Servants on Horseback*. Golding pleaded with the parliament to help Bermudians become free from the rule of the Somers Island Company. His main points of grievance were the monopoly of trade that the Company had over the island, and the persecution of the Independents. The petition had the desired effect pertaining to religious matters as the Long Parliament reiterated that the inhabitants of Bermuda were to have freedom of worship.⁵⁸ However, the religious tensions on the island remained intense, and conformity to one form of worship was still the aim for both sides.

In order that the great majority of colonists could once again benefit from the services of the church, the Company sent two ministers to the island around 1646. These men were avowed Presbyterians, the only ones to serve on the island during the seventeenth century.⁵⁹ The fact that they were Presbyterians, combined with the religious situation at the time, suggests that they were brought in to help fight against Independency. In spite of the apparent Presbyterian influence from England, the majority of Bermudians do not appear to have had Presbyterian leanings. Rather they appear to be loyal Church of England members who wanted the opportunity to worship in the way they saw fit.

A letter sent by Norwood to Prynne in May 1647 sheds some light onto the situation at the time:

We have here only two independent ministers and two presbyterian, or that stand eagerly to sett upp the presbyterian,..For these ministers on either side doe much instigate the people on either side one against another, which is like to produce much bitternes in the end...But yet if our two presbyterian Ministers prevaile to sett themselves in place of government,...I see not that we shalbe in any better case, for they are not such in whom a man may descerne any true work of regeneration.⁶⁰

Throughout the early months of 1647 both White and Copeland were charged with preaching illegally. At one point Copeland was even put under house arrest.⁶¹ Later that same year White and Paynter were charged with 'high treason for their subversive doctrines and action, in claiming to be the head of the government for years before' and sent to England to be tried.⁶² White and Paynter were acquitted by the Company court and returned with a message that Bermudians had the right to enjoy liberty of conscience. However, Turner and his council still wanted uniformity of worship in favour of the Presbyter. In summer 1648 Turner declared uniformity of worship and said that those who did not conform would not be protected by the government.⁶³ This in essence was a banishment declaration for all those who remained loyal to the Independent congregation.

Thus after fighting for about two years, the Independents were finally forced to leave the Island in 1649. They resettled on Eleutheria, an island in the Bahamas. The soil on the island was unyielding, making life difficult for the settlers. Some returned to Bermuda and conformed to the law there, while many stayed until 1656 when relocation was offered.

Soon after the Independents were banished from Bermuda, the new Commonwealth government came to power in England. Initially the colonists ignored the new English government and pledged allegiance to Charles II. The new English government ordered that no one was to trade with Bermuda and other 'rebellious colonies' which included Barbados, Antigua and Virginia.⁶⁴ Then, in February 1652, the islanders were ordered to swear allegiance to the Commonwealth; Bermuda was ordered to align her services along Independent lines and 'designs for a Presbyterian Church of England were to be halted in Bermuda as well as England'.⁶⁵

Then, in June 1653, the Somers Island Company received a complete overhaul as a result of the events of 1647 especially. The government of the island was handed over to seventeen men, including Cornelius Holland and

John Oxenbridge. A document dated 28 June, which was three days after the decision was made, explains the reason for the change:

Several well affected persons in the Somers Islands, having been much oppressed and vigorously and unjustly dealt with, in relation to matters of conscience and the worship of God, contrary to the privileges granted to them, and receiving no reparation for their great sufferings.⁶⁶

One must wonder why the Independents were left in the unsuccessful colony of Eleutheria for so long after Cromwell came to power. The most obvious answer is that they were simply forgotten. To a certain extent this seems to be true. However, the correspondence between Bermuda and England was not very consistent during this time. This lack of communication is shown by the small amount of information on Bermuda in the State Papers Colonial between 1653 and 1656. There are many possibilities for this absence. First, the Council of State in England had more important things to do as it attempted to establish England's first republic. Second, during this time England was at war with the Dutch which would have taken precedence over events in a small, poor, colony. Third, during this period much was said about the growing trade in Barbados. There are many entries with requests for supplies such as shoes and horses to Barbados. The enterprise in Barbados and the capture of Jamaica took the limelight for this period. In addition to this, it was not until after the Restoration of Charles II that the plantations became more settled and thus gained importance resulting in more regular correspondence.⁶⁷ Finally, as an older colony run by a Company, Bermuda would have been more established and thus seen as more self-sufficient.

White returned to Bermuda in 1658. He seems to have conformed to the Church of England as he is recorded shortly before his death in 1661 as 'not able to preach the Gospell as formerly...by reason of weakness and infermities'.⁶⁸ At that time it was ordered that he should have the glebe lands in Southampton and Sandys Tribes and that he should be paid £40 a year by the Company until another minister could be found for those churches. Not long after these provisions were made White died. Throughout these documents there are no references to White's former Independency and he is shown to be an indispensable member of the community.

There are many possible reasons for White's return to the Church of England. His age suggests that he may have compromised his beliefs for security. More simply it may be because the Church of England had changed a great deal since his banishment. It is known that Cromwell was in power and that he favoured the Independents. Also, as before, the Company still

hired ministers who had been discharged from ministering in England. However, it is known that White had connections with the Independent church in Boston until he died. Thus, although he was older and probably more willing to compromise, White never fully relinquished the beliefs that caused him to be banished.

IV

How profound the effects of the decade's religious upheaval were may never be fully known, due to the loss of documentation from the era. What emerges from the remaining documents is a picture of a conflict of opinions in matters of government and religion. By the mid 1640s, Bermudians were divided into two camps. On one side were the Independents who felt that matters of worship should not be governed by parliament. On the opposing side were Church of England members who felt that the parliament had the right to order uniformity of worship. This group, who had support from well-known English Presbyterians such as William Prynne, felt that the colonists should wait for the parliament's decision on a form of worship.

The conflict was complicated by the fact that Independents, who were the minority, held the majority on the government council. Also the absence of Church of England ministers caused further problems. This conflict offers a prime example of the links that existed between England and Bermuda, as it mirrors what was happening in England at this time. The parliament was plagued by the question: What should replace the bishops? Parliament's inability during this period to come to a decision on the form of worship greatly affected the island. During the search for a new form of worship the church rested on unsure ground both in England and Bermuda. Firstly, the civil war meant that the leaders of the Company, most of whom lived in London, were too occupied to ensure that people had ministers between 1644 and 1647. Also it meant that White's rise to power from 1641 was possible because there were bigger problems to deal with in the mother country.

White, Oxenbridge, Golding and Copeland found what they felt was the true way to worship God. They felt that there should not be one church ruled by the king and parliament. As all these men lived in England until the late 1630s it is most likely that their ideas and beliefs were developed in England during the period that Laud was Archbishop. They would have been exposed to the ideas that helped to fuel the dispute that would begin less than five years after these men left the country.

In any conflict it is the ideas of men that count. Thus another connection between the two events is seen. The ideas that fuelled the Bermudian conflict are much the same as those which evolved during the civil war. In fact, it can be said that the ideas were brought to Bermuda by men from England.

Those who were banished because of their unorthodox views brought their ideas of reform with them. The men who came to the island as workers would have most likely been the ones who held to the Church of England and government by king and parliament.

The Independent ministers' dedication to their beliefs caused problems for many reasons. Firstly, as they were the only ministers on the island their separation from the church meant that most of the islanders were left without ministers. Secondly, their belief that their method of worship should not be regulated by any government set them at odds with the majority of the islanders who felt that king and parliament should have a say in the form of worship held in the country. The conflict arose on the island because most people wished to obey parliament but felt this obedience was compromised because they were governed by men who they felt had disregarded parliament in setting up a new church.

The main problem seems then to be that Bermuda was controlled by a minority group who were seen as being rebellious against the established Church of England and the rule of parliament. Much of what happened could have been prevented if the majority would have had a minister. But ministers that were sent to the island either joined the Independents or left. This meant there was a lack of strong spiritual leadership from the Church of England on the island. Little effort was made by the Somers Island Company to make sure that the issue was properly resolved.

It was not until 1646, two years after the Independent church was formed and five years after Norwood had first notified the Company of the actions of White and Oxenbridge, that something was done. The Independent 'coup' was finally overthrown with the aid of the new Presbyterian governor. This ended in the banishment of the small and now powerless group of Independents. However, the problems were not solved with this banishment as England's aims and focus changed that same year with the death of the king. In the search for a new republic the Bermuda issue was forgotten for a period. But in 1653 the Somers Island Company was reorganised, because it was generally agreed that the Company leaders had not done enough to ensure that the islanders, including the Independents, had religious liberty. Parliament, now led by Cromwell, felt that the Company had failed to ensure the religious liberty of the Independents. This is a change from the decisions made when the Presbyterians had the main sway of parliament during the 1640s.

Thus the connections are found through similar ideas and mirrored conflicts. The search for a unified form of worship and the conflict it caused with the rising sects in England greatly affected the colonists in Bermuda. Also, the upheaval occurring in England meant there was little time to worry about

the troubles of a small colony. Echoes of the English conflict are seen in the battle for control of the council and the request of the majority for rulers and ministers who would be obedient to parliament. The struggle in the mid 1640s in both Bermuda and England was between the Independents and the Presbyterians, who each felt they had the solution for church government.

Also the way in which the conflict developed holds many similarities. Firstly, it originated with men who belonged to the same church but had different ideas of government and religion. It progressed to an all-out 'war', between those who were labelled Independent and Presbyterians. It ended with the rejection of Presbyterianism as the form of church government and the embracing of a more Independent-minded church.

The conclusion of the conflict in Bermuda was greatly affected by Cromwell's rise to power. Thereafter, those of the Independent view politically had the government on their side. Ecclesiastically, it meant that the Presbyterian model for the Church of England was no longer rigorously imposed, both in England and in Bermuda. Thus the weapon that was used to help banish the Independents was now annihilated. And although forgotten during the initial search for a republican form of rule for England, the Bermudian Independents were finally remembered.

Both countries were connected by a theme of political and religious struggle. They were both hugely affected by the conflict between warring religious factions and the eventual death of the king of England. From start to finish, the English Revolution had a colossal impact on the Bermudian colonists but more for religious and ecclesiastical than for constitutional and political reasons.

Notes.

1. E Heyl, *Bermuda's Early Days* (Glasgow, 1959), pp. 65-6.
2. A C Hollis Hallett (ed), *Chronicles of a Colonial Church* (Pembroke, Bermuda, 1993), xii.
3. *Ibid*, ix-x.
4. The first prayer service was held in 1612 when the *Plough* arrived in Bermuda.
5. Heyl, *Early Days*, p. 103.
6. J de Chantal Kennedy, 'Parliamentary institutions: Bermuda's colonial parliament, 1620-70', *Bermuda Historical Quarterly* 27 (1970), pp. 7-22, especially p. 7.
7. Heyl, *Early Days*, p. 132.
8. J H Lefroy, *Memorials of the Bermudas* (2 vols, Toronto, 1981), p. 548. [All references are from vol I unless otherwise indicated].
9. *Ibid*.
10. *Ibid*, p. 580
11. *Ibid*, p. 687.

12. Hallett, *Chronicles*, p. 43.
13. J P Kenyon, *Stuart England* (London, 1990), p. 122.
14. Hallett, *Chronicles*, p. 42. Hallett assumes that White's undergraduate work was completed at Oxford, but is unable to give any hard evidence to confirm this.
15. N White, *Pastors Charge and Cure* (London, 1645), p. 8. The preface says it is the sermon he preached at Oxford in the 1630s.
16. *Ibid*, pp. 14-15.
17. *Ibid*, p. 20.
18. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 615. The letter was written while Beake, an elderly school teacher, sat in prison in 1646. He was sent there after calling White a demi-god.
19. *Ibid*, p. 706.
20. H Wilkinson, *The Adventurers of Bermuda* (Oxford, 1958), p. 254.
21. *Ibid*, p. 255.
22. Hallett, *Chronicles*, p. 45.
23. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 255.
24. Wilkinson, *Adventurers*, p. 255.
25. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 617. *Richard Beake to W Prynne* [1646].
26. Wilkinson, *Adventurers*, p. 68.
27. J Kenndy, *Isle of Devils: Bermuda under the Somers Island Company, 1609-85* (London, 1971), p. 177.
28. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 569; letter from R Norwood to the governor and Company, 28 February 1642.
29. R Norwood, *An Advertisement to such here as have care of the Conservative of True Religion*, in W Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery of some prodigious New Wandering-Blasing Stars* (London, 1645).
30. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 570.
31. *Ibid*.
32. As the two men lives twelve miles apart, communication was difficult.
33. Lefroy, *Memorials*, pp. 571-2. Norwood's correspondence with Prynne was published by the latter in 1645 in his *A Fresh Discovery*.
34. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 574.
35. *Ibid*, pp. 581-2.
36. W K Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England* (Gloucester, Mass., 1965), pp. 40-1.
37. *Ibid*, p. 41.
38. Norwood, *An Advertisement*.
39. Wilkinson, *Adventurers*, p. 251.
40. *Ibid*, p. 248. His appointment encompassed all of the American islands and plantations. He was re-elected for a short term in the mid 1650s.
41. *Ibid*, p. 91.
42. *Ibid*, p. 256.
43. A Anderson, *The Civil Wars, 1640-9* (London, 1995), p. 105.
44. Hallett, *Chronicles*, p. 46.
45. Kennedy, *Isle of Devils*, p. 185.
46. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 587.
47. *Ibid*, p. 591.
48. *Ibid*, p. 611.
49. *Ibid*, p. 604.
50. *Ibid*, p. 579.

51. Ibid, p. 616.
 52. Ibid, p. 617.
 53. Ibid.
 54. N White, *Truth Gloriously Appearing from under the sad and sable Cloud of Obliquie* (London, 1646).
 55. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 601.
 56. Hallett, *Chronicles*, p. 51.
 57. Wilkinson, *Adventurers*, p. 264.
 58. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 600.
 59. Hallett, *Chronicles*, p. 58.
 60. Lefroy, *Memorials*, p. 622.
 61. Ibid, p. 627.
 62. Wilkinson, *Adventurers*, p. 269.
 63. Ibid, pp. 270-1.
 64. Ibid, p. 285.
 65. Hallett, *Chronicles*, p. 59.
 66. N Sainsbury (ed), *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, 1574-1660* (London, 1860), p. 411.
 67. Ibid, Introduction, xxxiii.
 68. Lefroy, *Memorials*, II, 276.

Kristy Warren took a BA (Hons) at Newbold College and has taught at primary school level in Bermuda. She is currently finishing an MA in Race and Ethnicity Studies at the University of Warwick.

WHAT WAS THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR ON CATHOLICS, 1642-48?

by Simon Stevens

English Catholics suffered from persecution throughout the seventeenth century, but this persecution was by no means uniform through the period. Under Elizabeth, and in the early years of James I's reign following the Gunpowder Plot, JPs enforced the recusancy laws vigorously, but in James's later years, as fears of an immediate Catholic rising wore off, this was gradually (and informally) relaxed. Under Charles I, who had a Catholic wife, Catholics became increasingly prominent at court, but at the same time the king's financial problems meant that the recusancy laws against ordinary Catholics were enforced severely once again. Between 1640 and 1642, following the summoning of the Long Parliament, this persecution was heightened even further. It was at this point that the civil war broke out, and it seems likely that the impact of the war on Catholics had both positive and negative aspects: on the one hand they suffered persecution from the fiercely anti-Catholic parliament and its supporters, but on the other the war meant that much of the traditional judicial system, the tool for their persecution, ceased to function and that, for a variety of reasons, in many areas Catholics were increasingly socially accepted.

During the civil war Catholics perhaps suffered the most at the hands of parliamentarian soldiers. Parliament claimed to be fighting a crusade against popery and papists; in all its declarations the Commons asserted that popery was a major issue, or even *the* major issue, separating it from the king, and constantly reiterated that it was acting 'to maintain and defend...the true reformed Protestant religion...against all Popery and popish innovations'. In Hirst's words, 'sheer anti-Catholicism drove on many conscientious followers of parliament'.¹ A group of parliamentarian prisoners who in 1644 explained to the royalist divine Edward Simmons that they 'took up arms against Antichrist and popery' were typical. In 1642 many parliamentarian battle-standards bore slogans such as 'Antichrist must down'. In these circumstances, parliament gave almost full rein to the anti-popery of its supporters, with the result that, as Miller suggests, 'Catholics suffered more severely than other Royalists...from the depredations of the Parliamentary forces'.²

This often took the form of plunder. Clarendon recorded that 'the Papists' houses in all places' were, in 1642, being 'plundered or pulled down, with all circumstances of rage, by the parliament-soldiers' who 'in their march took the goods of all Catholics and eminent malignants as lawful prize'. In his study of Worcestershire, Gilbert suggests rather tentatively that 'Catholics seem to

have suffered particularly heavily from plundering soldiers... one gets the impression that Catholics were especially selected for "visitations" and "visited" more frequently than non-Catholics'.³ Contemporaries were certain of this. Sir Henry Garraway, an alderman of London with royalist sympathies, asserted to Pym in 1643 that 'if they stay at their houses they are plundered: it is good justification for plundering that they are papists'. No distinction was made between active Catholic royalists and Catholic neutrals, for it was assumed that all Catholics were enemies. In 1647 the trained bands of Colchester attacked the house of a known local royalist and then 'cried out that now they were met together' they should 'deal in the same manner with the Papists'. Several Catholic houses were broken into and pillaged, the mob 'miserably spoiling what they could not carry away'; even quite poor Catholics were robbed of their animals and furniture. Similarly William Sheldon, a Warwickshire Catholic, described in 1649 the hardships he had had to endure during the civil war:

In September, 1643, my house at Weston...was ransacked, and my cattle and goods taken by soldiers...In December following, my house at Beoley...was burned to the ground and all my goods and cattle plundered...Immediately after, all my flock of cattle for my provision of housekeeping was taken from us at Weston by a party of soldiers...[We] removed [later] to a small farm house in the parish of Clifton upon Tyme...where we remained about eight months, until all our goods and horses were also taken by soldiers and the house threatened to be burned

It is of course difficult to ascertain how typical this degree of suffering was, but Mosler concludes from his local study of Warwickshire that this account is to some degree representative and 'illustrates the tribulations of Warwickshire Catholics'.⁴

The widespread plundering was sometimes accompanied by physical violence, and Catholics again seem to have been often selected for particularly harsh treatment. Lawrence Bird of Rowington, Warwickshire, for example, was plundered and physically assaulted by parliamentary troops and Robert Apreece of Washingley, a small landowner in Huntingdonshire, was shot by Puritan troopers simply for being a Catholic. The massacre of the predominantly Catholic garrison of Basing House was one of the few real atrocities of the civil war. The violence of many parliamentary soldiers against Catholic civilians drove many of them to seek refuge in royalist garrisons. In 1651-2, William Birchley, a Catholic apologist who wanted to show that not all Catholics had opposed parliament, asserted that 'a great part of those papists, who are sequestered as absolute delinquents, were never in actual arms against the Parliament, but only fled to the enemies Garrisons for shelter...Since whoever did observe the fury and rage of most of our

common soldiers (at the beginning of the late troubles) against many of that party, will easily conclude that the Papists had reason to distrust their own personal security amongst them'. A similar picture emerges from the records of the Committee for Compounding. John Jones of Monmouthshire, for example, claimed that he had not been in arms against parliament, but had been 'constrained often to repair unto Raglan Castle, being two miles from his habitation, to avoid the soldiers...the violence of the Common Soldier being great against Recusants', and similarly Thomas Empson asserted that 'for the preservation of his life he was forced to fly to a Garrison of the Enemies to Avoid the fury of the Soldiers that at the same time killed a neighbour'.

Lindley terms this 'involuntary royalism' and concludes from his study of the records of the Committee for Compounding that 'instances of Catholics who claimed before the Committee...that they had been forced to seek refuge with the royalists can be found in all [the nine] counties studied in this survey'.⁵ In many cases their claims were upheld and this is evidence not only that many Catholics (who, according to Everitt, 'in general...kept their heads low and endeavoured to remain neutral') were forced to take sides and enter royalist garrisons, but that many were punished for it, being sequestered for delinquency as well as recusancy. Some were subsequently able to have this reversed by the Committee for Compounding, but it seems likely that many others were not.

Plundering and physical violence against Catholics was, as it was against all civilians, concentrated in the most contested regions, through which large bodies of troops passed many times (although this was certainly not exclusive: some of the worst attacks on Catholics were in the parliamentary heartlands of Essex and Suffolk). In Warwickshire, for example, the Catholics who suffered the most from plundering troops were those in the south-west of the county, through which there were frequent parliamentary troop movements westward to attack royalist strongholds in Worcestershire. Sequestrations and fines, however, were supposed to affect all Catholics in areas controlled by parliament. In 1643 parliament decreed that the estates of all royalists and Catholics were to be seized as they fell into parliamentary hands: the county committees were to take possession of two-thirds of the estates of all Catholics, and four-fifths of Catholics in arms for the king. Catholics were to be identified by the administration of a new 'Oath of Abjuration', which included an outright denial of papal supremacy and the doctrine of transubstantiation. Gregorio Panzini, an Italian priest, reported that 'these acts were executed with extreme severity on the whole body of Catholics. Few families escaped...The lowest orders suffered in the general sequestration. They even tripartited the day-labourer's goods and very household stuff; and have taken away two cows where the whole flock was but three'. Mosler concurs, suggesting that 'in Warwickshire, this financial anti-Catholic structure placed an extreme burden on the Catholic community' and that few had the money

required to compound (to pay a flat amount for the return of their estates). Certainly there were many examples of severe hardship. Mrs Nicholas Griffin, for example, a widow from Warwickshire, was forced to beg the Sequestrations Committee for relief, on the grounds that she was unable to maintain her extended family of twenty on the £70 p.a. left after her two-thirds sequestration fine and taxes. On other hand, the records of the Committee for Compounding show that many gentry, and a significant number of those below gentry status, were able to compound. Moreover, a significant number of Catholics probably benefited from the connivance of their neighbours or local committee men in reducing the burden upon them (see below). Miller suggests that 'few Catholics were totally ruined by sequestration' since 'by compounding or fictitious sales many avoided having their lands confiscated or quickly recovered them; most emerged at the Restoration with a heavy load of debt but with most of their lands intact'.

The imposition of sequestration was thus a severe burden on the English Catholic community, but perhaps not as crippling as might have been expected. In addition it seems likely that during the war many Catholics benefited from a relaxation in the enforcement of the recusancy laws in areas controlled by parliament, for the means for enforcing them had often collapsed. In London there was a vigorous searching out of priests, large numbers of whom were incarcerated in Newgate, and twenty of whom were executed between 1641 and 1646 (compared to just two between 1625 and 1640). However, as Miller argues, most lay 'Catholics were not vigorously persecuted' in this period. The abolition of the Court of High Commission in 1641 had removed one of the main agencies for the persecution of Catholics, and meant that there could be no more special recusancy ecclesiastical commissions (the use of which had in 1627 been revived from the time of Elizabeth's reign to increase the crown's revenue from recusants). Moreover much of the local justice system ceased to function: parliament declared assizes illegal and in many counties quarter sessions ceased to take place. The functions of the JPs were often taken over by the county committees, but these were overburdened, and acted only erratically; Pennington refers to their 'constant struggle to offer some haphazard justice and relief to a community where war had destroyed both respect for law and order and the means of enforcing them'.⁶ In contrast to the demands in many of the county petitions to parliament in 1642 for the complete rooting out of popery - six demanded the 'utter abolition of the mass' - the private practice of the Catholic faith does not seem to have been greatly interfered with in the war years. Compulsory attendance at the parish church was no longer demanded, and faced with the huge financial demands of conducting the war, parliament seems to have been more interested in extracting revenue from Catholics than forcibly converting them. As Mosler notes, 'Catholics could be taxed at a higher rate than the general population, and, ironically, it was in the interests of puritans to leave the religion of the Catholics alone'. Although there were

examples of compulsory conversions - for example, the children of Mrs Anderton of Clitheroe were taken from her after the death of her husband in battle and brought up as Protestants, and the wife of William Blundell of Crosby was allowed to retain one-fifth of his estate in trust for her children, on condition that they were raised 'in the Protestant religion' - these seem to have been isolated instances.

In royalist-controlled areas, there was an attempt to ensure that traditional judicial institutions, chiefly the quarter sessions, continued to function, but although the records for these areas are extremely scanty for the war period, it seems very likely that the recusancy laws were not at all vigorously enforced. Certainly there were no prosecutions of priests in royalist areas. Charles's attitude towards Catholics had always been governed by pragmatic considerations; between 1625 and 1640 this had meant that financial impositions weighed particularly heavily on them - his subsidy Acts provided that Catholics should pay double, for example - but during the war Catholics could be used as soldiers, just like anybody else, and it is probable therefore that persecution of them was largely lifted. Nevertheless there is evidence that Charles continued to see Catholics as a source of revenue which could be milked particularly heavily. In September 1642, for example, he negotiated with the Catholics of Staffordshire and Shropshire, and received nearly £5,000 in advances on recusancy fines, and in July 1643 following the fall of all Yorkshire (except Hull) to the royalists, a county committee was set up to extract money from suspected parliamentarians and Catholics, especially neutral Catholics.

Charles's willingness to entertain Catholics in arms probably led to a greater social acceptance of them, by royalists at least, and allowed them an access to positions of public responsibility which they had not enjoyed before the war and would not enjoy again for many years afterwards. On 23 September 1642 Charles wrote to the Earl of Newcastle: 'This rebellion is grown to such a height that I must not look of what opinion men are who at this time are willing and able to serve me. Therefore I do not only permit but command you to make use of all my loving subjects' services without examining their consciences - more than their loyalty to us'. Subsequently, parliamentary propaganda that all royalists were papists led him twice publicly to ban Catholics from his armies, but these proclamations do not seem to have had any practical effect.

Lindley has argued that 'the most remarkable fact that emerges [from his study of the records of the Committee for Compounding] is the extent of Catholic neutralism during the war. In every county studied the majority of Catholics were neutral throughout the hostilities'; 82% of all the Catholics he examined remained neutral. However, while there is no reason to doubt his general conclusion, he himself concedes that 13% of all the royalists he studied

were Catholics, describing this as 'a very small proportion'. When this is related to the percentage of Catholics in the total population, however, (which may have been as low as 1.5% and was certainly no higher than 5%) it is clear that Catholics fought for the king in disproportionately high numbers.

Many Catholics rose to senior positions. Newman has found that of the 101 royalist colonels in the Northern Army who can be identified, twenty-nine were Catholics.⁷ Several of these were appointed to high-profile posts: Lord Belayse, for example, was governor of York and lieutenant-general of Yorkshire in 1644, while Lord Widdrington was the president of the Earl of Newcastle's council of war. Many senior Catholics showed favour to their co-religionists, appointing them as company commanders: the Catholic governor of Dudley castle, for example, had a Catholic deputy, and nine of his fourteen other officers were also papists. Many other Catholic junior officers served under Protestant commanders, however. Catholics were also able to serve the royalists in civilian positions: the commission of array for Worcestershire in 1642 included three Catholics, and a fourth was appointed in 1645. One of them, Sir William Russell, became governor of Worcester and sheriff of Worcestershire, and was able to use his influence to favour other Catholics. In October 1643 he was accused of 'returning recusants of the Grand Jury at summer sessions', and the quarter sessions jury list of July that year shows that the charge was probably true, for it included the names of at least two Catholics.

Occasionally other royalists expressed disquiet at the employment of Catholics. The inhabitants of the Close in Salisbury protested when sergeant-major Innis was placed in charge of the fortification of the city, because he was 'of the Romish religion...If so great authority be placed in such a person, great discouragement may arise to your religion'. Similarly, Lord Belayse seems to have been hampered by dissensions among his staff, and his appointment as governor of Newark seems to have excited some animosity. However, in general there is little evidence of distrust of Catholics in the king's armies or on his commissions. Certainly there was nothing like a recurrence of the widespread desertion and mutiny which had taken place in troops commanded by Catholics in the army sent against the Scots in 1640 which had included the flaying to death of two Catholic officers and declarations by soldiers that they would murder all papist officers.

The civil war thus seems in royalist areas to have created the opportunity for a significant minority of Catholics to hold with little animosity positions of responsibility and authority, to which in normal circumstances they would not have been allowed. Protestant royalists seem in general to have accepted this. Caraman goes so far as to assert that for the Catholic gentry the war was a 'heaven-sent occasion, the first in eighty years, to prove that their protestations of loyalty to the Crown were sincere', and suggests that the

acceptance of Catholics by the cavaliers was so great that 'only the plot of a mentally deranged Oates...delayed the understanding between the State and the Catholic body'.⁸ This is overstated, for the Cavalier parliament repeatedly threw out proposals by Charles II for Catholic toleration, and panicked in 1673 and 1674 following the revelation that the heir to the throne was a Catholic. Nevertheless it is likely that the activities of the Catholic royalists in the civil war did help to accelerate the general acceptance of the Catholic gentry by their Protestant peers, particularly, as discussed below, in the localities.

Miller suggests with reference to the Restoration period that, 'consciously or unconsciously, [English Protestants] distinguished between Popery as a malign political force and Papists as people'.⁹ The latter were generally well-treated and accepted into the local community. There is clear evidence of the growth of this attitude before the civil war. It worried Pym, who warned the Commons in 1642, 'We must not look on a Papist as he is in himself but as he is in the body of the Church', but it seems likely that the war accelerated the acceptance of this distinction, so that while fear of popery did not diminish in the second half of the seventeenth century, fear of papists gradually did. This was due largely, not to the actions of the minority of Catholics in arms for the king, but to the behaviour of the majority of neutral Catholics who remained in their local communities.

Between 1640 and 1642, a series of panics that local Catholics were plotting to rise up and murder their Protestant neighbours convulsed much of England, including the five largest cities - London, Norwich, Bristol, Newcastle and York - and at least thirty-six other towns and villages, ranging in size from Colchester, Oxford and Salisbury to small hamlets. Only three counties have left no evidence of being affected by the panics. During this period Catholics were treated with intense fear and suspicion, and innocent actions such as buying stocks of food, changing residence, selling land to get cash in hand, or, once the panics had begun, obtaining weapons to defend themselves, were interpreted as preparations for a rising. Even if they attempted to go about their business normally, there were some who observed that Catholics were 'merrier than ever' and interpreted this as a sign that 'there was some new design in hand'. The recusancy laws were enforced with a new vigour: presentments for recusancy in Worcestershire rose from forty-six in 1640 to 223 in 1642. Catholic houses everywhere were forcibly searched for hidden arms, often several times, both by local officials and, sometimes, by local mobs. The searches of the latter were often accompanied by looting and violence. In 1642 in Maldon in Essex, for example, a roving band of townsmen and sailors attacked and searched Catholic houses up to twenty miles away. There were numerous anti-Catholic riots, including outside the Catholic queen's apartments, and in Essex and Suffolk in 1642 the Catholic Lady Rivers was driven from place to place by anti-Catholic crowds. Catholics

attending the embassy chapels in London were mobbed. Tensions were so high that in Staffordshire Protestants 'were in such fears...[that] they durst not go to Church unarmed' and such behaviour in Chester led to a skirmish in January 1642 between Catholics and Protestants in which several men on each side were killed.

Clifton has observed that these panics were concentrated around political crises: - 'five distinct concentrations can be seen between April 1640 and August 1642, each coinciding with a period of major political crisis' - and he suggests that this was because 'serious occurrences in national politics were understood at popular level in terms of a papist/anti-papist dichotomy'.¹⁰ It might have been expected, therefore, that during the war, the greatest political crisis of all, these local panics, tensions and attacks would have continued or even intensified. In fact the reverse was true, for while there were a few minor alarms in early 1643, the panics then fizzled out. After 1643 there were still numerous fears of conspiracies, but in contrast to 1640-2, these were very rarely pinned on Catholics. One London panic in 1643, for example, was based on the fear that 'surely the Danes were in Kent and would presently be in London'.

The reason for this decline during the war in attacks by local civilians on Catholics seems to have been, as Clifton suggests, that 'the first months of fighting exposed the true weakness of English Catholicism - in terms of numbers, arms, organisation and crusading spirit - which decades of peace had hidden'. The same idea was recorded by alderman Garraway in 1643: 'I confess I have not any fear of danger from [Catholics], and the truth is this bugbear is grown less terrible to everybody'. The terrifying Elizabethan stereotype of Catholicism, as described by Weiner¹¹ - that all English Catholics were the tools of foreign powers, inherently disloyal, and part of a 'tightly organised...treasonous monolith' controlled by the Jesuits and the Pope - was shown up by the war, and by the behaviour of the vast majority of Catholics who remained peaceably at home, for the bogey it was. In particular, the fear that there were innumerable secret papists who would declare themselves when they judged the time to be right to destroy Protestantism (Clarendon recorded that 'their strength and number were then [in 1642] thought so vast within the Kingdom...that if they were drawn together and armed under what pretext soever, they might...be able to give the law both to King and Parliament') was shown to be unfounded. When the expected Catholic hordes failed to materialise, fears instead turned to the sects, whose members were commonly accused of being Catholics in disguise. The fear of popery was not diminished by the war, but the fear of individual papists was, and with it the attacks and persecution of them by local people also declined. It was not until a generation later, when memories of the Catholics' weakness in the 1640s had faded, that Catholics were once again believed to be capable of armed rebellion.

Catholics were gradually being accepted into the local community in the seventeenth century: Clifton suggests that 'local sympathies were stronger than religious divisions' and that 'toleration was associated with the very strong regional or county feeling in the seventeenth century'. Again the civil war seems to have accelerated this process, by intensifying local loyalties. Everitt suggests that during the war 'local attachments were, if anything, becoming deeper rather than more superficial' and that 'the civil war period, by greatly adding to the complexity and volume of local government, increased this sense of county awareness'.¹² Pennington, Roots and Woolrych all concur; Roots, for example, refers to the 'intensified localism' as the central government's weapons for coercing the localities, such as the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, the assizes, and the Councils of Wales and the North, were swept away after 1640.¹³ As the internal bonds of the local community were strengthened, Catholics were increasingly accepted into it. There are numerous examples of this in the civil war period. In Ingatestone in Essex, for example, local villagers came to defend the house of the Catholic Lady Petre against the marauding trained bands in 1647. Similarly, although in many counties large numbers of Catholics fled to nearby royalist garrisons to escape the violence of parliamentary troops, Lindley notes that 'in Suffolk, where the most violent anti-popery riots took place, most Catholics did not in fact flee but managed to remain at home as neutrals'. Significantly there were no royalist garrisons near to Suffolk, and it seems that in these circumstances most Catholics chose to remain within their local community, and the protection that it might afford, rather than completely abandoning it by fleeing to the royalists. Moreover there are numerous examples of Protestants willingly participating in fraudulent transfers of land to preserve their Catholic neighbours' estates from sequestration, and even examples of county committee-men deliberately under-valuing the estates of Catholics and royalists for the purposes of sequestration, or sequestering Catholic royalists as 'papists' only and not as 'delinquents', in order to lighten the burden on them.

Thus, in conclusion, the civil war caused great suffering for many Catholics; in particular they were targeted for plundering and violent treatment by fiercely anti-Catholic parliamentary troops. They also suffered particularly severely economically, from parliamentary sequestrations, and, it appears, from the demands of the king. At the same time, however, the disruption the war caused to the judicial system seems to have meant that the recusancy laws were rarely enforced, in either parliamentary or royalist areas, and that the private practice of Catholicism was not generally interfered with. The war also meant that the significant minority of Catholics who fought for or aided the king were generally accepted in positions which in normal circumstances would have been barred to them. Above all, the civil war, and the neutrality of most Catholics, showed many of the traditional conceptions about

Catholics to be completely false, and as a result fear of individual Catholics began to diminish. Catholics were consequently increasingly accepted into their local communities, whose internal bonds the war was strengthening anyway. Nothing similar to the suspicions and attacks of 1640-42 occurred again until almost a generation later, in 1666 following the fire of London. The panics then, and during the Popish Plot, show that the civil war certainly did not mark a watershed in the treatment of Catholics, but it did perhaps cause an acceleration in the trend during the seventeenth century from the pervasive Elizabethan phobia and intolerance of Catholics towards *de facto* toleration of them.

Notes.

1. D Hirst, *Authority and Conflict: England 1603-58* (London, 1986).
2. J Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-88* (London, 1973).
3. C D Gilbert, 'The Catholics in Worcestershire, 1642-51', *Recusant History* 20 (1991).
4. D F Mosler, 'Warwickshire Catholics in the civil war', *Recusant History* 15 (1980).
5. K D Lindley, 'The part played by Catholics', in B Manning (ed), *Politics, Religion and the English Civil War* (London, 1973).
6. D H Pennington, 'The county community at war', in E W Ives (ed), *The English Revolution, 1600-60* (London, 1968).
7. P R Newman, 'Catholic royalist activities in the north', *Recusant History* 14 (1977).
8. P Caraman, *The Years of Siege: Catholic Life from James I to Cromwell* (London, 1966).
9. Miller, *Popery and Politics*.
10. R Clifton, 'The popular fear of Catholics during the English Revolution'. *Past & Present* 52 (1971); Clifton, 'Fear of popery', in C Russell (ed), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (London, 1973).
11. C Z Weiner, 'The beleaguered isle: a study of Elizabethan and early Jacobean anti-Catholicism', *Past & Present* 51 (1971).
12. A M Everitt, *The Local Community and the Great Rebellion* (London, 1969).
13. Pennington, 'The county community at war', I Roots, 'The central government and the local community', and A Woolrych, 'The English Revolution: an introduction', all in Ives, *The English Revolution*.

Other sources.

C Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England* (London, 1970); M D R Leys, *Catholics in England, 1559-1829: A Social History* (London, 1961); D Mathew, *Catholicism in England* (London, 1936); C Carlton, *Going to the Wars: The Experience of the English Civil Wars, 1638-51* (London, 1992); B Coward, *The Stuart Age* (London, 1980); A Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London, 1981); and J Morrill, *The Revolt of the Provinces* (London, 1976).

This essay, by Simon Stevens of Wolvercote, Oxford, won the 2001 Cromwell Prize Competition in the 15-18 age group.

DID THE CIVIL WAR AND ITS AFTERMATH TO 1660 OFFER ANY LASTING NEW OPPORTUNITIES TO WOMEN?

by Heather Delonnette

Life for women at the beginning of the civil war in England was a life ruled and administered by the men in their lives. Women themselves had few rights and privileges. In most cases they were seen as chattels of their husbands or fathers. It was these men who would do what they considered best for the women under their control. Men were considered as the head of their household and responsible for all those living within it. The upheavals caused by civil war provided some women, at least, with an opportunity to break from the social and cultural bonds that bound them. Brian Manning suggests that seeds of discontentment with their lot were already present in women before the outbreak of war, the war just allowed them to germinate.¹ It must, however, be stressed that this change in women's roles was not a nation-wide phenomena; it seems to have occurred in pockets and for many women life would have carried on virtually as normal.

Some areas of influence became available to women purely because of the absence of their men-folk. The defence of property often fell to the female inhabitants left behind by combatant male relations. Antonia Fraser recounts many episodes of high born ladies defending their homes, which were also the strongholds of whichever faction they supported, against opposing armies.² Many of their maidservants and other female members of the household were also caught up in the ensuing sieges and violence but were rarely mentioned or praised for their bravery, although their mistresses were. Gender was not the only discrimination taking place. The social status of women had a bearing on the way they were treated and represented.

Women without large fortified homes to guard did, however, get involved with the fortification and protection of their villages and towns. Many women raised money for the fortifications and defences, and some even helped to build and maintain them. Money was also raised to supply the army with troops. These troops were known as 'virgin' or 'maiden' troops because of their female patrons. Other women went one stage further, following the army around the country. Some of these women were prostitutes who saw the business potential of several hundred men away from home for months at a time. Soldiers' wives were also camp-followers, often adopting male dress to protect themselves from other soldiers. Sometimes women enlisted into the army as a way of staying close to their men and earning a living. This was usually the case when the wife had no other way of earning an income with her husband gone.

For some women the absence of their husband or father left them in the role of 'deputy husband'.³ They were already becoming more important within businesses, often being effectively business partners with their husbands. The women of the period were similar to modern women; they worked in several different areas at the same time. They were in charge of their home, ensuring this was properly provisioned and maintained. They also worked in the family business, either selling their wares in shops and markets or tending fields and animals with their husbands. When the men left to fight the women were left in charge of these businesses and farms. This increased their economic activity; they were the ones making the decisions and reaping the rewards or penalties of those decisions. Martyn Bennett suggests that it was this increase in financial and economic power that encouraged women to attempt to increase their influence in other areas.⁴

One way in which women attempted to influence the way government behaved was by petitioning parliament. Women had been involved in more physical protests. They had been among the rioters in Herefordshire and the Fenlands as well as being members of the clubmen movement. The clubmen were groups of local people who took up arms, mainly the club of their name, to defend their local villages and livelihoods against any perceived threat. Women also joined the 'mob' that attempted to influence the attitudes of parliament. They attacked the Lord Mayor of London when he accompanied Charles I in his attempt to arrest the five Members of Parliament; what stopped them attacking the king may have been guards or may have been his rank. Petitioning parliament was a more political form of protest. In 1642 women petitioned parliament about the economic effects the war was having on their livelihoods. As they were now in charge of the family businesses, these women petitioners were often in the best position to describe the consequences of civil unrest on local economies. They were also those most affected by the shortages and high prices that the war induced; after all they did not have army provisioning officers making sure their family was fed and watered. Women Levellers claimed that they were just as affected by the war and the political decisions of government as any man in the country and so should have their views considered by parliament.

The following year, in August 1643, women appealed to parliament for peace, as the war was having such a dramatic affect on society. What started as a march by several hundred London women to parliament to hand in a petition and await an answer is described as resulting in a riot, the severity of which depends on whose account is believed. The 'Peace Petition' seems to have similarities with the Greenham Common protests that took place three hundred years later. Other similarities with later protests can be seen. Patricia Higgins suggests that men could well have been the instigators of the Peace Petition and may even have dressed as women to lead the demonstration.⁵ If this is the case, the concept of men dressing as women in

protests was repeated two hundred years later in the Rebecca Riots. It is highly likely that women were present at the execution of Charles I, and the following century would again see women present at another king's execution, this time in France.

The issues covered by women's protests extended further in later years. The 'Women's Petition' of 1651 argued for reforms in the laws of debt. They claimed that being imprisoned for debt was unjust as there was no way for the debtor to repay his debt while incarcerated. Other legal issues were addressed in petitions put forward by women, such as the use of courts martial during peacetime. A great number of petitions were presented demanding the release of Leveller leaders and other 'political' prisoners. These groups were usually led by the prisoners' wives such as Elizabeth Lilburne and Mary Overton, who claimed that their husbands were being held without trial and therefore illegally.

All this political activity was not received with complete acceptance. The term 'fishwife' became used as a disparaging term for the women who involved themselves in these protests. This type of behaviour was considered abnormal for women at the time despite their increased activity in other spheres, as we have seen. Women's involvement in politics was the source of a series of jokes claiming that there would soon be a 'Parliament of Women' where women would have superiority over their husbands and fathers, a world truly 'turned upside down'.

Women were considered incapable of making a reasoned decision, and this was done for them by their husbands and fathers. Some groups did argue for the right of women to vote, but they were usually groups of women rather than men. Some women attempted to register to vote - for example widows who were landowners were entitled to vote, but only if the local sheriff allowed them. Leveller women claimed equality with their male counterparts - 'Have we not an equal interest with the men of this nation in those liberties and securities contained in the Petition of Right?'⁶ When this claim was rejected a pamphlet was circulated claiming that 'if this principle were true, that all subjection and obedience to persons and their laws stood by virtue of electing them, then...all women at once were exempt from being under government'.⁷

Parliament had declared that women were excluded from the Petition of Right and to emphasise this the word 'persons' was substituted by 'men' in the 1650 debate on the Act of Subscribing the Engagement. Even the Levellers, who claimed to want to 'level' society and called for anyone who was 'freeborn' to have the vote, made clear that 'freeborn' did not include servants or anyone who did not maintain themselves, thus excluding wives and daughters. Widows and spinsters who had their own income would,

under these rules, have been able to vote. This disparity existed within the Leveller movement, in spite of John Lilburne's assertion, in 1646, that men and women 'are, and were by nature all equall and alike in power, dignity, authority and majesty, none of them having (by Nature) any authority, dominion, or magisterial power, one over or above another'.⁸

The legal and administrative systems were areas where women had been involved and continued to be throughout the war and interregnum. Women had been allowed to act as prosecutors in certain cases in both the secular and ecclesiastical courts. More usually, though, women were called as a kind of expert witness when medical evidence was needed, for example in cases of rape or desertion. Women were also given minor roles in local government, such as overseers of the poor in the parish, which was considered to be in keeping with their natural talents. These positions were often given to women because of a lack of male candidates. Women did become especially valuable as representatives of their husbands during sequestration cases. There were harsh penalties to pay if the estate's valuation was wrong and using women as the representative had two main advantages. First, as the estate's owner was usually on the losing side and away fighting, he was unlikely to have a clear idea of what his estate was worth. Secondly, a woman was entitled to one fifth of the value of the estate to maintain herself and her children. This meant that it was not in a woman's interest to undervalue her husband's estate. In fact Thomas Knyvett wrote to his wife 'Women solicitors are observed to better Audience than masculine malignant'.⁹

Religion was the other area in which women's roles changed. Many of the newer religious groups believed that men and women were equal in the eyes of God and so therefore they should be equal within their church. This equality allowed women not only to be equal members of the congregation but also to preach. They were not, however, expected to preach their own ideas; they preached only as the Spirit moved them and not by right. There had been a limited precedent for women being deeply involved in religion. During the middle ages a group called the Lollards had had many female members who were encouraged to be as religious as their male counterparts.

The increase in radical religious groups rekindled these notions of female piety, although not all groups agreed with female religious equality. The Muggletonians looked forward to a heaven that consisted only of men. The established, traditional Church of England and Roman Catholic church did not have a policy of allowing women any religious freedom. As with politics; they were supposed to be guided by their male superiors; this patriarchal stance is suggested as the reason why many women opted to join more radical groups. Even members of these groups did not always agree with allowing women more involvement. Prynne, for example, felt that the sects

that encouraged female membership only did so to increase their ranks and therefore appear more popular than they actually were, thereby increasing the group's importance and influence. In 1641 a rhyme was circulating entitled 'Lucifer's Lackey or the Devil's New Creation'. Its words claimed that women preachers were the Devil's work: 'When women preach and cobblers pray/ The fiends in hell make holiday'.¹⁰ At the same time the male-dominated established churches claimed that the increasing involvement of women in religion was undermining the family and therefore society, a parallel with what the MPs felt about many of the women petitioners. Women preachers claimed that Joel 2:28-29 allowed for female preaching: 'your sons and daughters will proclaim my message'.

Groups that did accept women preachers claimed that women were less susceptible to the sin of pride and therefore less likely to corrupt the word of God. Also as women were not used to this elevated role within the group they would be very frightened by the idea of getting up and speaking in front of the congregation. So if they were moved to speak it could only happen by the will of God.

There was also a rise in the acceptance of women prophets during this period, probably for the same reasons as the increase in women preachers. Lady Eleanor Davies was known to have advised Cromwell as well as prophesying the deaths of the Duke of Buckingham and Charles I, while Elizabeth Poole advised the army council. Women prophets were not accepted universally. As women, they were always liable to claims of bewitchment or possession by the Devil, a charge not often made of male prophets. Women preachers and prophets were considered as different from most women and not always thought of in a positive light. They were the consequence of the world being upended and when it returned to normal these women would retake their rightful positions in society, as wives and mothers under the authority of men.

Women were also involved in other aspects of society during the war. They wrote the pamphlets and sold the news sheets that were used as propaganda by both sides. Women were also used as spies and messengers because their sex gave them a greater freedom of movement than men. They also campaigned for better education and prospects for women when the war was over. Patricia Crawford and Laura Gowing suggest that women's activities during the civil war showed the first glimmers of what would become feminism three hundred years later.¹¹

When Charles II was restored to the throne in 1660 the turbulent years of the civil war and the interregnum were over and things could return to normal. Women ceased to be a force in politics, and they again became the chattels of their male relations. Women who had petitioned parliament and

been actively involved in local administration were once again treated as possessions. Even the women who satisfied the property qualification, which would allow them to vote, continued to be excluded from the electoral system. Women would not be granted the vote for another two and a half centuries, when women would also take their places in the House of Commons, a Women's Parliament perhaps. Women preachers would likewise have to wait to be allowed to preach in the Church of England and this would so upset some male preachers that they would join the Roman Catholic church where women are not allowed to preach. Even the Quaker movement, which had been so progressive in its acceptance of women, had reversed its stance by 1700 and not only were women prevented from preaching in all but the most exceptional circumstances but separate meetings for men and women were held.

The civil war did offer women new opportunities. They were short-lived and by the turn of the century most of the advances had been reversed, the world had been righted and women were firmly back at the bottom of the heap. Women would eventually have access to similar opportunities as men, but this would not be the case until well into the twentieth century.

Notes.

1. B Manning (ed), *Politics, Religion and the English Civil War* (London, 1973), p. 178.
2. A Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel* (London, 1985), especially pp. 183-207.
3. M Bennett, *The Civil Wars in Britain and Ireland, 1638-51* (Oxford, 1997), p. 222.
4. *Ibid*, p. 8.
5. P Higgins, 'The reactions of women, with special reference to women petitions', in Manning, *Politics, Religion and the English Civil War*, p. 197.
6. P Crawford & L Gowing (eds), *Women's Worlds in Seventeenth Century England* (London, 2000), p. 254.
7. K Thomas, 'Women and the civil war sects', in T Aston (ed), *Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660* (London, 1969), p. 336.
8. Bennett, *Civil Wars*, p. 320.
9. Fraser, *Weaker Vessel*, p. 234.
10. *Ibid*, p. 277.
11. Crawford & Gowing, *Women's Worlds*, p. 245.

Other sources.

C Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (London, 1975); P Mack, 'Women as prophets during the English civil war', in M & J Jacob (eds), *The Origins of Anglo-American Radicalism* (London, 1984); and M Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories* (London, 1981).

This essay, by Heather Delonnette of Llandrindod Wells, won the 2001 Cromwell Prize Competition in the adult age group.

THE REVEREND ROBERT RAM AND THE SIEGE OF CROWLAND, 1643

by Michael Byrd

Crowland, or more correctly Croyland meaning soft muddy island in the original Saxon, is chiefly associated with site of the great Benedictine abbey founded by Ethelbald, King of Mercia, in AD 716, just two years after the death of the hermit Saint Guthlac who landed on this 'island' in the fens in AD 699. In fact, the site has revealed much earlier evidences of occupation, including a series of tumulus urns, flints and pottery, Bronze and Iron Age and Roman artifacts. Isolated it may have been but not quite the howling wilderness devoid of human habitation commonly portrayed in the early accounts.

Whilst surrounded by still largely undrained fens in the seventeenth century, Croyland was accessible, weather permitting, by raised roads from Peterborough, Spalding, Wisbech and Stamford, making it a place of strategic importance. In April 1643 the parliamentary cause in south Lincolnshire was under threat, Newark, Grantham, Stamford and Peterborough were under royalist control, Lincoln and Boston were threatened, Spalding had been captured and retaken, and Croyland had been seized and hurriedly fortified with earthworks. Thus the natural line of defensible towns covering the eastern counties from the north was dangerously compromised and a determined royalist army might have successfully breached the gap.

The Rev Robert Ram, minister of Spalding since 1626, was a much respected and active parliamentary figure in the area. In 1644 Ram published the *Soldier's Catechism* composed for parliament's army, in 1645 he published *Paedobaptism or A Defence of Infant Baptism* dedicated to Edward Rossiter, and on 27 March 1646 he preached a sermon to the army at Balderton near Newark, which was then published. Finally in 1655, still minister at Spalding, he published the *Countryman's Catechism*, dedicated to his parishioners, and set up a library in the parish church.

It is therefore not surprising that he should have written on 31 January 1643 to his errant neighbour, the royalist rector of Croyland, Mr William Stiles, pointing out his misguided support for the royalist partisans who had lately taken over the town. Bearing in mind that Stiles had been rector at Croyland since 1640, was a warden of Browne's Hospital in Stamford and also held the rank of colonel in the royalist army, the appeal was perhaps misguided, if not futile.

The net result of this exchange was that, early in the morning, of Saturday 25 March, some 80 or 90 men lead by a captain Welbie, captain Thomas Stiles, brother of the Croyland rector, and captain Cromwell of Ramsey and cousin to Oliver, broke into the parsonage at Spalding 'in a violent and uncivil manner' and carried away with them to Croyland Mr Ram, his guests John Harrington esquire, sergeant Edward Horn, a Mr Slater aged 66 who was quickly released and two others.

The prisoners were paraded through the streets of Croyland upon return 'in mind of Sampson's entertainments when he was taken by the Philistines', lodged crudely in the room of a public house and subjected to fierce pro-royalist sermons and lectures in the abbey. The Croylanders spent the evening toasting their 'victory' in the local and no doubt delighted at the thought of the humiliation they had inflicted on their local rivals at Spalding. The local rivalry extended back into the pre-reformation period when the priors of Spalding and abbots of Croyland contended their boundaries and rights, aided by their respective townspeople, normally fuelled by 'Sir John Barlycorn' for the purpose. Feelings in Croyland were further raised at this time by the appearance of a Mr Jackson, minister of nearby Fleet, who preached 'incendiary' royalist sermons to the townspeople invoking the 'Holy stones and books' of the abbey to rise and defend them, much to the indignation, one suspects, of the Rev Ram and party who were compelled to listen!

By 13 April the people of Spalding were in a position to respond. Trained bands mustered voluntarily under the command of colonel Edward King of Martin, the parliamentary high sheriff of Lincolnshire, supported by local men, marched against Croyland and appeared before the town that evening. As soon as parliamentary forces approached Croyland, about 8'o clock, the prisoners were, in the words of Robert Ram, 'carried to that part of the town where the first onset was given, being all of us fast pinioned and made to stand in an open space where all the cannon began to play'. The parliamentary drummer sent into the town to parley was forcibly restrained and made prisoner by the Croylanders, much to the indignation of the besiegers but perhaps understandable in view of the dual purpose, embracing intelligence-gathering, of such persons. In the failing light, the prisoners were thus fired upon by their own side for above three hours, without injury, until finally recognised. One captain John Harrington had fired upon his own father several times.

The first siege lasted for three days from 13 to 16 April, when the inclemently wet weather and stout bulwarks compelled the Spaldonians to withdraw. The prisoners were compelled to endure more 'victory' celebrations and public humiliation from the revelling defenders.

On 25 April events took a more serious turn from the Croylanders' point of view with the arrival of colonel Sir Miles Hobart with an estimated 800 men (which he took to Marston Moor in 1644), supported by Sir Anthonie Irbie with 90 men and colonel Oliver Cromwell, with captain Oliver Cromwell his son, and 300 men, augmented by the Spalding men. Again, the weather favoured the defenders but the unfortunate Mr Ram and his servant, and probably sergeant Horn, were pinioned to the bulwarks despite the weather. Nonetheless, the town was assaulted on three sides, the cavalry fighting on foot, but with the assistance of the weather the bulwarks were held when the attacking companies had to be withdrawn from their 'inhospitable quarters' until Friday.

On the morning of Friday 28 April, having rejected the unreasonable terms of surrender submitted to them by the defenders, the parliamentarians prepared to assault the bulwarks again, but the defenders had already decided to yield since many of the royalist garrison had slipped away, including captain Welbie; thus the parliamentarians were able to march in unopposed later in the afternoon, much, no doubt, to the relief of Robert Ram and his fellow prisoners.

The intrepid Ram and friends were returned in triumph to Spalding. The full story of their saga can be found in a pamphlet published in London in June 1643 called *Divers Remarkable Passages of God's Good Providence in the Wonderful Preservation and Deliverance of John Harrington, Esq and Mr Robert Ram, Minister.*

Mr Ram resumed his duties, officiating at a mass burial in Spalding on 18 January 1655, when twenty-three townspeople were killed in a roof collapse of one of the old priory buildings whilst gathered therein to watch a troop of dancers. According to his successor and friend, Robert Pierson, whilst this entertainment did not commend itself to the Rev Ram, he was nonetheless much moved at the loss and showed great compassion. The Rev Ram died and was buried in Spalding parish churchyard on 4 March 1656; the record of his burial includes a description, added by the Rev Robert Pierson, noting his integrity, faith and service for over thirty years.

Sources.

T Bevis, 'The siege of Crowland', *Lincolnshire Life* (September 1997); E H Gooch, *History of Spalding* (Spalding, 1940); B Jones, *The Rev Robert Ram as a Writer* (locally produced information sheet, n.p., n.d.); Spalding PCC, *700 Years: Spalding Parish Church* (Spalding, 1984); and W E Foster, *The Plundered Ministers of Lincolnshire* (Guildford, n.d.).

Michael Byrd, Secretary of The Cromwell Association, lives close to Spalding and Croyland.

JOHN LAMBERT AND THE ROOTS OF AN EARLY MODERN ART COLLECTION

by David Farr

Major-General John Lambert (1619-84), who presented Cromwell with the title of Lord Protector, has long been recognised for his diverse cultural interests, including the appreciation and practice of painting. In 1762 Walpole commented that Lambert 'was a great encourager of painting and a good performer in flowers'.¹ More recently, Professor Hutton summarised the man as 'the handsome and flamboyant Lambert, a soldier, aesthete and statesman'.² Whilst there has been limited comment on Lambert's artistic interests, as well as his reading matter, botany, mathematics and role in the establishment of Durham College, no attempt has been made at a coherent and detailed narrative in relation to the extent and nature of his artistic pursuits. In particular, while the evidence for his own practice is reasonably clear, that which suggests that he may have begun the construction of a collection of paintings has, as of yet, not been considered. Having begun to emerge as one of the new ruling elite, it is probable that Lambert sought to take on some of the traditional trappings associated with his elevated status. One of the possible means for him to do so was through the little known minor Dutch artist Jan Baptist Gaspars (c1620-91).

In *The Case of Colonel John Lambert, Prisoner in the Tower of London* of 1661, it was stated that Lambert was 'a lover of Arts and Learning'.³ Lambert's interest in art extended to his own practice. Most notably, Lambert is said to have been well-practised in the art of flower painting, a passion that came from his extensive interest in botany. Satirised after the Restoration as 'The Knight of the Golden Tulip', Lambert had been noted during the 1650s for his gardens at Wimbledon and was active in the trade of importing different varieties of flowers from the continent, even through royalists, as well as getting plants out of the Cambridge Botanical Garden.⁴ Some paintings of Lambert's flowers still exist, hanging in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle. In 1659 Lambert sent Alexander Marshall some of his tulips from Wimbledon House which were then painted in water-colour.⁵ Despite, for example, claims that the portrait of 'Cromwell before Naseby', at Goodwood House, was executed by Lambert, unfortunately no picture that can be definitely attributed to him is now known to exist.⁶

Lambert employed the Dutch artist Jan Baptist Gaspars to tutor him and, no doubt, the rest of his family. This is in part suggested by the activities of Lambert's eldest son who was heavily involved in artistic pursuits, much to the detriment of his estate and his imprisoned father. In the twenty-first year of his imprisonment, following the Restoration of Charles II in 1660,

Lambert had to send one of his sons-in-law, John Blackwell, to ensure his eldest son paid the rents on what remained of his Yorkshire estate. Lambert was so angry at the 'high and riotous way of liveing' of his son that he aimed to turn him out of the lands and secure a good tenant who would provide regular rent to ease his incarceration.⁷ A print of an engraving of Lambert's eldest son still survives. It shows him seated at his easel holding a palette.⁸ It is also possible that portraits by Lambert's son of some of his relations in the Lister family, once in the collection of Lord Ribblesdale, still survive.⁹ This practical interest may have extended to Lambert's son asking one of his artist friends, William Lodge, to engrave the image of James Nayler, his father's old Quaker quarter-master, who in 1656 had been tried by parliament for blasphemy. Given what we know of the high-living son, it is more likely that this engraving was intended for his imprisoned father rather than himself.¹⁰

The employment of Gaspars is testimony not only to Lambert's interest but practical experience of painting. Professor Trevor-Roper commented that

Art has many functions, social as well as individual. It has one function for the artist, another for the patron. To the artist and the aesthete it expresses a Platonic conception of beauty or a personal conviction; to the patron it may represent this, but it also represents other things: propaganda, pride, prestige.¹¹

Lambert was, to a degree, both patron and artist. Given his practical artistic pursuits it is very likely that Lambert also undertook numerous purchases. The conjecture that Lambert purchased paintings is supported by the knowledge that at the Restoration he was noted as owning works of art at his Wimbledon residence. One of the paintings that Lambert owned was described as 'Noah's flood'.¹² That this work was housed at Lambert's main residence during his time of power, Wimbledon House, also suggests, given its scale, the probability of it being part of a wider collection. This, in part, is also reinforced by the portrait of Lambert by Robert Walker. Whilst this work, now housed in the National Portrait Gallery, was a reflection of Lambert's position as the second man in the state behind Cromwell, it was unlikely that it hung at Wimbledon in isolation.

Wimbledon House had been the residence of Queen Henrietta-Maria. Lambert acquired the property on 17 May 1652 for £16,822 17s 8d through his agent Adam Baynes.¹³ Lambert's ownership of Wimbledon was representative of his elevated role in the state. His life-style at Wimbledon was a primary factor in how some contemporaries saw him.¹⁴ The actual scale and luxury of Lambert's purchase is apparent from the parliamentary survey of November 1649:

the lights of this roome render it very pleasant, having three double leaved wyndow doores of waynscot and glass opening to a leaved walke rayled with turned ballasters of free stone, lying over the orange garden, conteyninge 108 foote in length and twelve foote in breadth, in nature of a large balcony...¹⁵

This is further reinforced by the size of its grounds which, given Lambert's interest in gardening, was a further reason for his purchase.¹⁶ Some of Charles I's extensive collection had been housed at Wimbledon. Indeed it has been outlined that 143 pieces of Charles's 'goods' of the value of £1709 19s were held at Wimbledon and Greenwich.¹⁷ The parliamentary survey of 1649 mentions some of the art found at Wimbledon, including a

large picture of Henry the Fourth of France, in armes on horseback...twentie-fower pictures, most of them set in frames, and of excellent workmanship; which are not valeded herein, in regard they were placed by the trustees for the sale of the late king and queene's goodes.¹⁸

Given the nature of Wimbledon House and Lambert's position as the second man in the state, but also particularly given what we know of his genuine interest in the arts, it would only be natural if Lambert began to establish his own collection there.

In 1660 a satire of Lambert envisaged him as he fell from power crying 'Farewell Wimbledon! Farewell my tulips and my pictures there!'¹⁹ One day after the proclamation of the Restoration in May 1660, the House of Lords established a committee to try to find and reclaim as much of the royal collection as possible. Gleissner has argued that 'Without specific knowledge of where to look for the scattered royal collection and what to look for, Committee-ordered searches would have been time-consuming and relatively ineffectual, not to say "invidious"'.²⁰ Having bought the former royal palace of Wimbledon it was natural that Lambert's property would be searched. Clement Kynnersley, one of the committee's investigators, vigorously searched Wimbledon for royal goods.²¹ The report of the Lord's committee makes very clear that Lambert 'hathe divers raere pictures'. It is clear, then, that despite his name not appearing in the list of purchasers at the sale of the royal goods, Lambert did own, by 1660, 'divers raere pictures' from the royal collection.²²

As well as the clear evidence of the Restoration committee, it is the nature of Lambert's relationship with Gaspar, and the artist's career, that hint that some of Lambert's collection came from the sale of the goods of the executed king, Charles I. The Lord's committee also reported that 'One Duts painter that served my Lord Lambert has had divers pictures and sold and stolen

sume'.²³ This 'Duts painter' was, most probably, Gaspar. Although an exact reading of the committee's comments in relation to Gaspar could be read as implying that he did not have any in his possession by 1660, without further evidence we cannot draw any definite conclusions regarding Gaspar's ownership. Gaspar has been noted as a principal purchaser from the sale of the king's paintings. It is not clear when or how Lambert received paintings from Charles's collection but it is possible that Lambert might have received some pictures from Gaspar. Whilst the transfer of paintings from Gaspar to Lambert could have taken place at any point during the 1650s, is it also possible that Gaspar was acting as an agent for Lambert at the sales in 1649 and 1650?

Gaspar was not a major artist. The son of a painter, he was born in Antwerp and studied under Thomas Willeboerts Bossaert, a disciple of Rubens. Gaspar's portrait of Thomas Hobbes, presented to the Royal Society by John Aubrey, is one of only a small number of his works that has survived. After the Restoration he was an assistant to Sir Peter Lely and hence became known as 'Lely's Baptist'. One of his works from this later period, a portrait of Charles II, was at St Bartholomews Hospital, London, and a portrait of Sir Justinian Isham at Lamport Hall.²⁴ Given his limited artistic status, is it possible that the purchases attributed to Gaspar at the sale of the collections of Charles I, or at least some of them, were on Lambert's behalf?

Nuttall and others had no reason to question whether the fifty-five purchases attributed to Gaspar from the sale, amounting to £1,073, were for his own use.²⁵ Yet the evidence of the sales attributing the purchases to Gaspar may not be as straightforward as a simple reading of them might suggest. In fact, Gaspar appears to have purchased fifty-nine items at over £1,100 in cost.²⁶ It appears from the lists of the sales of the crown's goods as if Gaspar bought the works over a period beginning on 31 October 1649 to 14 May 1650.²⁷ Would Gaspar as 'an independent portrait painter of moderate skill' have the necessary funds solely to finance the 'cash' purchase of over £1,100 within a short time of arriving in England?

Gaspar came to England at some point towards the end of the civil wars. It is likely that he would have done so under someone's patronage. The most probable source of his means, according to Millar, was Peter Lely. Millar has argued that Gaspar was 'probably associated with Lely throughout his career in England'. Yet there is no direct contemporary evidence for Gaspar's relationship with Lely until 1660. It is also possible that Lambert, who was already establishing himself firmly among the new political elite, might have been his patron. Even if Gaspar was working for Lely from the late 1640s, it was noted that Lely was receiving in 1647 '£5 for every "ritratto", and £10 down to the knees' and consequently Gaspar would be

earning proportionately less. While in the early Stuart age some fashionable Italian artists could receive as much as £200 a year, it has been noted in comparison that Inigo Jones was only paid £50 a year.²⁸ In comparison to Gaspars's surface purchases, Lely only appears to have bought a few according to Nuttall, unidentifiable pictures from Charles's collection. However, as the work of Dethloff has shown, at the Restoration Lely was noted as having eight paintings from Charles's collection including Van Dyck's 'Cupid and Psyche' which Lely had 'bought of several persons', although these could have been later purchases.²⁹ Lely was later able to construct his own collection because he came from a wealthy family in The Hague, received an annual salary from the crown of £200 and had an income from property investment. Despite these sources, his own collection put Lely heavily in to debt.³⁰ Yet despite his status Gaspars is listed as one of the most extensive purchasers from Charles's collection. Gaspars as a minor artist appears to have been unlikely to have had such personal funds for a purchase of over £1000. The other figures known to be 'cash purchasers' at the sale of Charles's collection appear to be much more substantial figures from the merchant community, army and royal service.³¹

In comparison to Gaspars's probable economic standing in the period concerned, Lambert had the funds, as well as the inclination, for extensive purchases from the crown's goods. His activity in the market of crown lands also shows he had no ideological opposition to benefiting from those he had defeated on the battlefield.³² By October 1649, when the sales started, Lambert had, through his military career, improved his overall economic position from the approximately £300 per annum that his estates had been worth in 1642. By 1646 Lambert was, according to Bulstrode Whitelocke, one of the 'great commanders' and as such had become more financially secure.³³ For example, although army pay fell into arrears, officers such as Lambert benefited from the debenture system and grants to address the shortfalls. In October 1646 Lambert was ordered £2000 out of delinquent estates.³⁴ In August 1649 there were reports of £500 per annum being settled on Lambert.³⁵ Given their relative standing, is it possible that Gaspars acted as Lambert's agent at the sale?

There was nothing unusual about an artist or other person acting as an agent at a sale. For example, Edward Baker represented Elizabeth Cromwell at the royal sale.³⁶ At the sale of Lely's collection, the Elector of Brandenburg was represented by his artist. Indeed, Lely's sale saw artists forming a syndicate to purchase work or having to be supported by wealthy guarantors.³⁷ In part, an artist might have been given some freedom of choice in terms of the purchases through their skills but also the presence of an agent rather than the individual for whom the works were destined was less likely to inflate the prices. Furthermore given Lambert's military and political concerns during the period of the sales, 1649-51, he was rarely in

London to attend the sales himself and would thus be likely to have had to rely on an agent.³⁸

Those paintings listed in the sale purchased by Gaspars included Van Dyck's portrait of his mistress Margaret Lemon (bought for £23), Rubens's 'Diana and Acteon' (£31), Titian's 'Mary Magdalene' (£25 8s), Vecchio's 'Virgin and Child with SS Catherine and John Baptist' (£225), Schiavone's 'Mary and Christ' (£5), Reni's 'Mary Magdalene' (£17 10s), Cambiaso's 'Magdalene' (£5 10s), Annibale Carracci's 'Venus' (£6 5s), Guercino's 'The Prophet Elias' (£2 10s), a Caravaggio (£7 10s) and Mantegna's 'Death of Mary' (£17 10s) and 'Mary and diverse Saints' (£17).³⁹

One of the other works purchased by Gaspars, Van Dyck's 'Count van den Bergh', can be closely linked to Lambert. It may have been in Lambert's possession for Robert Walker's portrait of Lambert was based on this work. The purchase of the portrait of Count Henry de Berg might even have been passed as a gift to his early commander Sir Thomas Fairfax. Fairfax had a collection of 150 heads of soldiers and Fairfax had been present in May 1630 at the siege of Bois-le Duc when de Berg had attempted to raise the siege.⁴⁰ Robert Walker also painted Fairfax.

The evidence for the way Lambert formed his collection does not allow any detailed analysis of its exact content because the evidence regarding Gaspars's role at the sales is far from definite and although Lambert clearly did receive works from Charles's collection, we can not be exact as to which paintings came into his hands. However, it appears very likely that Lambert did construct a collection to be housed at Wimbledon. Furthermore, given his association with Gaspars, even if the artist did not act on Lambert's behalf at the sales, he had, no doubt, some input into the formation of Lambert's collection. Even if Gaspars did not act as Lambert's agent at the sales, he remains the most obvious source for the former royal paintings that had come into Lambert's possession sometime before 1660. As with many other early modern collections, changed political circumstances saw its dispersal. Despite his escape from the Tower of London in 1660 and final attempt to prevent the Restoration, Lambert was to spend his last twenty-four years in prison. From the activities of the Lords committee directed to restore the royal collection following the Restoration it is clear that whatever pictures Lambert had purchased from the sale of Charles I's paintings, or later, were reclaimed by Charles II. The fate of whatever else Lambert may have held can only be the subject of further conjecture.

Whilst both Lambert and Gaspars were investigated at the Restoration for any royal goods they might hold, their fortunes in the period were

contrasting. Whilst he lost most of his wealth and property at the Restoration, Lambert was fortunate to escape execution after being brought to trial in 1662. Having been first imprisoned on Guernsey, Lambert was transferred to St Nicholas Island, off Plymouth, in 1670. It was here, far from the splendour of his life at Wimbledon House in the 1650s, that he died in 1684.

In comparison, Gaspar's career prospered. In part he seems to have benefited from his connection with Lambert for he appears, at some point, to have entered the employ of Christopher, First Viscount Hatton. In September 1676 Hatton informed his brother that

Your pictures will be all finished ye next week. The Queen's, Prince's, and Ld Dorset's are ready. I dare not hazard them in my little house, least ye sea coale smoke this winter shou'd spoyle them. Had ye Queen's picture hung a little longer at Thanet House, it wou'd have been quite spoyled, for ye cloth wase primed wth tobacco pipe clay, and it wou'd have pilled all of. As soon as the dirt wase wash'd of, ye cracks appeared. But Mr. Baptist engages he hath secured it for ever. He highly admires my Ld Dorset's picture, sath it is every stroake of Van Dyke and of his best painting; and ye priming of ye cloath is very good. Van Dyke was vey neglectfull in ye priming of ye cloths he painted on.⁴¹

Despite being Lambert's prison governor on Guernsey, Lambert appears to have a good relationship with this Hatton's father, Christopher, First Baron Hatton, based on their pre-Restoration correspondence centred on both men's love of botany. The relationship was extended by the marriage of one of Lambert's daughters, Mary, to Hatton's younger son, Charles, brother of the First Viscount, despite the circumstances of Lambert's imprisonment under Hatton's governorship. It is possible that Lambert was Gaspar's route into the employ of the Hattons.

The height of Gaspar's career, however, was his employment in the studios of Sirs Peter Lely and Godfrey Kneller. At the death of Lely in 1680 Gaspar was one who was employed to make an inventory of his extensive collection, said to be worth £10,000, in preparation for its sale to meet Lely's debts and fulfil the terms of his will. For this Gaspar was paid £2 3s. Interestingly, Gaspar purchased one work from Lely's sale 'The Cupid of Fiamengo' priced at £145.⁴² A portrait said to be Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, by Gaspar from 1690 at Blickling Hall, Norfolk, may also be a reminder of his earlier association with Lambert. Lambert's grandson Sir Blackwell Lambert became based at nearby Sprowston Hall and might be the source of the portrait's appearance at Blickling.⁴³ Similarly two other portraits at Blickling

of unknown men in the manner of Sir Peter Lely could be the work of Gaspar.⁴⁴ When he died in 1691 Gaspar was buried in St James's.

Whilst the turmoil of mid-seventeenth century Britain was perhaps more pronounced and widely felt than any other period in the island's history, war and political breakdown have always been catalysts for the formation but also the break-up of new collections. Whatever the nature of Lambert's collection, his career in the 1650s appears to provide another example of this process of formation and dispersal. Lambert's political failure following Cromwell's death ended his role as a collector but also the career of someone who, given his artistic interests, could have left a much more profound influence on the cultural development of the country.

Notes.

1. J Dallaway, *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (5 vols, London, 1826-8), II, 362.
2. R Hutton, *The British Republic, 1649-60* (London, 1990), pp. 122-3.
3. *The Case of Colonel John Lambert, Prisoner in the Tower of London* (1661), p. 4.
4. British Library, E1048 (6), *Don Juan Lamberto, or a Comical History of the Late Times* (1660); British Library, Additional Ms 21426, f. 273 and Additional Ms 29569, f. 212; *The Garden Book of Sir Thomas Hanmer* (1659), ix; R Coke, *A Detection of the Court and State of England during the Four Last Reigns, and the Interregnum* (2 vols, London, 1694), II, 76; C Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-60* (London, 1975), p. 152.
5. W Blunt, *The Art of Botanical Illustration* (London, 1950), pp. 126 and the drawing of the 'Guernsey Lily' on p. 103.
6. W H Mason, *Goodwood House* (London, 1839), p. 107; *Notes & Queries*, 2nd series, 73, pp. 410-11.
7. For an examination of Lambert's imprisonment and its consequences, see D Farr, 'New information with regard to the imprisonment of Major-General John Lambert, 1662-84', *Cromwelliana* (1998); 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* (1999).
8. British Library, *Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits*, p. 8.
9. E Hailstone (ed), *Portraits of Yorkshire Worthies, Selected from the National Exhibition of Works of Art in Leeds* (2 vols, London, 1869). For the importance of the bond between the Lambert and Lister families, see D Farr, 'The shaping of John Lambert's allegiance and the outbreak of the civil war', *Northern History* 36 (2000) and D Farr, 'The education of Major-General John Lambert', *Cromwelliana* (2000).
10. H M Hake, 'Some contemporary records relating to Francis Place, engraver and draughtsman, with a catalogue of his signed work', *Walpole Society* X (1921-2), pp. 58, 64; J Chaloner Smith, *British Mezzotint Portraits* (6 vols, London, 1880), III, 1003. For a consideration of Lambert's relationship with Nayler and the Quakers generally, see D Farr, 'The Quakers and the religious identity of Major-General John Lambert', *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, forthcoming (2002).

11. H R Trevor-Roper, *The Plunder of the Arts in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1970), p. 7.
12. The description in the record does not enable us to detail exactly what this work was. The subject was one depicted quite frequently in the early modern period; for example, the versions by the Dutch and Flemish artists, Bloemart, Bols, Pourbus, Valckenborch and Wierix. See A M Hind (ed), *Catalogue of Drawings by Dutch and Flemish Artists Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum* (5 vols, London, 1926).
13. Public Record Office, C54/3677/29.
14. D Farr, 'Kin, cash, cavaliers and Catholics: the financial management of John Lambert', *Historical Research* 74 (2001).
15. Public Record Office, E317, no. 72. Printed in *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 5 (1871), pp. 399-448.
16. British Library, Additional Ms 21427, ff. 105-6. Their size can be judged from this document which is a survey of just the fruit trees at Wimbledon.
17. F Portier, 'Prices paid for Italian pictures in the Stuart age', *Journal of the History of Collections* 8 (1996), p. 61.
18. Public Record Office, E317, no. 72.
19. *Don Juan Lamberto*, no pagination.
20. S Gleissner, 'Reassembling a royal art collection for the restored king of Great Britain', *Journal of the History of Collections* 6 (1994), p. 104.
21. Public Record Office, SP 29/23; *Calendar of State Papers Charles II, 1660-61*, pp. 407, 422.
22. *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Seventh Report* (Nendeln, 1979), p. 89.
23. *Ibid.*
24. N H Robinson & E G Forbes, *The Royal Society Catalogue of Portraits* (London, 1980), pp. 166-7; C H Collins Baker, *Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters. A Study of English Portraiture Before and After Van Dyke* (London, 1912), pp. 141, 198, appendix II of obscure Stuart painters; E Waterhouse, *The Dictionary of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century British Painters* (Woodbridge, 1998), p. 98.
25. W L F Nuttall, 'King Charles I's pictures and the Commonwealth sale', *Apollo* 82 (1965), pp. 305-6.
26. O Millar, 'The inventories and valuations of the king's goods, 1649-51', *Walpole Society* 43 (1972).
27. Bodleian Library, Rawlinson Ms D 695.
28. Portier, 'Italian pictures', p. 65.
29. Nuttall, 'King Charles I's pictures', p. 306; D Dethloff, 'The executors' account book and the disposal of Sir Peter Lely's collection', *Journal of the History of Collections* 8 (1996), p. 24.
30. Dethloff, 'Lely's collection', p. 24.
31. Nuttall, 'King Charles I's pictures', p. 306.
32. Farr, 'Kin, cash, cavaliers and Catholics'.
33. B Whitelocke, *Memorials of English Affairs* (4 vols, Oxford, 1853), II, 204.
34. British Library, E513 (16), *A Perfect Diurnall*, 2-9 October 1646; *Commons Journal*, IV, 683; British Library, Additional Ms 10114, f. 20.
35. British Library, E571 (17), *The Moderate Intelligencer*, 16-23 August 1649, p. 2216; E571 (27), *Mercurius Elencticus*, 20-27 August 1649, p. 141.
36. Nuttall, 'King Charles I's pictures', p. 305.
37. Dethloff, 'Lely's collection', pp. 18-19.

38. D Farr, 'The Military and Political Career of John Lambert, 1619-57' (Cambridge University PhD, 1996), pp. 75, 257, 260.
39. For a reconstruction of paintings passing to Gaspar and possibly Lambert, see O Millar, 'The inventories and valuations'; C Phillips, *The Picture Gallery of Charles I* (London, 1896); Gleissner, 'Reassembling a royal art collection', pp. 103-15; E C Law, *A Historical Catalogue of the Pictures in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court* (London, 1881); O Millar, *The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (2 vols, London, 1963); O Millar, *The Queen's Pictures* (London, 1984). Other paintings listed included more works by Titian, Stalbeempr, Steenwyck, Veronese, Elsheimer, Breenbergh and il Vecchio. There are also numerous works difficult to identify from the contemporary sale descriptions. Of the 43 identifiable pictures, by subject, of the 55 paintings, 17 can be classed as religious paintings, 9 landscapes, 8 mythological and the rest fairly miscellaneous.
40. For notice of Fairfax's collection, see P C D Brears, 'Ralph Thoresby, a museum visitor in Stuart England', *Journal of the History of Collections* 1 (1989), pp. 213-24.
41. E M Thompson (ed), *Correspondence of the family of Hatton* (2 vols, Camden Society, 1878), I, 139-40.
42. Dethloff, 'Lely's collection', pp. 17, 37.
43. W L F Nuttall, 'Governor John Blackwell: his life in England and Ireland', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 88 (1964), p. 141.
44. *Blickling Hall* (National Trust, 1987), pp. 82, 85-6.

Dr David Farr is Head of History at Norwich School. Since completing his doctoral study on the military and political career of Lambert in 1996, he has published extensively on aspects of Lambert's life and career.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES V CROMWELL THE MENTOR

by Jane A Mills

Cromwell throughout his life showed concern for humanity and, possibly because he had times when he suffered turmoil, he felt a real need to help and advise other people. There was also a feeling of duty, of making sure the best person carried out a role. Cromwell when considering the right person for an assignment did not always automatically chose loyal parliamentarians, and even applicants with royalist leanings were given serious attention - as in the case of Dr John Wilson a fervent royalist who was appointed Professor of Music. After all Cromwell believed that 'the State, in choosing men to serve it, takes no notice of their opinions; if they be willing faithfully to serve it, that suffices.'¹ Candidates once appointed could still count on being answerable to the Lord Protector and would also receive a certain amount of guidance in order to carry out the job to the best of their ability.

The best illustration of Cromwell the Mentor can be seen in his approach to two very different men. The first, Bulstrode Whitelocke, was a political colleague who came to oppose Cromwell and denounced him at the dissolution of the Long Parliament. As a practising lawyer, he was unable to sit in the Nominated Assembly, but was seen to be an ideal candidate as an envoy to Sweden in 1653 and to conduct delicate negotiations - even though Whitelocke himself felt it was a means to get him out of the way.

The first letter is dated September 1653 and was written by Cromwell in his own hand after the two previous attempts by Sir Gilbert Pickering and Cromwell's secretary were unsatisfactory. Cromwell tried to flatter the man as they had had trouble filling the post.

To the Right Honourable the Lord Whitlocke, one of the Commissioners of the Seal: These

My Lord,

The Council of State having thought of putting your Lordship to the trouble of being Extraordinary Ambassador to the Queen of Swedeland, did think fit not to impose that service upon you without first knowing your own freedom thereunto. Wherefore they were pleased to command our services in making this address to your Lordship; and hereby we can assure you of a very large confidence in your honour and abilities for the employment. To which we begging your answer, do rest,

My Lord,
Your humble servants,
O. Cromwell
Gil. Pickering

Whitehall, 2nd September, 1653. ²

Whitelocke was unwilling to accept the job, especially when to be a diplomat for the parliamentary government meant in some cases becoming a target for assassination.

Cromwell's wish was to create a secure, religious and commercially viable nation. This was achieved by forming trading alliances with other Protestant nations against the Catholic enemy. The obvious exception was Catholic France who was better as an ally than an enemy. An alliance with the French would help in the battle with Spain, steer them away from supporting the Stuarts and in the long term protect French Protestants.

Cromwell had to be very careful in his diplomacy with Sweden. The country was Protestant, so ideal, but he did not want to be drawn into the Swedish-Danish dispute. He needed Swedish friendship but only so far as it would help with trading links to the Baltic region. A diplomatic mission would have to be careful and the envoy would need special qualities.

Cromwell needed to convince Whitelocke that he should undertake the job. They met on 5 and 13 September 1653 for discussions.

And the buisnes is of exceeding great importance to the common-wealth, as any can be; that it is: and there is no prince or state in Christendome, with whom there is any probability for us to have a friendship, butt only the queen of Sweden.³

Whitelocke felt himself 'altogither unfitt for this very weighty and high employment', and he was concerned that it would 'suffer under so weake a management as by my hand',⁴ an opinion Cromwell did not share:

I doe earnestly desire you to undertake it, wherein you will doe an act of great merit, and advantage to the common-wealth, as great as any one member of it can performe;⁵

During the second meeting Whitelocke continued to be hesitant about taking the employment and Cromwell this time introduced the element of duty owed to the commonwealth, God and himself. Whitelocke soon realised that if he did not accept this he would fall into disfavour.

...I am not self-willed, and how much I value your excellence's commands, and can submit my own to better judgements, I am resolved to lay aside further considerations of wife, children, friends, fortune, and all objections and feare of daungers, and to conforme myselfe to your excellence's desires,...and doe rest confident of your excellence's care and favour towards me, who undertake it by your command.⁶

Cromwell wrote this next letter for the Queen in a commanding tone, instructing her that they had been directed by God to send Whitelocke and therefore she should be available for talks at Whitelocke's convenience. The instructions to Whitelocke were firm - that he was to make sure of a successful outcome, though Cromwell would maintain control.

To Queen Christina

Oliver, Lord Protector of the Republic of England, Scotland and Ireland, and their Dominions,

To the most serene and powerful Princess and Lady, Lady Christina, by the grace of God Queen of the Swedes, Goths and Vandals, Great Princess of Finland, Duchess of Esthonia, greeting and the prosperous issue of events.

MOST SERENE AND POWERFUL QUEEN,

When in accordance with His inscrutable wisdom it pleased God, who directs and governs all things by His will, to change the form of government and supreme power in these nations, in consequence of this the most noble Bulstrode Whitelocke, Constable of Windsor Castle, and one of the Keepers of the Great Seal of England, departed from here, especially sent as Ambassador Extraordinary by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England to Your Majesty, to consult with you concerning those things which are of future advantage to both peoples. Therefore we considered it necessary to give Your Majesty absolute assurance that nothing on account of this present change of circumstances will diminish the sincere good-will and friendship of this Commonwealth towards Your Majesty or your dominions. In truth, just as in the exercise of that authority which has been intrusted to us by God and the people, we have considered ourselves bound to cultivate a good understanding with neighbors, so we consider ourselves bound to do the same first and above all with the Crown of Sweden, between which and these nations a close treaty and firm friendship have existed for a century. And so we have therefore given these mandates to the said Lord Whitelocke which may attest a similar good disposition; we ask that, as often as he should require it, you kindly grant him a friendly

audience and have undoubting confidence in the things which he is about to propose for our part. Likewise we heartily commend Your Majesty and your affairs to the divine will of the Highest Ruler. Given from Whitehall, 23 December (old style), 1653.

Your good friend,

OLIVER P.

Diploma of instructions given to Bulstrode Whitelocke, Constable of Windsor Castle, one of the Keepers of the Great Seal of England, Ambassador Extraordinary from the English Commonwealth to the Queen of Sweden.

Seeing that you have recently been sent under the title of Ambassador Extraordinary by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England to Her Majesty the Queen of Sweden, to renew and contract a treaty and alliance with the said Queen and Kingdom according to the commission and instructions accepted by you from the said Parliament and from the Council of State of that time; and seeing that after your departure hence the said Parliament of that time was dissolved and the Protectorate was founded and established for the reason of which you have been informed by the letter of Lord Thurloe, Secretary of the Council, who in the Council accepted the mandate to explain to you the course of the whole affair; now, lest perchance the matter committed to you, which is as sincerely desired from our side as it is necessary for both nations, should be broken off or delayed because of changed circumstances and because of questions probably arising therefrom concerning the validity of your commission and instructions, it seemed expedient to the Council summoned in this to write a new letter of credentials, a copy of which you are receiving herewith, to Her Majesty, which letter you shall deliver to the Queen. And by virtue of these presents you shall inform Her Majesty that the change of government here has altered none of our good intentions towards Her Majesty and her Dominions, that the same inclination to any good understanding and mutual agreement with the Queen and Kingdom will be found in us just as what was promised formerly under the rulers of these Nations should be kept as well as increased. Finally, you are instructed by the authority of these presents to proceed with the negotiation undertaken, and to endeavor to bring the treaty with her Majesty to a good result, in accordance with the tenor and sense of the power of commission and of the instructions already accepted by you; these things I shall later ratify and sanction just as the nature of the affair may demand.

Before your lordship deliver these letters credential to the Queen, or make any addresses to her, you are to inform yourself fully of the reception you are like to have, and whether her intentions be to come to a treaty of amity with this state, as the government is now established; that no dishonor may befall us, or these dominions, in your addresses upon these letters and instructions.

Given at Whitehall this 23 of December, 1653.

OLIVER P.⁷

Cromwell continued to coach Whitelocke in his negotiations with the Queen; the mission proved to be successful and on his return Cromwell publicly thanked him.

The second man was Cromwell's fourth son Henry, a fine soldier, who was appointed commander-in-chief in Ireland in 1655 and went on to be Lord Deputy in 1657. He proved himself to be a very able administrator without having to resort to violence, but at the outset he was in a very difficult position and needed reassurance from his father.

The letter to Henry of November 1655 was written at a time when Cromwell was experiencing his own difficulties steering the country in a Godly fashion through the Major-Generals. Cromwell was aware of the burden of leadership and was trying to guide his son through the difficult times. A good leader has to do what is best for the country; though he must be aware of the views of the people, he cannot be solely guided by them. The difference between the Stuart monarchs and Cromwell was that they believed they were put there by God and therefore could do no wrong, whereas Cromwell believed he was elected by God and therefore he feared doing wrong. In this letter he tries to reassure his son that he should be patient and time will prove him right and that help will be forth coming.

For my Son Henry Cromwell, at Dublin Ireland

Son,

I have seen your letter writ unto Mr Secretary Thurloe, and do find thereby that you are very apprehensive of the carriage of some persons with you, towards yourself and the public affairs.

I do believe there may be some particular persons who are not very well pleased with the present condition of things, and may be apt to show their discontents as they have opportunity: but this should not make too great impressions in you. Time and patience may work them to a better

frame of spirit, and bring them to see that which, for the present, seems to be hid from them; especially if they shall see your moderation and love towards them, whilst they are found in other ways towards you, which I earnestly desire you to study and endeavour, all that lies in you. Whereof both you and I too shall have the comfort, whatsoever the issue and event thereof be.

For what you write of more help, I have long endeavoured it, and shall not be wanting to send you some farther addition to the Council, as soon as men can be found out who are fit for that trust. I am also thinking of sending over to you a fit person who may command the North of Ireland; which I believe stands in great need of one; and I am of your opinion that Trevor, Ards, Audley, Mervin, &c. are very dangerous persons, and may be made the heads of a new rebellion. And therefore I would have you move the Council that they be secured in some very safe place, and the farther out of their own countries the better.

I commend you to the Lord; and rest;

Your affectionate father

Oliver P.

Whitehall 21st Nov, 1655.⁸

This second letter was written in 1656 and encourages Henry to fight like with like. The trouble Henry is experiencing with the Anabaptists will be overcome if he trusts in God. God had been Cromwell's Mentor since his religious conversion in the 1630s.

For my Son Harry Cromwell

Harry,

I have received your letters, and have also seen some from you to others, and am sufficiently satisfied of your burden, and that if the Lord be not with you, to enable you to bear it, you are in a very sad condition.

I am glad to hear what I have heard of your carriage; study still to be innocent, and to answer every occasion, roll yourself upon God, which to do needs much grace. Cry to the Lord to give you a plain single heart. Take heed of being over-jealous, lest your apprehensions of others cause you to offend. Know that uprightness will preserve you; in this be confident against men.

I think the Anabaptists are to blame in not being pleased with you. That's their fault. It will not reach you, whilst you with singleness of heart make the glory of the Lord your aim. Take heed of professing religion without the power: that will teach you to love all who are after the similitude of Christ. Take care of making it a business to be too hard for the men who contest with you. Being over-concerned may train you into a snare. I have to do with those poor men, and am not without my exercise. I know they are weak, because they are so peremptory in judging others. I quarrel not with them but in their seeking to supplant others, which is done by some, first by branding them with antichristianism, and then taking away their maintenance.

Be not troubled with the late business: we understand the men. Do not fear the sending of any over to you but such as will be considering men, loving all godly interests, and men 'that' will be friends to justice. Lastly, take heed of studying to lay for yourself the foundation of a great estate. It will be a snare to you: they will watch you; bad men will be confirmed in convetousness. The thing is an evil which God abhors. I pray you think of me in this.

If the Lord did not sustain me, I were undone: but I live, and I shall live, to the good pleasure of His grace; I find mercy at need. The God of all grace keep you. I rest,

Your loving father,

OLIVER P.

Whitehall
21st April, 1656.⁹

In June Henry asked to be sent home. Cromwell's reply was a refusal, but also reassuring him of his affection and enjoining him to stand firm. His tone in writing to his son was always encouraging; he worked at strengthening his confidence and character. When writing to him, he was fatherly but respectful of his position. This can be seen in the next letter, written in 1656/7, concerning colonel Simon Rugely who had loyally served the Commonwealth to the point of ruin. Cromwell was recommending him for work and land in Ireland.

For my son, Harry Cromwell, in Ireland

Son Harry,

Colonel Symon Rugely, the bearer hereof, having been very active in the cause of this Commonwealth, to the near ruin of his estates as we are informed, and being not so happy as to get the same repaired by satisfaction of a very considerable debt owing him by the State for his personal services and disbursements, though the same hath been much endeavoured by him, and something determined in order thereunto by us and our Council; we do therefore recommend him to your knowledge and kindness (as a very deserving gentleman), for some employment in Ireland, which his former services and education (as we are also informed) do well qualify him for, whether in a military or civil way; and if it shall not be speedily in your power so to dispose of him, yet to procure him a lease of some convenient lands in Ireland, whereon he may be encouraged to sit down with his family, his condition not admitting of his long attendance without being put into a way of action. On which latter if you shall at present resolve, yet let it be no prejudice to him as to the other proposal for an employment, so soon as a vacancy shall give you the advantage. I pray be specially careful of him as to one to whom a very good respect is borne by.

Your affectionate father,

Oliver P.

Whitehall
Feb. 10, 1656/7¹⁰

A letter written in late 1657 has a different tone. Instead of the usual to 'my Son' it is more business like; he now demands whereas before he requested. Cromwell holds himself slightly distant in order to reprimand.

For the Lord Henry Cromwell at Dublin: These

Harry Cromwell,

I have seriously thought of your letter, and thank you for your care expressed in the business which I imparted to you under the caution of secrecy, of which I suppose you will hear more hereafter.

I am sorry you wrote me some sad apprehensions of some enemies of yours to be about me; truly none dare appear so, and I am persuaded if you think your B. Fleetwood to be so, you are mistaken. It were dangerous for you to think so and he not be so, and safer for you to be mistaken, for indeed none (I hope) can wrong you with me, and though all things answer not, be you humble, and patient, place value where it

truly lies, viz., in the favour of God, in knowing Him, or rather in being known of Him. If your heart be truly here, you cannot miscarry.

I am sorry you gave me not one word about Lieutenant-Colonel Brafild's business. I did see my Lord Broghill's account thereof. It was as fair as I believe the business would bear, but yet, though he solicited a trial he should not have had it. I would not have put him upon men, or I would have after restored him. I would not believe 2 carnal men against one such protesting innocency, it being in a case concerning myself, where it is in my power to pardon without injustice.

I am afraid you have erred in this. If you can, I pray you give a remedy for my sake, and let the poor man be handsomely restored.

My love to your wife and children. I rest,

Your loving Father,

Oliver P.

October the 13th, 1657.¹¹

Notes.

1. P A Scholes, *The Puritans and Music in England and New England* (London, 1934), p. 141.
2. All the remaining quotations are taken from the texts in W C Abbott, *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (4 vols, Cambridge, Mass, 1937-47), reissued by Oxford UP in 1988. Abbott, *Writings and Speeches*, III, 97.
3. *Ibid*, III, 98.
4. *Ibid*, III, 99.
5. *Ibid*.
6. *Ibid*, III, 101.
7. *Ibid*, III, 150-1
8. *Ibid*, IV, 26-7.
9. *Ibid*, IV, 146.
10. *Ibid*, IV, 404.
11. *Ibid*, IV, 646-7.

Jane A. Mills, MInstLM, is a regular contributor to *Cromwelliana*. In January of this year she was elected to the membership of the Royal Historical Society.

CROMWELLIAN BRITAIN XV BRIDGWATER, SOMERSET

by Jane A Mills

The town of Bridgwater, part of the North Petherton Hundred, is situated in the county of Somerset and located on the river Parrett; to the west are the Quantock Hills and to the east the Polden Hills. It is 18km by water from Bridgwater Bay. The ancient parish included seven small settlements and covered an area of 4.5km north to south and 6km west to east. In the Domesday Book the town is listed as a small settlement called 'Brugie'. This name derived from the Old Norse 'bryggja' meaning quay or jetty and the Old English 'brycg' which means gang plank between a ship and the shore; this proves that the area had been used as a landing place for a long time.

The area around Bridgwater has been the source for many archaeological finds dating from Old Stone Age, Iron Age and Saxon periods. The Blake Museum has a fine selection of examples covering these periods and also Roman artefacts such as surveying and military equipment. There were Roman camps in the region and the River Parrett was ideal for access to Somerset and the sea for trading.

In 1199 William Brewer had been granted the Bridgwater manor as part of an exchange, and this was then confirmed by the crown. His close friend, King John, granted him the town's charter, and he then fortified the town with a castle and built a bridge across the river so ships would dock. The inhabitants soon developed the town into a river port and commercial centre. A borough was created around the castle and by the fourteenth century Bridgwater had become an important market town and went on to be a busy port for the local woollen industry, exporting to Ireland and importing cattle. Because of its proximity to the Bristol Channel via Bridgwater Bay, it was able to take advantage of the coastal route to Bristol and the river Avon. The medieval buildings of Bridgwater have been replaced by mostly Georgian ones, but the town's redevelopment sites are a rich source of medieval artefacts.

Over the years the town and surrounding area has been home to brick and tile manufacturing using local clay, glass making and the famous Bridgwater pottery. Also the town was an important shipping centre - it had a very busy port and hosted many related industries such as shipbuilding, rope and sail making.

In August 1599 admiral Robert Blake was born in Bridgwater to a successful merchant family. His grandfather owned several ships and was

elected mayor of the town three times. Blake attended Oxford University and went on to be elected to the Short Parliament in 1640. With the outbreak of the civil war he joined the parliamentary side, fought in Sir John Horner's regiment and became a captain in Popham's regiment. He soon gained a reputation for his courage and expertise during sieges. At Bristol in July 1643 he had the gall to carry on fighting a further twenty-four hours after the parliamentary governor, colonel Fiennes, had surrendered the city; this so infuriated Prince Rupert that he nearly hanged him. This brought him to the attention of the parliamentary leaders who appointed him to the Somerset committee and as lieutenant-colonel in Popham's regiment.

Blake tried to mount a surprise attack on Bridgwater castle but failed. He went on to Lyme in Dorset and successfully held this small fishing village with only 500 men against a superior royalist force of 5,000 led by Prince Maurice. Blake's garrison managed to survive the assaults until they were relieved by Warwick from the sea on 23 May 1644. This had helped the parliamentary cause and allowed Essex time to enter the region.

In June 1643 half of the parliamentary garrison, forced to leave Taunton by the advancing 6,000-strong royalist army led by Hopton, stayed briefly in Bridgwater but they had to retreat again as the Marquis of Hertford advanced. Blake with his own regiment successfully re-took Taunton in July 1644, was made governor and together with 1,000 men withstood three sieges. Colonel Edmund Wyndham, governor of Bridgwater, and 3,000 troops led the first unsuccessful siege from October until December 1644. Blake then organised raids on the royalist garrison at Bridgwater and other royalist sites until the second unsuccessful siege, when Sir John Berkley and Sir Richard Grenville led a fierce attack in April 1645. The final siege was led by Lord Goring in June 1645, but was relieved by Fairfax. In November 1645 he besieged Dunster castle, the last royalist stronghold in Somerset, which surrendered in April 1646.

His reward was to be appointed as one of the generals-at-sea in command of the parliamentary navy in February 1649. He proved to be victorious over the royalist navy under the command of Prince Rupert and by November 1650 it was destroyed. By May 1651 he had captured the royalist Scilly Isles. All this gained him a place in the Council of State. During the Dutch War he commanded the fleet in the English Channel, winning three of the four major engagements against the Dutch admiral, Maarten Tromp, over the period May 1652 to June 1653. His next project was to take on the Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean; their fleet was destroyed at Porto Farina, on the Gulf of Tunis, in April 1655. He went on to destroy the Spanish treasure fleet in the Canary Islands, which was situated in the bay of Santa Cruz de Tenerife. He did not lose a single ship during the attack

on the fleet and coastal defences. But sadly he had to leave due to ill health and he died an hour before the victorious fleet entered Plymouth Sound. During his naval career he had introduced the 'Articles of War' and developed fighting instructions to improve operations; these have proved to be an important legacy.

During the 1630s the clergy of Somerset were opposed to the Laudian ideas. Bridgwater was a puritan parish and unfortunately the Laudian bishop, William Piers, suspended the rector John Devenish's lectureship. Robert Blake's brother Humphrey, who was the churchwarden, was ordered to do penance as he had failed to inform on Devenish.

The commissioners of the newly formed Western Association held a meeting in Bridgwater from 23 to 30 April 1645; the Prince of Wales, as general of the Association, attended with his council and it was at this meeting that it was decided to raise an army of 8,000 in June from the counties of Somerset, Dorset, Devon and Cornwall. It was also used as a kind of tribunal to investigate the conduct of Sir Richard Grenville, who had been requesting money for an army three times its actual size.

In June 1645 Cromwell played a major part in the decisive victory at the battle of Naseby; it put a large dent in Charles's forces but he still had Goring's army of 7,000 in the south-west. Now the attention was drawn towards the west-country and Bridgwater was to enter the fray. Fairfax decided to help Blake, who was under siege in Taunton. He destroyed the bridges on the river Yeo between Langport and Yeovil, and forced Goring back to the river. On 7 July the parliamentary infantry pushed Goring to Langport.

Two days later Goring's answer was to divide his army and send a large force of cavalry towards Taunton. He was probably hoping that this would persuade Fairfax to divide his force. Fairfax sent Massey with 3,600 men after them and moved the rest of army to Long Sutton; he then sent a further 2,000 men to help Massey. Massey surprised the cavalry, capturing some royalist prisoners, and the rest fled back to Langport.

The following account is in Cromwell's own words:

In the morning, word was brought us, That the Enemy drew out. He did so, with a resolution to send most of his cannon and baggage to Bridgewater, which he effected, but with a resolution not to fight, but, trusting to his ground, thinking he could make away at pleasure.

The pass was strait between him and us; he brought two cannons to secure his, and laid his Musketeers strongly in the hedges. We beat-off his cannon, fell down upon his Musketeers, beat them off from their strength, and, where our Horse could scarcely pass two abreast, I commanded Major Bethel to charge them with two Troops of about one-hundred-and-twenty Horse. Which he performed with the greatest gallantry imaginable;- beat back two bodies of the Enemy's Horse, being Goring's own Brigade; brake them at sword's-point. The Enemy charged him with near 400 fresh Horse; set them all going, - until, oppressed with multitudes, he brake through them, with the loss not of above three or four men. Major Desborow seconded him, with some other of those Troops, which were about three. Bethel faced about; and they both routed, at sword's-point, a great body of the Enemy's Horse. Which gave such an unexpected terror to the Enemy's Army, that it set them all a-running. Our Foot, in the mean time, coming on bravely, and beating the Enemy from their strength, we presently had the chase to Langport and Bridgewater. We took and killed about 2,000,- brake all his Foot. We have taken very many Horses, and considerable Prisoners. What are slain we know not. We have the Lieutenant-General of the Ordinance; Colonel Preston, Colonel Heveningham, Colonel Slingsby, we know of, besides very many other officers of quality.¹

Richard Symonds, who was a member of the king's lifeguard and an avid note-taker, gave a far less exciting account:

About Thursday, July 10, Sir Thomas Fairfax and Lord Goring had a touch about Ilchester com. Somerset; lost two great guns and not 200 men. Goring putt his ordinance into Bridgewater, and his carriages, and _____ hundred foot; himself and the rest retreated to Tiverton com. Devon.²

Fairfax was very pleased with the victory; they had captured 2,000 prisoners, (800 changed over to the parliamentary side), two guns, arms and 32 colours. The cavalry was destroyed and the most of the foot retreated into Bridgewater itself. But the seizure of Bridgewater proved to be a more devastating blow to the royalists; it was their magazine in the west and contained a large store of military supplies as the king presumed it was impregnable.

Cromwell and Fairfax went to look at the defences and decided to give their men a rest. Six days later, on 16 July, they debated in the council of war whether to storm or abandon Bridgewater. On the same day Fairfax wrote to his father Lord Fairfax:

...This town is of greater consequence, as we conceive, than any in the western parts; for if we have it, we shall garrison in a line which will reach from Severn's mouth to the South Sea, and so divide Devonshire and Cornwall, where their chief force is driven.³

The parliamentary army was prepared for the storming by Hugh Peters and Edward Bowles preaching sermons on Sunday the 20th to encourage the soldiers to do their duty. Fairfax requested Wyndham to surrender and legend has it that Lady Wyndham aimed a pot shot at Cromwell in reply.

Bridgewater was defended by a ditch, which was too broad and deep to be filled up with faggots and stones (the usual practice), therefore Fairfax asked Hammond, his commander of artillery, to come up with a solution. His answer was to get the storming parties, who had been drawn by lots, to lay eight, three-metre wooden bridges across the ditch; this proved to be very successful.

In the early hours of the 21st the attack began, the main assault from the north-east with a diversion on the south side. The bridges allowed them to cross the ditch at Castle Field and force the royalists back to the town centre. The east gate was breached, pushing Sir John Stawell's regiment across the bridge, where they barricaded themselves. There was a lot of fighting round the church and captured guns were used. The royalists started using red-hot cannonballs and fires broke out. Fairfax decided not to cross the river but to regroup and continue the next day.

In Fairfax's letter to Lenthall he describes the result of the first day:

On Monday morning last, we gained that part of the town which lye on this side the River, and therein above 600 prisoners, divers officers of quality, and two piece of ordinance:⁴

Fairfax opened fire from all sides on the town the next day and at 2pm

...gave leave to women and children to come forth by four in the afternoon, some few did, viz. The Lady Hawly and the Governors wife Mrs Windham, which gave that ill milk to Prince Charles.⁵

The bombardment continued with red-hot cannonballs and soon several areas were alight, fanned by the high winds. Sir Hugh Wyndham sent out the hostages in the evening and by the morning the surrender was official. In a letter dated the 24th Fairfax wrote to his father:

...and finding their obstinacy I was forced to fire two or three houses, which presently made them to render the town and

themselves to mercy. The governor told me, some of his own men set fire on several parts of the town, for which he had committed some to prison, else we had done little hurt by fire.⁶

This victory netted 2,200 prisoners, 42 guns, ammunition, provisions, 800 horses and some oxen, plus 'Treasure in Plate, Jewels, &c said to be worth 10000^{ll}.'⁷ This captured booty was ordered to be sold by parliament and the profits given to Fairfax's soldiers as an incentive. The soldiers received 'Storming money' worth six shillings (30p) each, a gratuity in lieu of plunder.

Richard Symonds makes a comment in his diary about the events and also the effect they had on the king:

Thursday, 24 July, came intelligence to Bristoll that Sir Thomas Fairfax had taken Bridgwater the day before. Propositions sent into the towne, that the inhabitants and townsmen should have quarter. The townsmen sett it on fyre in divers places. In the meane time they stormed it and got it. Most of the towne was burnt, except some howses neare the castle.

The newes of Bridgwater's unexpected losse rather stayed him [the king].⁸

A third of the town was burnt but it was not until 1656 that the mayor asked for help to repair 120 of the destroyed houses, including the almshouses.

During this period parliamentary forces met opposition from the clubmen, a group the king was hoping would help him retain the south-west. Unfortunately for him, they were not organised and therefore really only posed a hindrance rather than a threat. As Goring's troops were undisciplined, in part due to lack of pay, they ran amok. Fairfax talked twice to large gatherings of clubmen near Bridgwater and won them over. Unfortunately the rest were becoming a nuisance, stopping supplies getting through. Cromwell and Disbrowe were sent to deal with them.

They met 2,000 of them at Hambledon Hill, over the border in Dorset; they were unco-operative, hostile and started to attack. Cromwell lost two men and four horses:

I believe killed not twelve of them but cut very many, and put them all to flight. We have taken about 300; many of which are poor silly creatures, whom if you please to let me send home, they promise to

be very dutiful for time to come, and will be hanged before they come out again.⁹

The main parliamentary force moved into Devon and Cornwall, while the few remaining royalist garrisons were persuaded to surrender. The campaign in the west signalled the end of the first civil war.

In June 1649 colonel Disbrowe became army commander in the west. He had started his army career in 1642 as quarter-master in his brother-in-law's regiment (he was married to Oliver's sister Jane), fighting alongside him at Langport, Bridgwater, Bristol and Worcester. Later, during the 1650s, he was chosen to be a general of the fleet with Blake, Monck and Penn. He served as a commissioner of the admiralty and navy, which also managed maritime affairs at home.

In 1655 he played a leading part in crushing Penruddock's rising. In August Cromwell appointed him Major-General for the west country and later he sat as MP for Somerset. As an attorney who had served as a member of the committee for law reform, he worked closely with local JPs, showing a genuine concern about the composition of juries and even put tradesmen on the Somerset bench. His hands-on approach meant that royalist and Quaker leaders were gaoled, dubious members of local councils were removed from office and he successfully muzzled large dogs.

He was blunt and honest, but above all a strong republican who showed great loyalty to Cromwell, a role he did not extend to Richard Cromwell. In partnership with Fleetwood, he forced Richard to dissolve parliament. After the Restoration he was a prisoner in Dover castle and the Tower until 1667. He went on to live a peaceful life, dying in 1680 in Hackney.

The only medieval building still remaining in Bridgwater is the fourteenth century St Mary's church; it was from its tower in 1685 that James, Duke of Monmouth, illegitimate son of Charles II, watched the approaching royalist army led by Louis de Durfort, 2nd Earl of Faversham, and his second-in-command, John Churchill. After discussions with a Sedgemoor man, Monmouth decided on a night attack and at 11 pm they left Bridgwater for the Battle of Sedgemoor, fought on 5 July 1685. Monmouth had landed at Lyme Regis with 85 men and was later joined by nearly 3,000, but now so many had deserted and the royalist army out-classed them. Sadly, men who had fought with Cromwell had joined Monmouth, as they thought he was the saviour of the Protestant cause. If only they had waited three more years they could have joined William of Orange.

The future had seemed so certain when he was met at Taunton by students from the school of Sarah Blake (sister of Robert), and presented with a bible

and banner. Then at Bridgwater he was proclaimed and crowned king in the castle by the mayor and corporation. The inhabitants even gave voluntary contributions to his cause. Sadly, this Norman castle where Monmouth had his quarters was demolished after the Restoration and only the stone archway on West Quay remains.

Two days after the battle Monmouth was captured two miles from Horton in Hampshire, and on 15 July he was beheaded at the fourth blow in the Tower of London. In the following autumn the Bloody Assizes began, the lord chief justice, George, Baron Jeffreys, presiding. In Silver Street, Bridgwater stands a very old doorway dating from 1220 and it was in this house that judge Jeffreys stayed during the assizes. About 320 were hanged (eleven of them from Bridgwater)¹⁰ and more than 800 were sold to plantation owners in Barbados, bringing considerable funds to the crown. Hundreds more were fined, flogged or imprisoned. In 1686 James II briefly visited Bridgwater and the town petitioned for the removal of the dragoons that were still quartered there.

Though very little of old Bridgwater remains, a visit to the Blake Museum is well worth the trip. The surrounding area is beautiful and this part of Somerset was the setting for R D Blackmore's novel *Lorna Doone*, a love story set during the Monmouth Rebellion.

Notes.

1. T Carlyle, *The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (4 vols, London, 1897), IV, 234; L C Bennett, *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1941), pp. 82-3; W C Abbott, *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (4 vols, Oxford, 1988), I, 365; British Library, Thomason Tract, E293 (18).
2. S Peachey (ed), *Richard Symonds: The Complete Military Diary* (Partizan Press, 1989), p. 59.
3. R Bell (ed), *Memorials of The Civil War: The Fairfax Correspondence* (London, 1849), I, 239.
4. British Library, Thomason Tract E294 (6).
5. British Library, Thomason Tract, E261 (7).
6. Bell (ed), *Fairfax Correspondence*, I, 240.
7. British Library, Thomason Tract E293 (34).
8. Peachey (ed), *Symonds Diary*, p. 61.
9. Carlyle, *Letters and Speeches*, I, 219-21.
10. Joshua Bellamy, Isiah Davis, Richard Engram, Robert Fraunces, Roger Guppy, Richard Harris, John Hurman, William Moggeridge, Robert Roper, Nicholas Stodgell, John Trott.

Jane Mills, MInstLM, is a regular contributor to *Cromwelliana*. In January of this year she was elected to the membership of the Royal Historical Society.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PUBLICATIONS

I. BOOKS

- Andreadis, H, *Sappho in Early Modern England* (Chicago UP, 2001).
- Anstey, P R, *The Philosophy of Robert Boyle* (Routledge, 2000).
- Arni, E G V, *Justice to the Maimed Soldier: Nursing, Medical Care and Welfare for Sick and Wounded Soldiers during the Civil Wars and Interregnum, 1642-60* (Ashgate, 2002).
- Atkin, M, *The Battle of Worcester* (Harlot P, 2001).
- Auchter, D, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* (Greenwood P, 2001).
- Aylmer, G, *The Crown's Servants: Government and the Civil Service under Charles II* (Oxford UP, 2001).
- Barbour, R, *Literature and Religious Culture in Seventeenth Century England* (Cambridge UP, 2001).
- Bellancy, A, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2002).
- Benn, T, *The International Significance of the Levellers and the English Democratic Tradition* (Spokesman Books, 2000).
- Booy, D (ed), *Personal Disclosures: An Anthology of Self-Writings from the Seventeenth Century* (Ashgate, 2002).
- Boyce, D G, *Political Discourse in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Ireland* (Palgrave, 2001).
- Braddick, M & Walter, J (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge UP, 2001).
- Brown, C, *The Battle of Aberdeen, 1645* (Tempus, 2002).
- Cameron, E (ed), *Early Modern Europe: An Oxford History* (Oxford UP, 2001).
- Canny, N P, *The Oxford History of the British Empire I: The Origins of Empire* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- Canny, N P, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford UP, 2001).
- Clark, S (ed), *Languages of Witchcraft* (Palgrave, 2000).
- Clegg, C S, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge UP, 2001).
- Collins, R J M, *Major-General Sir Edward Massie* (R J M Collins, 2001).
- Cooper, T, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth Century England* (Ashgate, 2001).
- Corns, T N, *A Companion to Milton* (Blackwell, 2001).
- Coster, W, *Family and Kinship in England, 1450-1800* (Longman, 2001).
- Coster, W, *Baptism and Spiritual Knowledge in Early Modern England* (Ashgate, 2002).
- Crawford, P, *Women, Men and Families in Early Modern England* (Longman, 2001).
- Davidson, P (ed), *Poetry and Revolution: An Anthology of British and Irish Verse, 1625-60* (Oxford UP, 2001).
- Davies, T A L, *Quakers in English Society, 1655-1725* (Oxford UP, 2000).

Daybell, J, *Early Modern Women's Letter-Writing* (Palgrave, 2001).

Eales, J, *Community and Disunity: Kent and the English Civil Wars* (Keith Dickson Books, 2001).

Ferrell, L A & McCullough, P (eds), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600-1750* (Manchester UP, 2000).

Fissel, M C, *English Warfare 1511-1642* (Routledge, 2001).

Flannagan, R C, *John Milton* (Blackwell, 2002).

Fowler, A, *New Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse* (Oxford UP, 2002).

Gaskill, M, *Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Glete, J, *War and the State in Early Modern Europe* (Routledge, 2001).

Goodare, J (ed), *The Scottish Witch-hunt in Context* (Manchester UP, 2002).

Gordon, A, *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Gordon, A & Klein, B (eds), *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Grabes, H, *Writing the Early Modern English Nation* (Rodopi BV, 2001).

Grassby, R, *Kinship and Capitalism: Marriage, Family, and Business in the English-speaking World, 1580-1740* (Woodrow Wilson Center P, 2001).

Griffiths, P & Jenner, M S R (eds), *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London* (Manchester UP, 2000).

hAnnrachain, T O, *The Catholic Reformation in Ireland: The Mission of Rinuccini, 1645-9* (Oxford UP, 2001).

Hattaway, M (ed), *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Blackwell, 2001).

Healy, M, *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England* (Palgrave, 2001).

Hodgson-Wright, S, *Women's Writing of the Early Modern Period 1588-1688: An Anthology* (Columbia UP, 2002).

Hotz-Davies, I, *The Creation of Religious Identities by English Women Poets from the Seventeenth to the early Twentieth Century* (E Mellen P, 2001).

Houston, A & Pincus, S (eds), *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Jordan, M, *Milton and Modernity* (Palgrave, 2001).

Judges, A V (ed.), *The Elizabethan Underworld: A Collection of Tudor and Early Stuart Tracts and Ballads* (Routledge, 2002).

Keeble, N H (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Kertzer, D & Barbagli, M (eds), *Family Life in Early Modern Times, 1500-1789* (Yale UP, 2001).

Knowles, N, *Kidderminster and Bewdley during the Civil War* (Star & Garter P, 2001).

Kyle, C (ed), *Parliaments, Politics and Elections, 1604-48* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Lake, P, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy', 'Heterodox' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Manchester UP, 2001).

Lenihan, P (ed), *Conquest and Resistance: War in Seventeenth Century Ireland* (K Brill, 2001).

Levine, A, *Engaging Political Philosophy: From Hobbes to Rawls* (Blackwell, 2001).

Llewellyn, N, *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

McBride, K B, *Country House Discourse in Early Modern England* (Ashgate, 2001).

McClain, M, *Beaufort: The Duke and His Duchess, 1657-1715* (Yale UP, 2001).

McKerral, A, *Kintyre in the Seventeenth Century* (Kintyre Antiquarian & Natural History Society, 2001).

Malcolmson, C, *Heart-work: George Herbert and the Protestant Ethic* (Stanford UP, 2000).

Maxwell-Stuart, P G, *Witchcraft in Europe and the New World* (Palgrave, 2001).

Meldrum, T, *Domestic Service and Gender, 1660-1750* (Longman, 2000).

Mendle, M (ed), *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Merritt, J F (ed), *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Morris, R, *Headwear, Footwear and Trimmings of the Common People 1580-1660* (Stuart P, 2002).

Morton, T & Smith, N (eds), *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650-1830* (Cambridge UP, 2002).

Newcomb, L H, *Reading Popular Romance in Early Modern England* (Columbia UP, 2002).

Nuttall, G, *Visible Saints: The Congregational Way, 1640-60* (Quinta P, 2001).

Orr, B, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

Pacheco, A, *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing* (Blackwell, 2002).

Peacey, J, *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (Palgrave, 2001).

Peachey, S, *Textiles and Materials of the Common Man and Woman, 1580-1660* (Stuart P, 2001).

Peachey, S, *Dyeing the Clothing of Common Folk, 1580-1660* (Stuart P, 2002).

Plowden, A, *Henrietta Maria* (Sutton, 2001).

Prall, S, *The Puritan Revolution and the English Civil War* (R E Krieger P, 2002).

Rogers, G A J, *Hobbes and History* (Routledge, 2000).

Ronayne, L, *The Battle of Scariffhollis, 1650* (Eagrain Dhun na nGall, 2001).

Rose, M B, *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature* (Chicago UP, 2002).

Schama, S, *A History of Britain 2: The British Wars, 1603-1776* (BBC, 2001).

Scodel, J, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton UP, 2002).

Seel, G & Smith, D, *Crown & Parliament, 1558-1689* (Cambridge UP, 2002).

Seel, G & Smith, D L, *The Early Stuart Kings 1603-1642* (Routledge, 2001).

Sharpe, J A, *Witchcraft in Early Modern England* (Longman, 2001).
 Shawcross, J T, *John Milton* (Kentucky UP, 2001).
 Shepard, A & Withington, P J, *Communities in Early Modern England* (Manchester UP, 2002).
 Smyth, J, *The Making of the United Kingdom 1660-1800* (Longman, 2001).
 Southern, A, *Forlorn Hope* (Book Guild, 2001).
 Spaeth, D A, *The Church in an Age of Danger: Parsons and Parishioners, 1660-1740* (Cambridge UP, 2001).
 Speck, W A, *James II* (Longman, 2002).
 Spicer, T, *The Battle of Worcester* (P Griffith, 2001).
 Spinks, B D, *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines* (Ashgate, 2002).
 Stater, V, *A Political History of Tudor and Stuart England* (Routledge, 2002).
 Stoye, M, *West Britons: Cornish Identities and the Early Modern British State* (Exeter UP, 2002).
 Swatland, A, *The House of Lords in the Reign of Charles II* (Cambridge UP, 2002).
 Tanner, M, *Ireland's Holy Wars* (Yale UP, 2001).
 Todd, M, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (Yale UP, 2002).
 Traub, V, *The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2002).
 Tuck, R, *Hobbes* (Oxford UP, 2002).
 Turner, J, *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London* (Cambridge UP, 2001).
 Tyacke, N, *Aspects of English Protestantism c.1530-1700* (Manchester UP, 2001).
 Vigne, R & Littleton, C (eds), *The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750* (Sussex Academic P, 2001).
 Webb, A, *Civil War in Dean* (Dean Archaeological Group, 2001).
 Whyman, S E, *Sociability and Power in Late Stuart England* (Oxford UP, 2002).
 Wickham, G, Barry, H & Ingram, W (eds), *The English Professional Theatre, 1530-1660* (Cambridge UP, 2001).
 Wilcox, H, *The Seventeenth Century Religious Lyric* (Longman, 2002).
 Wills, J E, *1688: A Global History* (Granta Books, 2002).
 Wilson, A N, *A Life of John Milton* (Pimlico, 2002).
 Wilson, L, *Theaters of Invention: Drama and the Law in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2001).
 Wood, A, *Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England* (Palgrave, 2001).
 Woolf, D R, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2001).
 Worden, B, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (Allen Lane/Penguin, 2001).
 Wrightson, K, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (Yale UP, 2001).

II. ARTICLES

Adams, B, 'The "dirty spirit" at Hertford: a falling out of Friends', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52 (2001).
 Ahnert, T, 'The varieties of contexts in early Stuart intellectual history', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001).
 Allan, D, "An ancient and sage philosopher": Alexander Ross and the defence of philosophy', *The Seventeenth Century* 16 (2001).
 Anderson, R, "Well disposed to the affairs of Spain?": James VI and I and the propagandists, 1618-24', *Recusant History* 25 (2001).
 Anderton, P, 'Seventeenth century Nantwich', *Cheshire History* 41 (2001-02).
 Archer, I W, 'The government of London, 1500-1650', *The London Journal* 26 (2001).
 Arni, E G V, 'Soldiers-at-sea and inter-service relations during the first Dutch War', *The Mariner's Mirror* 87 (2001).
 Baker, A, 'Upton church and the Bulstrode brasses', *Records of Buckinghamshire* 42 (2002).
 Baker-Smith, D, 'Shakespeare at court', *The Court Historian* 6 (2001).
 Barnes, G, 'A Malpas schoolmaster goes to court', *Cheshire History* 41 (2001-02).
 Bastow, S L, "Worth nothing, but very wilful": Catholic recusant women of Yorkshire, 1536-1642', *Recusant History* 25 (2001).
 Bawcutt, P, 'James VI's Castalian band: an early modern myth', *Scottish Historical Review* 80 (2001).
 Bennett, K, 'John Aubrey's collections and the early modern museum', *Bodleian Library Record* 17 (2000-01).
 Betelho, L, "The old woman's wish": widows by the family fire? Widows' old age provisions in rural England, 1500-1700', *The History of the Family* 7 (2002).
 Bissell, D, 'Some seventeenth century roads in Breconshire', *Brycheiniog* 33 (2001).
 Black, J W, 'From Martin Bucer to Richard Baxter: "Discipline" and reformation in sixteenth and seventeenth century England', *Church History* 70 (2001).
 Blatchly, J & Fisher, G, 'Thomas Essington at Brightwell and the identity of his sculptor', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History* 39 (2000).
 Bostock, T, 'Owners, occupiers and others: seventeenth century Northwich', *Cheshire History* 41 (2001-02).
 Burrows, J & Craig, H, 'Lucy Hutchinson and the authorship of two seventeenth-century poems', *The Seventeenth Century* 16 (2001).
 Chernaik, W, 'Captains and slaves: Aphra Benn and the rhetoric of republicanism', *The Seventeenth Century* 17 (2002).
 Christianson, P, 'Two proposals for raising money by extraordinary means, c.1627', *English Historical Review* 117 (2002).
 Collins, J R, 'The church settlement of Oliver Cromwell', *History* 87 (2002).

Colman, C S, 'The paralysis of the Cumberland and Westmorland army in the first civil war, c.1642-45', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 3rd series, 1 (2001).

Cope, J, 'Fashioning victims: Dr Henry Jones and the plight of Irish Protestants, 1642', *Historical Research* 74 (2001).

Coulton, B, 'The fourth Shropshire Presbyterian classis, 1647-62', *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society* 73 (1998).

Coulton, B, 'Thomas Hunt of Shrewsbury and Boreatton, 1599-1669', *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society* 74 (1999).

Curth, L, 'The commercialisation of medicine in the popular press: English almanacs 1640-1700', *The Seventeenth Century* 17 (2002).

Dietz, B, 'Dikes, dockheads and gates: English docks and seapower in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *The Mariner's Mirror* 88 (2002).

Edwards, F, 'The first Earl of Salisbury's pursuit of Hugh Owen', *Recusant History* 26 (2002).

Estabrook, C B, 'Ritual, space and authority in seventeenth-century English cathedral cities', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32 (2002).

Evans, A C, 'George Twisleton, 1617/18-67', *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society* 50 (2001).

Evans, A C, 'George Twisleton, 1617/18-67', *Transactions of the Caernarvonshire Historical Society* 62 (2001).

Evans, N, 'Stephen Hughes, the family man', *The Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 37 (2001).

Fauch, 'Constructing the dead: late sixteenth and early seventeenth century effigy sculpture in Devon', *Church Monuments* 14 (1999).

Fenley, P, 'Charity and stautus: the activities of Sir John Kederminster at Langley Marish, Buckinghamshire', *Records of Buckinghamshire* 42 (2002).

Fincham, K, 'The restoration of the altars in the 1630s', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001).

Findlay, E, 'Ralph Thoresby the diarist: the late seventeenth-century pious diary and its demise', *The Seventeenth Century* 16 (2001).

Foster, G, 'Pepys, Dryden and the politics of spectating in 1667', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 63 (2000).

Foyster, E, 'Parenting was for life, not just for childhood: the role of parents in the married lives of their children in early modern England', *History* 86 (2001).

Friedeburg, R V, "Self defence" and sovereignty: the reception and application of German political thought in England and Scotland, 1628-9', *History of Political Thought* 23 (2002).

Froide, A, 'Female relationships in early modern England', *Journal of British Studies* 40 (2001).

Gilbert, C D, 'Thomas Habington's account of the 1606 search at Hindlip', *Recusant History* 25 (2001).

Goldie, M, 'Roger Morrice and his entring book', *History Today* 51 (Nov. 2001).

Gragg, L, 'A heavenly visitation: George Foxe's visit to Barbados', *History Today* 52 (Feb. 2002).

Greaves, R I, 'Seditious sectaries or "sober and useful inhabitants"? Changing conceptions of the Quakers in early modern Britain', *Albion* 33 (2001).

Gruenfelder, J R, 'Great Yarmouth, its haven and the crown, 1603-42', *Norfolk Archaeology* 43 (1998-2000).

Haigh, C, 'Success and failure in the English Reformation', *Past & Present*, 173 (2001).

Hallett, N, "As if it had nothing belonged to her": The lives of Catherine Burton (1668-1714) as a discourse on method in early modern life-writing', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 7 (2002).

Hamlin, H, 'Psalm culture in the English Renaissance: readings of Psalm 137 by Shakespeare, Milton and Others', *Renaissance Quarterly* 55 (2002).

Hanley, H, 'Probate and the church courts in Buckinghamshire in the civil war era', *Records of Buckinghamshire* 40 (1998-2000).

Harding, V, 'Controlling a complex metropolis 1650-1750: politics, parishes and power', *The London Journal* 26 (2001).

Harris, A L, 'The funerary monuments of Richard Boyle, Earl of Cork', *Church Monuments* 13 (1998).

Herman, P. C, 'Authorship and the royal "I": King James VI/I and the politics of monarchical verse', *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001).

Hickman, D, 'Wise and religious epitaphs: funerary inscriptions as evidence for religious change in Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire, c.1500-1640', *Midland History* 26 (2001).

Hopper, A J, 'A directory of parliamentary allegiances in Yorkshire during the civil wars', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 73 (2001).

Houten, A V, 'Prudence in Hobbes's political philosophy', *History of Political Thought* 23 (2002).

Howson, B H, 'The Puritan hermeneutics of John Owen', *Westminster Theological Journal* 63 (2001).

Hoyle, R W, 'The management of the estates of the Earls of Derby, 1575-1640: some new sources', *Northern History* 39 (2002).

Hunt, A, 'A Jacobean consensus? The religious policy of James VI and I', *The Seventeenth Century* 16 (2001).

Jefferson, L, 'A garter installation ceremony in 1606', *The Court Historian* 6 (2001).

Jennings, S B, 'Colonel Isham Parkyns: Nottinghamshire's forgotten royalist', *Transactions of the Thorton Society of Nottinghamshire* 104 (2000).

Johnston, J A, 'Furniture and fittings in seventeenth century Lincoln', *Lincolnshire History & Archaeology* 35 (2000).

Jones, J G, 'Phylipiaid Ardudwy: aspects of their bardic contribution in late sixteenth and seventeenth century Wales', *Journal of the Merioneth Historical & Record Society* 13 (2001).

Jones, J G, 'The Welsh gentry and the image of the "Cambro-Briton", c.1603-25', *Welsh History Review* 20 (2001).

- Knoell, S, 'An eternal academic community: Oxford memorials 1580-1680', *Church Monuments* 16 (2001).
- Lamb, G, 'Aylesbury in the civil war', *Records of Buckinghamshire* 40 (1998-2000).
- Little, P, 'The Irish "Independents" and Viscount Lisle's lieutenantancy of Ireland', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001).
- Little, P, 'Providence and posterity: a letter from Lord Mountnorris to his daughter, 1642', *Irish Historical Studies* 32 (2001).
- Lux-Sterritt, L, 'An analysis of the controversy caused by Mary Ward's Institute in the 1620s', *Recusant History* 25 (2001).
- Mac Cuarta, B, 'The plantation of Leitrim, 1620-41', *Irish Historical Studies* 32 (2001).
- MacDonald, A R, 'Deliberative processes in parliament c.1567-1639: multicameralism and the Lords of the Articles', *Scottish Historical Review* 81 (2002).
- Mann, A J, 'The anatomy of the printed book in early modern Scotland', *Scottish Historical Review* 80 (2001).
- Marsh, C, "'Common Prayer" in England 1560-1640: the view from the pew', *Past & Present* 171 (2002).
- Marshall, T, 'James VI & I: three kings or two?', *Renaissance Forum* 5 (2000).
- Matar, N, 'The Barbary Corsairs, King Charles I and the civil war', *The Seventeenth Century* 16 (2001).
- Maule, J, 'Thomas Carew's epitaph for Maria Wentworth at Toddington, Bedfordshire', *Church Monuments* 14 (1999).
- Merritt, J F, 'The cradle of Laudianism? Westminster Abbey, 1558-1630', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52 (2001).
- Milton, P, 'John Locke and the Rye House Plot', *Historical Journal* 43 (2000).
- Morrill, J, 'The Putney power-brokers', *BBC History Magazine* 3 (June 2002).
- Orr, B, 'The heroic plays and empire in the Restoration', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 63 (2000).
- Parkinson, A C, 'Religious drama in Kendal: the Corpus Christi play in the reign of James I', *Recusant History* 25 (2001).
- Patterson, A & Dzelzainis M, 'Marvell and the Earl of Anglesey: a chapter in the history of reading', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001).
- Plackett, R L, 'William Senior, mapmaker, in Northumberland'. *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th series, 28 (2000).
- Porter, D, 'Uncivil warfare', *BBC History Magazine* 2 (2001).
- Prest, W, 'Law reform and legal education in interregnum England', *Historical Research* 75 (2002).
- Ransome, D R, 'Village tensions in early Virginia: sex, land, and status at the neck of land in the 1620s', *Historical Journal* 43 (2000).
- Redwood, P, 'The landscape and population of early modern Breconshire', *Brycheiniog* 33 (2001).
- Roberts, J, 'The building activities of Henry Oxinden of Barham', *Archaeologia Cantiana* 121 (2001).

- Roberts, S K, 'Office-holding and allegiance in Glamorgan in the civil war and after: the case of John Byrd', *Morgannwg* 44 (2000).
- Rublack, U, 'Fluxes: the early modern body and the emotions', *History Workshop Journal* 53 (2002).
- Sacks, D H, 'Iniquity and regeneration: urban life and the Reformation in England', *Journal of British Studies* 40 (2001).
- Sarasohn, L T, 'Was *Leviathan* a patronage artifact?', *History of Political Thought* 21 (2000).
- Seddon, P R, 'Major-General Edward Whalley and the government of Nottinghamshire, 1655-56', *Transactions of the Thorton Society of Nottinghamshire* 103 (1999).
- Semler, L E, 'The creed of *Eliza's Babes* (1652): nakedness, Adam and divinity', *Albion* 33 (2001).
- Serjeantson, R W, 'Herbert of Cherbury before deism: the early reception of the *De veritate*', *The Seventeenth Century* 16 (2001).
- Smith, C S, 'Painted ladies', *History Today* 51 (Oct. 2001).
- Smith, H, 'English "feminist" writings and Judith Drake's *An Essay in defence of the female sex* (1696)', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001).
- Spurgeon, C J & Thomas, H J, 'Marsh House, Aberthaw; a seventeenth century fortified tobacco store in Glamorgan', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 146 (1997).
- Spurgeon, C J & Thomas, H J, 'Caerphilly castle: the civil war redoubt', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 147 (1998).
- Spurr, J, 'A profane history of early modern oaths', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6th series, 11 (2001).
- Spurr, J, 'The English post-Reformation?', *Journal of Modern History* 74 (2002).
- Steggle, M, '*Paradise Lost* and the acoustics of hell', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 7 (2002).
- Steggle, M, 'Brome, Covent Garden, and 1641', *Renaissance Forum*, 5 (2001).
- Styles, J, 'Innovation and design in Tudor and Stuart Britain', *History Today* 51 (Dec. 2001).
- Tait, C, 'Irish images of Jesus, 1550-1650', *Church Monuments* 16 (2001).
- Tarlton, C D, 'The despotic doctrine of Hobbes, Part I: the liberalization of *Leviathan*', *History of Political Thought* 22 (2001).
- Tarlton, C D, 'The despotic doctrine of Hobbes, Part II: aspects of the textual substructure of tyranny in *Leviathan*', *History of Political Thought* 23 (2002).
- Taylor, G, 'Thomas Middleton, *The Nice Valour* and the court of James I', *The Court Historian* 6 (2001).
- Tittler, R, 'Reconsidering the "English Urban Renaissance": cities, culture and society after the Fire of London', *Journal of British Studies* 40 (2001).
- Trevett, C, 'Women and the coming of Quakerism to Wales', *Journal of Welsh Religious History* 7 (1999).

- Tyler, K, 'The excavation of an Elizabethan/Stuart waterfront site on the north bank of the river Thames', *Post Medieval Archaeology* 35 (2001).
- Tyson, B, 'Building a public bakehouse at Appleby in 1615', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 3rd series, 1 (2001).
- Ungerer, G, 'Recovering unrecorded Quixote allusions in ephemeral English publications of the late 1650s', *Bodleian Library Record* 17 (2000-01).
- Vallance, E, 'Oaths, casuistry, and equivocation: Anglican responses to the engagement controversy', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001).
- Vallance, E, 'Loyal or rebellious? Protestant associations in England 1584-1696', *The Seventeenth Century* 17 (2002).
- Vallance, E, "'An holy and sacramentall paction": federal theology and the Solemn League and Covenant in England', *English Historical Review* 116 (2001).
- Vaughan, G M, 'The audience of *Leviathan* and the audience of Hobbes's political philosophy', *History of Political Thought* 22 (2001).
- Walker, K, 'The military activities of Charlotte la Tremouille, Countess of Derby, during the civil war and interregnum' *Northern History* 38 (2001).
- Walter, J, 'Confessional politics in pre-civil war Essex: prayer books, profanations, and petitions', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001).
- Wareing, J, "'Violently taken away or cheatingly duckoyed": the illicit recruitment in London of indentured servants for the American colonies, 1645-1718', *The London Journal* 26 (2001).
- Weiser, B, 'A call for order: Charles II's ordinances of the household', *The Court Historian* 6 (2001).
- Whalen, R, 'George Herbert's sacramental Puritanism', *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001).
- Wilcox, H, 'Women's devotional poetry in seventeenth century England', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 63 (2000).
- Wilks, T, "'Forbear the heat and haste of building": rivalries among the designers at Price Henry's court, 1610-12', *The Court Historian* 6 (2001).
- Williams, G, 'Stephen Hughes (1622-88): "the apostle of Carmarthenshire"', *The Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 37 (2001).
- Williams, I L, 'The urbanity of Marlborough: a Wiltshire town in the seventeenth century', *Wiltshire Archaeology Magazine* 94 (2001).
- Wilson, J, 'Ethics girls: the personification of moral systems on early modern English monuments', *Church History* 13 (1998).
- Worden, B, 'Whig history and Puritan politics: the *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow* revisited', *Historical Research* 75 (2002).
- Worden, B, 'Putting the Protector on a pedestal', *BBC History Magazine* 3 (Jan. 2002).
- Wormald, J, 'James VI and I', *History Today* 52 (June 2002).
- Zell, M, 'Walter Morrell and the new draperies project, c.1603-31', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001).

BOOK REVIEWS

The writing of history is often responsive to fashion. We may regret it, wish to forget it, but can hardly deny that some fashions, which may ultimately turn out to be palpable errors - never one hopes, *à la mode* - have in the pursuit proved more fertile than futile. Was 'the rise of the gentry' a totally sterile concept or the formulation of 'a' - or even 'the' - general crisis of the seventeenth century entirely the hunting of a snark? Is not 'British history' - even when laying some claim to Ireland - currently raising pertinent questions and providing provocative answers? Other current and recent fashions, among them challenging interdisciplinary ones, history with literary theory, literature itself, art, iconography, command respect as well as caution - as some of my late reviews to *Cromwelliana* have suggested.

An objection, of course, to fashion is that it turns us away from the proper recreation of the past in its own terms - a deficiency that would be fatal could we be sure of what those terms were. J H Hexter was a great one for urging escape from the historian's 'day', but his own writings, notably on 'liberty' in the early seventeenth century, expose a failure. The most austere archival researcher can hardly bring *tabula rasa* to the documents, relying on, say, serendipity to set him off. Whence comes the hunch that points him in a particular direction? Often, surely, a reaction to a particular fashion. First the bunk, then the debunk and then the (never quite the same as the old) rebunk. We may get nearer to the style - or call it fashion - of the past through awareness, which does not mean supine acceptance, of our own age. The civil wars were fought among men who looked back on the past - to 'the ancient constitution', the Norman Yoke or classical republicanism - through contemporary spectacles. Poring over their results, we may come up with some things valuable and valid about them.

All this meander is a prelude to two works under review which share a currently fashionable approach: Blair Worden's *Roundhead Reputations: The Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (Allen Lane: The Penguin Press, £20) and in a burgeoning series on 'Reputations in History' J C Davis on Oliver Cromwell. The key word is, of course, 'Reputation', which seems to be in a fairly natural progression from 'Image' and 'Representation', which are still in vogue. Worden makes no attempt at a comprehensive parliamentary historiography. His book is, rather, a selection of highlights, blending some recycled work with fresh studies. First (and in some ways foremost) he presents again the Edmund Ludlow of the published (doctored) *Memoirs* (1698), which turned him from the millenarian sectarian Worden believes he really was, to someone like a cool radical Whig, all to serve a current political purpose. Though doubts were current at the time, John Toland's creation survived C H Firth's 1890s edition till a chunk of the original manuscript

turned up, to be meticulously edited by Worden, establishing, if not re-establishing, the regicide's earlier reputation. Next comes Algernon Sidney, who certainly had had somewhat to do in the 1640s and 1650s, but whose eighteenth-century 'sea-green incorruptible' reputation came from his 1670s martyrdom and an idiosyncratic republicanism, hardly roundhead. It lasted surprisingly a long time until, a century on, his dubious dealings with Louis XIV scuppered him.

It is a latter-day Cromwell that Worden presents through Thomas Carlyle's 'heroic' (but hardly herculean, if the record of the compilation is anything to go by) task of bringing together Oliver's writings and sayings. Yes, Carlyle did enhance a more favourable reputation - along with his own, to some extent - for his 'brave one', but in fact he was in an already fashionable flow. Worden goes on to relate Cromwell to the burgeoning professional scholarship of the late Victorians, Firth and Gardiner, and to the extraordinary commemorations of the 300th anniversary of the Lord Protector's birth, which produced the statue under which the Association celebrates 3 September, Cromwell's day of victories and death. For the twentieth century, Worden selects the reputation of the Levellers achieved by 'the left', chiefly Marxists. He doesn't think much of it.

As I write, BBC Radio 4 is devoting an hour to extracts from, and discussion on, the Putney Debates, 'marking a milestone in British constitutional history', where issues were raised 'still resonant today'. John Morrill and Tony Benn are of the company. Very fashionable, then. So, too, must be Michael Mendle (ed), *The Putney Debates: The Army, the Levellers and the English State* (Cambridge UP, £45). Interestingly, the penultimate article in this diverse set representing 'three generations of scholars', none of them, I believe, Marxists, is 'The Levellers in history and memory, c.1660-1960', which turns out to be very much 'The Levellers and the Left' from *Roundhead Reputations*. Mendle's team, who include Austin Woolrych (on the debates from the perspective of the army), Ian Gentles (on *The Agreements of the People*) and Patricia Crawford (fashionably on 'The poorest she: women and citizenship in early modern England') certainly stimulate appreciation of the debates and their context. Mendle's spirited Introduction asks if the really important thing about Putney was 'the littleness' assigned to it by Mark Kishlansky or was there 'something broader afoot - a cultural shift that had finally brought academe into loose synchrony with the wider neo-capitalist culture of the "Anglo" world'? Fashionable question, indeed. Somewhat dubious about the jargon of the second part, this reviewer has no doubt that 'large' is the word to apply to the context of the debates, fully justifying the attention given to them by the contributors to this volume, along with all the others who over the last century have heard in their heads Buff Coat and Wildman and Ireton talking it over.

If William Clarke, who as clerk to the General Council of the New Model Army, had not conscientiously kept short-hand notes of that October 1647 meeting and for whatever reason - an eye to posterity, surely - had not transcribed them in 1662, little would have been known of the proceedings, which were not widely remarked upon at the time. As it was, Clarke's voluminous papers lay unnoticed in Worcester College Library, deposited there by Clarke's son, until at the end of the nineteenth century C H Firth's attention was drawn to them. He published a selection, including the report of Putney, at a time when current political and social developments were attracting the attention of professionals like Firth and S R Gardiner to the ideas that were the engine driving the events of what was being called 'the Puritan Revolution' and would have other ascriptions reflecting contemporary concerns. The 250 year gap in the historiography of the debates has been formative. The sense of discovery was intense and has been reinforced by controversies which have kept the issues of 1647 alive. Something else - increasingly close contextual study - has become an imperative. As Frances Henderson, masterly with the short-hand, demonstrates in Mendle's volume, the text, clearly the work of several short-hand recorders of varying style and competence, is a difficult, composite one. The debates themselves were text-driven - calling on e.g. *The Agreement of the People* and *The Case of the Armie*. Their here-and-nowness, vividly displayed, offers not a play-reading but a happening. Though it all began with an agenda, it wandered off into unscheduled items such as the franchise. If the Council had been called to pursue consensus, it was not surprising, given the heterogeneous characters of the participants, including some voluble civilians, that face-to-face moved from eye-to-eye nearly to eyeball-to-eyeball. The note-takers' efforts to get it all down are impressive, but they met difficulties which have left a problematic text, as difficult to establish as to interpret. Compare Firth's version with Woodhouse's. (Incidentally, it was the latter who in 1933 gave us 'The Putney Debates'.) There may be some wrong assumptions. Ireton's contributions are particularly uncertain. Readers will always place different emphases on different issues - engagements, indemnity, native rights, monarchy, the person of the king himself. Do the debates really deserve the close attention given them, of which Mendle's volume is merely one facet, or has the fashion gone over the top, pushed by liberals, Marxists, unreconstructed Old Labour aficionados like Tony Benn? Surely not. Here be riches, guarded maybe by dragons. The debate started at Putney must and will go on.

Cromwell took the chair at Putney, not always in control. If nothing was added to his reputation there, subsequent events, including suppression of the Levellers at Burford, certainly did. For Marvell's 'the war's and fortune's son' and Milton's 'chief of men' reputation - reputations, rather - would grow until in 2001 a radio poll put him well among the most significant English persons of the past millennium. J C Davis, a sceptic about a good

many received views on the English Revolution or whatever, is an apt choice for a critical reappraisal of Oliver - *Oliver Cromwell* (Arnold, £14.99 paperback). He is not starry-eyed about him, but one senses a growing respect. Davis, like his victim, - no, he is hardly that - stirs controversy. Briefly surveying the historiography, he notes that from the start friend and foe agreed at least that there was a greatness about the man, but he sees little useful in regarding him as enigmatic. What lay behind the enigma? In Napoleon III, nothing; in Oliver, no doubt, a great deal. Davis tackles him head on, contradictions, confusions, ambiguities and all to be probed, convinced that this difficult sitter can be depicted as a coherent entity. He points out that Oliver in 1640, as part of an extensive cousinage, a network of influence, already had a potentiality - if, as it turned out he did, he had the capacity and the instincts to exploit it. Gradually the man emerges from a review which, for all its urge to be different, turns out to be another 'life'. Davis does not like the notion of 'every man his own Cromwell', but this one will go down as Davis's alongside Hill's and Coward's and Gaunt's.

Blair Worden, again, and Tim Harris, two contributors to *The Putney Debates*, reappear in *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge UP, £45), edited by Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, essays emerging from proceedings, miscellaneous as they so often are, of a conference. They take in, some rather narrowly, aspects of politics, society, religion and culture, challenging recent historiography which has emphasised continuity rather than change across the middle decades of the seventeenth century. Here is a fashionable revisionism (perhaps one that could become standard), breaking the back of the Stuart era at the Restoration (as the title and subtitle, lacking a question mark, confidently suggest). Tim Harris reinforces his well-researched examination in the Mendle volume of the Leveller legacy from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis, with some suggestions for understanding popular politics in Restoration Britain. Seeking opinion 'out of doors', he looks beyond the elite to the middling sorts and the lower orders. Comparing the handling of public opinion by Elizabeth I and Charles II, Harris stresses how the queen's marvellous 'show of majesty' could do things unavailable to a king who, lucky to be restored but subject to a late 'demystification' of monarchy, had in effect to negotiate, wheedle even, when things were tight, even beneath the traditional political nation, for support. It worked for him - but at some cost, which would be paid by his less flexible successor, James II, who had to go back over the water once again. Worden tackles the question of secularisation in a thoughtful article which argues that what happened in religion over the final decades of the century was not less of it, but rather a shift from a stress on individual faith towards decency of conduct. He comes back to the published Ludlow's *Memoirs* which excised the regicide's rampant spirituality to turn him into an acceptably cool Whig. In the literary field, Joshua Scodel looks at Abraham Cowley who penned Pindaric odes on both Cromwell and

Charles II, each in effect recommending passivity - a sort of loyalty - to the powers that be, peace being always more acceptable than civil war, a desideratum extended to the relationships of men and women, moderation the keynotes.

'Time's winged chariot', bearing the editor's fiat, has caught me hoist with my own loquacity. There are other books I would have liked to have said something (I hope) useful about. I will finish with, first, a commendation for Christopher Durston's *Cromwell's Major-Generals: Godly Government during the English Revolution* (Manchester UP, £15.99 paperback), a thorough investigation of the reputation, representation and reality of the 'cantonization' experiment of 1655-6, a brief but pregnant episode, offering insights into the whole nature of the Protectorate. Second, coming back to fashion, note the increasing frequency of collections of thematic articles, some by a single hand, most by a diversity, offered in lieu of monographs. The universities' embracement of the notion of 'publish or perish' may have something to do with it, but it must be said it does have its virtues. Mark Stoye, who has contributed to our knowledge of popular allegiances in the civil war, offers in *West Britons: Cornish Identities and the Early Modern State* (Exeter UP, £40), a coherent body of essays on the peculiar nature of the Cornish experience during the turbulent years on both sides of the Tamar during the two early modern centuries. There are five important items here on the 1640s, in which the apparent simple loyalty of the Cornish is shown to have implications for their sense of themselves as 'a separate people', decidedly not English. Third, as an example of co-operation among scholars, I end with *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650-1830: From Revolution to Revolution* (Cambridge UP, £40), edited by Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith, which sets off briskly with Nigel Smith himself on 'Revolution and Replication', bringing us the 1650s and the Glorious Revolution (when some of the actors of the former were still alive) fruitfully together. But enough...

Ivan Roots

J R Hammer, *Protector: A Life History of Richard Cromwell* (Vantage Press, New York, 1997, \$17.95).

A new study of Richard Cromwell, the eldest surviving son of Oliver Cromwell, is badly needed. Three existing biographies of him, by R W Ramsey, *Richard Cromwell* (1935), E M Hause, *Tumble-down Dick* (1972) and J A Butler, *A Biography of Richard Cromwell* (1994) are not without value; indeed, Hause's book is a gold-mine of information and extracts from contemporary documents. But none of them provide totally satisfactory answers to many of the major historical questions about the man who succeeded his father as Lord Protector to become ruler of the British Isles

between September 1658 and May 1659. There is a list of tantalising questions to be answered about him. One would dearly like to know why Oliver Cromwell failed to groom him (or anyone else) as his successor as Lord Protector. Even more shrouded in mystery are the circumstances surrounding the nomination of Richard as Protector in the period when his father lay dying in August-September 1658. Did Oliver name Richard as his successor and, if so, when? Most intriguing of all is the question of whether or not Richard as Lord Protector deserves to be seen as 'Tumble-down Dick', a ruler whose failure was the inevitable result of his own incompetence. Have some historians grossly underestimated Richard's political abilities? Has the collapse of the Cromwellian Protectorate in May 1659 far more interesting explanations than merely the inability of Richard to fill his father's shoes?

These and other important questions about Richard Cromwell are not the central concern of Jane Ross Hammer's book. Readers wanting to work out their own answers to them should read writings like Austin Woolrych's 'The Good Old Cause and the fall of the Protectorate' in *Cambridge Historical Journal* 13 (1957) and the early pages of Ronald Hutton's *The Restoration* (1986). Ms Hammer's main contribution to the story of Richard Cromwell is what she has to say about what happened to him after his fall from power in 1659. With great enthusiasm, Ms Hammer explains why she believes that Richard helped two sons of his brother, Henry, to escape to America before following them there himself in the mid 1660s. There, she asserts, he stayed for five or six years, living first in Newbury, Massachusetts, and then in Woodbridge, New Jersey, where he played a leading role in founding a new settlement based on Cromwellian principles of political and religious liberty. Into her story of Richard's later life, Ms Hammer also interweaves other fascinating possibilities. For example, she says that late in life, by a second marriage to a French woman, Richard had a son, Thomas, who was also secretly sent to America to live with his relatives, who now were known as the Crowells.

As with all historical interpretations, the validity of Ms Hammer's views depends very much on the evidence she uses to support them. Is she right to identify the John Clarke (the alias Richard had used when in exile in France in the early 1660s) who is listed in the Newbury town books in the later seventeenth century and the John Cromwell who was a founding freeholder in Woodbridge as Richard Cromwell? How valid are the assumptions she makes about the reliability of family legends that survived much later among the descendants of the Crowells and others? Ms Hammer has few doubts that her evidence is very strong. Readers of her interesting book will have to make up their mind whether or not they agree.

Barry Coward

SUMMER SEASON 2002

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, contributions and papers. 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 0-905729-14-5

