

Cromwelliana

The Journal of
The
Cromwell Association

2017

The Cromwell Association

President:	Professor PETER GAUNT, PhD, FRHistS
Vice Presidents:	PAT BARNES Rt Hon FRANK DOBSON, PC Rt Hon STEPHEN DORRELL, PC Dr PATRICK LITTLE, PhD, FRHistS Professor JOHN MORRILL, DPhil, FBA, FRHistS Rt Hon the LORD NASEBY, PC Dr STEPHEN K. ROBERTS, PhD, FSA, FRHistS Professor BLAIR WORDEN, FBA
Chairman:	JOHN GOLDSMITH
Honorary Secretary:	JOHN NEWLAND
Honorary Treasurer:	GEOFFREY BUSH
Membership Officer	PAUL ROBBINS

The Cromwell Association was formed in 1937 and is a registered charity (reg no. 1132954). The purpose of the Association is to advance the education of the public in both the life and legacy of Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658), politician, soldier and statesman, and the wider history of the seventeenth century.

The Association seeks to progress its aims in the following ways:

- campaigns for the preservation and conservation of buildings and sites relevant to Cromwell
- commissions, on behalf of the Association, or in collaboration with others, plaques, panels and monuments at sites associated with Cromwell
- supports the Cromwell Museum and the Cromwell Collection in Huntingdon
- provides, within the competence of the Association, advice to the media on all matters relating to the period
- encourages interest in the period in all phases of formal education by the publication of reading lists, information and teachers' guidance
- publishes news and information about the period, including an annual journal and regular newsletters
- organises an annual service, day schools, conferences, lectures, exhibitions and other educational events
- provides a web-based resource for researchers in the period including school students, genealogists and interested parties
- offers, from time to time grants, awards and prizes to individuals and organisations working towards the objectives stated above.

Editor of *Cromwelliana*: Dr MAXINE FORSHAW, BSc, PhD

CROMWELLIANA 2017

Series III No 6

Editor: Dr Maxine Forshaw

CONTENTS

Editor's Note	3
Cromwell Day Address (2016)	5
Devolution for the East of England – Again by Jonathan Djanogly, MP	
Cromwell Study Day – Interpreting Cromwell and the Civil War (November 2016)	12
Collecting Cromwell: how Cromwell and the civil wars have been interpreted in museums and galleries by John Goldsmith	
The Bear Inn, Oliver Cromwell and the Committee of the Eastern Association by Dr Clive Holmes	29
Elizabeth Murray, Countess of Dysart and Duchess of Lauderdale (1626–1698) by Serrie Meakins	41
Windsor Castle: Roundhead Fortress by David Woodhall	49
The Schools Essay Prize-Winner 2016 'Does Oliver Cromwell merit a statue outside the Houses of Parliament?'	66
by Rebecca Bowers	
Cromwellian Britain XXVII Cambridge by Dr Andrew Barclay	71
Writings and Sources XVIII The radicalisation of Colonel Thomas Saunders By Prof Peter Gaunt	79

ISBN 0-905729-30-7

CONTENTS (cont'd)

Book Reviews

98

Jonas Moore's Mapp of the Great Levell of the Fenns 1658

by Frances Willmoth and Elizabeth Stazicker

The Battle of Montgomery 1644 – the English Civil War in the Welsh Borderlands

by Jonathan Worton

Reconstructing the New Model Army Vol 2: Regimental Lists 1649 to 1663

by Malcolm Wanklyn

The Army of the Eastern Association – Officers and Regiments

by Laurence Spring

Rethinking the Scottish Revolution: Covenanted Scotland 1637–1651

by Laura Stewart

The Train of Artillery of the Earl of Essex (The accounts of Sir Edward Peyto Lieutenant General of the Train of Artillery Oct 1642 – Sept 1643)

by Simon Marsh

To Settle the Crown – Waging Civil War in Shropshire 1642–1648

by Jonathan Worton

Reviews by Prof Peter Gaunt, Dr Clive Holmes, Dr Patrick Little, Prof John Morrill and Dr Stephen Roberts

Bibliography of Books

113

by Dr Jonathan Fitzgibbons

Bibliography of Journals

118

by Prof Peter Gaunt

Cover image:

This photograph of the Great Hall of Littlecote House shows the Littlecote armoury prior to its acquisition by the Royal Armouries Museum.

Courtesy of the Royal Armouries, Leeds.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Welcome to the 2017 edition of Cromwelliana. In 2016 we saw the first ever Blue Plaque erected to commemorate Cromwell in Cambridge, where he both studied and later became one of the town's MPs. The plaque was unveiled by Sir John Major; and Dr Clive Holmes gave a talk on the background to the location of the plaque and its links to Cromwell and the Eastern Association. He has kindly provided an article on the subject for this issue of the journal. Fittingly, our series on 'Cromwellian Britain' this time also features Cambridge.

The cover image shows the collection of civil war artefacts once housed at Littlecote House in Wiltshire and now safely in the hands of the Royal Armouries. The Study Day in 2016, held at the Royal Armouries, Leeds was entitled 'Interpreting Cromwell and the Civil War' and looked at a range of topics from interpreting battlefields, to living history, to running the National Civil War Centre. John Goldsmith's presentation 'Collecting Cromwell: how Cromwell and the Civil Wars have been interpreted in museums and galleries' is reproduced here.

Also in this issue there is an article on Windsor Castle which, understandably, most people tend to associate with the Royal family; however, during the mid-17th century the castle has an interesting tale to tell, as David Woodall explains in his feature on 'Windsor Castle: Roundhead Fortress'.

My thanks to all the contributors for their valued input to this edition of the journal.

If you are interested in contributing to future issues of the journal, please contact the Cromwell Association via the email address:

editor:jca@btinternet.com

To comply with the Research Excellence Framework policy on open access, authors are welcome to deposit accepted submissions in an institutional or subject repository, subject to a 24-month embargo period after the date of publication. If you require further assistance or clarification on our open access policy, please contact Dr Jonathan Fitzgibbons at:

jonathan.fitzgibbons@gmail.com

CROMWELL DAY ADDRESS 2016

DEVOLUTION FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND – AGAIN

by Jonathan Djanogly, MP

For most British people, Oliver Cromwell would probably be viewed in rather detached and polarised terms. The backbone of the Parliamentary revolution or the great dictator; Lord Protector or Regicide; a victorious military commander or suppressor of the Irish and Scots; the standard bearer for Puritanism or religious fanatic, and so forth.

However, in Huntingdon, which like Cromwell I have had the honour to represent in Parliament, we have a more personal and local view of the man. He was born there, lived there, came from one of the wealthiest local families and became its MP. After falling on hard times and falling out with the local government of Huntingdon, he moved to St. Ives, also in my constituency. It is there that he is supposed to have found faith, lost and gained his fortune, farmed the land and engaged with local issues. It is of course in St. Ives where his rather grand statue now resides.

Accordingly, whilst many see him as a man risen from obscurity, this is not how Cromwell is seen locally, where it is generally understood that he came from landed gentry stock and that his uncle had the huge house (Hinchbrooke) opposite the train station. In effect, in Huntingdonshire he is key to the local historical fabric.

So given all of that you will understand my and local people's great concern when the County Council decided they no longer wished to fund the Cromwell museum and it came under risk of closure. A protest campaign turned into something very much more positive when the County Council agreed to help in the formation of a new Trust. To their credit, the County Council then gave a significant amount of assistance and project leadership in order to save the museum. To cut a long story short, the building is being transferred to the Huntingdon Town Council and the museum will be owned and run by the new Trust. I have to say that I had no idea how complicated it was to run a museum.

But we are now up and running, having gathered a good and experienced team of trustees, of which I am one, with our able chairman, Peter Johnson and our new curator, Corinne Galloway. We have received great support from Huntingdon Town Council and no less than seventy-five volunteer

CROMWELL DAY ADDRESS 2016

DEVOLUTION FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND – AGAIN

helpers who came forward. We also have a Friends group and individual donors and other help, not least from the Cromwell Association, for which I thank you.

Of course this is only the start of the challenge, both in terms of securing our running costs, raising money to upgrade the quality of the museum, and better integrating the Cromwell museum experience with other civil war history offerings in and around the town. But a good start has been made.

My decision as to what to speak about followed a recent Commons debate on devolution proposals in the East of England. One of my colleagues suggested that no such proposals had been tried since Boudicca! Which got me thinking along the lines of: But surely there was devolution during the English Civil War – namely the Eastern Association? And so started some very interesting research which had me concluding that almost any debate on Eastern devolution that we are having now, to a greater or lesser extent already happened in the 17th century. Whether we have learnt the lessons of history, however, is another matter. Let me elaborate.

My first observation is that the devolution argument in the 17th century was, as it is now, a product of political fashion and cycles. Even looking at the last thirty years, we have seen Conservative centralisation of power in Whitehall in the 1980s based on fear of left wing councils, followed by Labour's devolving of regional government and regional spatial strategy proposals followed by their later abolition by the Coalition Government. Now we are moving back to devolution with so-called Combined Authorities or 'regional power houses', although the latest position in the East is that Peterborough and Cambridgeshire do not wish to join with Norfolk and Suffolk. So we are likely to have two mini powerhouses, with debates still hotly going on as to how these new entities should be governed, how they should be staffed, to whom they should be accountable, what powers they should have from Westminster and where the tax to pay for them should be raised. Now this should all sound fairly familiar to you students and masters of 17th century English history because all of these questions were of course considered during the Civil War.

The Eastern Association was formed following a parliamentary-led review in 1642. It went through a three year process of initial weak devolution based

CROMWELL DAY ADDRESS 2016

DEVOLUTION FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND – AGAIN

around participating counties' consent, through to receiving stronger tax-raising powers and leadership in the form of the Earl of Manchester (dare I say mayoral-like powers, although Manchester was unelected). The Association then went back to being a weak body as Parliament increasingly took control at the time of Manchester's political demise and the formation of the New Model Army.

Of course the backdrop then was somewhat different to now. The primary purpose of the Eastern Association was to organise and pay for an army. Furthermore, rebelling against the king and facing being hung, drawn and quartered for one's principles was rather different to, say, being confused nowadays as to which local authority to call up when one's wheelie bin remains uncollected.

Nonetheless, the process of bringing the counties together in the 17th century was probably more complicated then, than it is now. This was not least because the counties would have been so much more parochial in their nature and effectively controlled by local gentry and nobles, who were wary of both outsiders and also excessive Westminster intrusion. Having said that, research does suggest that people also took a keen interest in and were willing to play their part in national affairs. However, it was ultimately the expediency and innovation that war brings that forced required change. Although, even then it was not a smooth process and the achievement of bringing together the seven counties must count as one of the great successes of the Parliamentary cause.

For a start, not all of the counties' gentry or Lord Lieutenants were keen on working together, let alone against the king. Foot-dragging was particularly seen in Huntingdonshire and Cambridgeshire where residual support for the king, together with the opposition of Bishop Wren and Cambridge University, held strong. But these counties were also on the front line and more open to attack by vengeful royalist forces. Indeed, Huntingdonshire did not join the Association until April 1643.

Importantly, then as now, the impetus for devolution did not arise locally but was planned in Westminster and set up by Parliamentary ordinance. Local players in the 17th century originally saw Norfolk and Suffolk and

CROMWELL DAY ADDRESS 2016

DEVOLUTION FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND – AGAIN

Essex joining together, whilst Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire considered joining the South Midlands counties.

Whilst in modern times the mechanism for devolution has been a mix of cajoling by Lord Heseltine and financial sweeteners offered by the Treasury, methods in the Civil War were rather more brutal. An oath of Association was demanded from all county residents – which gave people the uncomfortable decision of calling for Parliament or King. Compliance was enforced by London troops in Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire as it was by Cromwell in March 1643 in Norfolk and Suffolk.

In the early days of the Association the desire to cooperate was driven locally by general agreement of the local notables, its Committee was headquartered in Cambridge and the counties did more or less help each other out. So, for instance, money raised for the fortification of Cambridge also paid for the protection of Huntingdonshire bridges. The Commissioners, of whom Cromwell was one, also shared values and were motivated by their religious faith. The squabbling between Calvinist Covenanters and Independent Puritans didn't come to a head at this time. Furthermore, there was a general view that they supported the king, but that he had to be put back on the right track.

For all of the constitutional changes during its life and its many weaknesses, the unity and efficiency of the Eastern Association played a decisive role in its effectiveness. Accordingly, the army of the Association was generally funded more efficiently than those of the king, whose troops would be more likely to live off the land.

The unity of the Association also meant that most of its counties were kept out of the war, which provided a stable tax base, opportunities for free trade with the Continent and better troop recruitment facilities. It also made it easier to tax (or plunder, depending on your view) royalist families such as those in Lincolnshire, whose 'malignants' paid over the most money raised by the Association.

The Eastern Association itself, in its early days, was more of a strategic talking shop than a power base. Interestingly, in the modern proposals the idea is that in the East of England mayors will be directly elected, but will

CROMWELL DAY ADDRESS 2016

DEVOLUTION FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND – AGAIN

not have much power. Similarly, as with the Eastern Association, it is planned for the new mayor today to be a convenor of representatives appointed by the constituent counties. Ultimately, in the 17th century this convenor role did not work, leading to the Committee of the Association having power increasingly centralised within it and with Manchester standing behind it, effectively calling the shots. Importantly, this included tax raising powers which originally were, as is the proposal for the Combined Authorities now, left in the hands of the individual counties. The first modern powerhouse was recently created in Manchester and it seems as if history is now repeating itself as there are already proposals to devolve more power from Whitehall to Manchester. Will the new proposed mayors in the East likewise soon have to ask for more powers or look again at expanding the size of their Combined Authorities? The lesson of the 17th century would indicate ‘yes’.

Following the threat of Newcastle’s army from the North and the subsequent legislative strengthening of the Eastern Association in the summer of 1643, each county sent two paid commissioners to its Cambridge Committee. Furthermore, powers were devolved to levy troops and raise taxes centrally by the central Eastern Association Committee rather than by county. However, even with these new powers, the Eastern Association still struggled to pay for its army which was increasingly being requested to fight outside of the Eastern area. Many consider that the glue that held the Association together was the personality of the Earl of Manchester. He based himself in Cambridge, but was also quick to support the Association cause in Westminster when necessary.

Perhaps the lesson here is that the personality and ability of the new current proposed Combined Authority mayors will be as great an ingredient for the success of modern devolution as will be the level of powers passed down from Whitehall. The ‘Boris factor’, if you like.

By the end of 1644 the Eastern Association revenues were 50 per cent too little to support its army, through a mixture of corruption, lower reserves and lack of powers to broaden the tax base. At the same time, and for a variety of reasons, the key local motivator, the Earl of Manchester, fell out of favour. At this point the Commons reviewed the Association structure once more.

CROMWELL DAY ADDRESS 2016

DEVOLUTION FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND – AGAIN

The key problem was that whatever devolved powers were put in place, the main ongoing concern of the counties and of the Cambridge Committee was the protection of the counties and, at best, the Association area as a whole, rather than participating in battles outside of the Eastern Association area. The best modern equivalent I can think of are the old Regional Development Agencies' insistence on opening their own offices in places like Beijing or Brussels, and this subsequently diluting the ability of Westminster to sell UK plc as a whole. The problem in 1644 for Westminster was that having the best Parliamentary troops protecting their own homes, from say marauding Newark royalists, was never going to win the war. The defensive advantages of the Eastern Association no longer sat well with Parliament's wish to develop an offensive capability. So the wheel of devolution turned and power was recentralised in Westminster, paving the way for the formation of the national New Model Army. Naturally, the Eastern Association didn't like this and petitioned against it. However, it is interesting to note that by the time the petition was heard in Parliament, three of the best infantry regiments of the Eastern Association had been merged into the New Model Army.

The lesson then as now is clear – whatever devolution may happen, when those in Westminster see differently from the devolved area, it is Parliament who will ultimately call the shots. Our new 'powerhouse' mayors take note. This is even more marked by the fact that in 1645, the by then powerless counties voted to disband the Eastern Association, but were stopped by the Commons who wanted it to stay to organise local defence. And to be fair, this, it did. At Naseby the New Model Army presented 13,000 troops to the king's 8,000. But this overlooks the Eastern Association still having a further 15,000 troops in reserve. In August 1645, with the New Model Army in the West, it was this reserve that chased the king out of the East.

Indeed, I would suggest that the greatest threat to the Eastern Association was not at any point the king, but rather Parliament's centralisation proposals. But what I think to be very impressive was how, ultimately, Parliament and particularly the Commons were able to allocate the available resources according to democratic principles. Arguments raged in Westminster, for instance, as to whether money should go to the Earl of Manchester or Essex's armies or more to the Eastern Association than other Associations. These involved lobbying and hard-fought debates, but also

CROMWELL DAY ADDRESS 2016
DEVOLUTION FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND – AGAIN

gave the Parliamentary side a strength and depth of analysis based on democratic principles that was never present on the royalist side. Indeed, these processes are essentially the ones that still serve us today and certainly form the basis for the devolution proposals that we are now, once again, considering.

Further reading:

Clive Holmes, *The Eastern Association in the English Civil War* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1974; reprinted 2007)

Alfred Kingston, *East Anglia and the Great Civil War: The Rising of Cromwell's Ironsides in the Associated Counties of Cambridge, Huntingdon, Lincoln, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex and Hertford* (originally published 1897; republished 2005)

Jonathan Djanogly is the Conservative MP for Huntingdon which he has represented since 2001. He graduated from Law School in 1988, became a partner in a commercial law firm and is a former Justice Minister. He is currently a trustee of The Cromwell Museum Trust.

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016
INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

COLLECTING CROMWELL: HOW CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WARS HAVE BEEN INTERPRETED IN MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES

by John Goldsmith

This paper was presented, along with several others, at the annual study day of the Cromwell Association held at the Royal Armouries in Leeds in November 2016.

The best word to describe how Cromwell and the civil wars have been interpreted in museums and galleries is sporadic, but that, on its own, would be unfair as history's judgement of Cromwell has been equally sporadic, inconsistent and a source of continuing contention. Even now, approaching four hundred years on, there is no agreed national narrative of this part of our national history. But to understand how, and why, Cromwell and the civil wars have been interpreted, there are several lines of investigation to be pursued.

Firstly, how have museums have changed from the 17th century when they could accurately be described as cabinets of curiosities, through to the 21st century use of technology and digital reconstruction? Secondly, how has Cromwell, and more broadly the period, been viewed by the public at large? Thirdly, where were there collections, who put them together and for what purpose? In the time I have available I am not going to satisfactorily address all three lines of investigation, but I will try to suggest some answers.

Was there any *contemporary collecting* going on during the war itself?¹ To which the answer, thankfully, is yes. The, what must have been at times frantic, if not dangerous, activities of George Thomason, the great collector of civil war tracts and pamphlets, news books and journals, has provided us with a fantastically rich resource for the study of the civil wars. Thomason took a very modern approach in the broad scope of his collection, and the eventual purchase of it by George III, and his presentation of it to the new British Museum in 1761, was a very enlightened act.

But that was print, the province of librarians and archivists. What about objects, artefacts, things, any term you choose, the material culture that reflected the activities of the civil war armies? Alas, there was no Thomason

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016

INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

of objects, who set out to acquire the three dimensional material that could help to interpret the period.

What we do know is that during the war itself, the captured colours, the flags, pennants and other devices, were prized by both royalists and parliamentarians as trophies of war, and they were put on display and sent as gifts to prestigious supporters. Irish Catholics took flags captured at the Battle of Benburb to Limerick, where, after marching them through the streets, they were displayed in the cathedral before being sent to Rome to hang in St Peter's to record the devotion of the Irish people to the Holy See.²

In England, flags and colours captured at Marston Moor were highly prized by Parliament's soldiers. A contemporary account records that they, 'Esteem it a great glory to divide them in pieces and wear them'.³ This was unfortunate as the order then came through that all the coronets and colours that could be, 'got from the soldiers',⁴ should be sent to London, where they were paraded through the streets. The following year, after Naseby, the official parliamentary herald was ordered to register and preserve them, 'in some convenient place ... all captured flags taken from the Enemy'.⁵ The 'convenient place' was Westminster Hall, and following the major battles at Preston, Dunbar and Worcester, the collection was added to and in significant numbers, about 100 after Worcester, for example. On one level this was the display of the spoils of war, but on another it was a collection, added to in an apparently coherent way, and with a register maintained.

Inevitably the exhibition of the flags did not survive the Restoration. In May 1660 it was ordered that they, 'Be forthwith taken down',⁶ and presumably destroyed, as the number of surviving flags (as opposed to illustrations of the same) are incredibly few. Even those that may have avoided deliberate destruction would have been extremely fortunate to have survived, as despite their origins for use on the battlefield, they were inherently fragile, and without great care unlikely to have lasted into the 18th, let alone the 21st century.

The Restoration settlement was too important to allow for any looking back and the new regime sought to eliminate embarrassing reminders of the past.

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016
INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

Any physical evidence which could be removed, was removed, coat of arms taken down, ships renamed, and in the most symbolic way possible, Cromwell's status thoroughly degraded.⁷ The Act of Oblivion sought to, 'bury all seeds of future discord and Remembrance of the former'.⁸ It was the law of the land to forget the civil war. The focus for almost the next two centuries was not to re-fight the civil wars but to construct a new consensus to show, supported by recollections of the 1640s and 1650s, that Puritans or Dissenters could not be trusted with power. The new regime effectively shaped public remembrance of the civil wars by supporting the publication of particular books, and by allowing, if not directly encouraging, the vilification of Cromwell as Lord Protector. Curiosities of the period may have been assembled, but the concept of a coherent and systematic collection, let alone one which challenged the post-Restoration national narrative, was still many years off.

The forerunner of the public museum, as opposed to private collections, began to emerge in the 18th century with commercial enterprises exhibiting collections of weird and wonderful objects. One of the best known was James Salter's. He was better known as Dom Saltero, whose coffee house in old Chelsea showed a disparate collection of natural and man-made objects. Some of them were cast-offs from Sir Hans Sloane's collection, itself the basis of the British Museum collection. It was a jumble of the weird and wonderful, including a piece of the true cross, Job's tears which grew on a tree and the King of Morocco's tobacco pipe, as well as material relating to Cromwell, including coins, medals, seals and prints and his broadsword, displayed alongside two arrows of Robin Hood's and the sword of William the Conqueror.⁹ Dom Saltero's collection was by no means unique and there were a number of other shows scattered throughout London, some of which had material allegedly connected to the civil war in some way or another. Quite possibly some of the material was genuine, but provenance and verification was never allowed to stand in the way of a good story. As the fashion for such collections faded, the contents were sold sometimes to reappear in another collection in due course, and in at least one example, though one suspects others exist, to survive into the 21st century in a museum.¹⁰

The greatest of all curiosities was Cromwell's head, which, after posthumous execution and gibbeting, appeared towards the end of the 18th century as

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016
INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

the centrepiece of an exhibition in London, with a significant entrance fee being charged for the privilege of viewing the semi-embalmed and wizened skull. At a time when public executions were still mass entertainment, viewing the head of a traitorous regicide was probably not thought to be overly distasteful.

The period of the civil war, Commonwealth and Protectorate had also exercised some level of fascination in more polite society. There was a market for Cromwell crowns (the coin designed by Thomas Simon) within a few years of the Restoration, as noted by Pepys, and an example was included along with a Cromwell gold broad in Archbishop Wake's bequest in 1737 of his coin collection to Christ Church College, Oxford. At the same time the Ashmolean had a skull donated that was supposedly that of Cromwell. There were certainly portraits of Cromwell in respectable houses, and Sidney Sussex College in Cambridge, Cromwell's alma mater, received a gift of a portrait of Cromwell in the 1760s from Thomas Hollis. The Walker portrait now in the National Portrait Gallery was transferred from the British Museum in 1879, but it had been bequeathed to the museum almost 100 years before in 1786 by Robert Rich. So, at the same time as Cromwell's head was on show in one part of London, his portraits were being shown in another; how much the audiences for these overlapped we cannot tell.

Events on the other side of the Channel in the late 1780s inevitably made any enthusiasm for English republicanism unfashionable, and possibly dangerous. Material about Cromwell and the civil wars had clearly existed as *social memory*, ie orally communicated memory, but as the events of the 17th century faded, who took on the role of the curators of the significant objects that had survived?¹¹

Elsewhere I have argued that the likelihood of a significant and coherent collection of Cromwelliana having survived in a continuous thread from Cromwell's death in 1658 is, to say the least, remote; and despite later claims for material owned by Cromwell's descendants, the case for it having an unassailable provenance is largely, with one or two exceptions, very weak.¹²

The material known as the Cromwell-Bush collection, the best of which is on display at the Cromwell Museum in Huntingdon, and has been on public exhibition since the late 1940s, owes its existence to the enthusiasm of

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016
INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

Cromwell's direct descendants for their celebrated ancestor. It was three generations after Cromwell's death before anything like a collection began to be assembled by his three great-great granddaughters, Elizabeth, Ann and Letitia. Elizabeth outlived her sisters and on her death the collection passed to her cousin, the last of the Cromwell male line, also named Oliver, who died in 1821. At least one of the objects had been viewed in the 18th century outside the family. Others were acquired quite late in the last surviving Oliver's lifetime, but with a dubious provenance. The Cromwell family collection was kept at Oliver Cromwell's house in Cheshunt Park for the enjoyment of its owners, basking in the reflected glory of his illustrious namesake. There was no suggestion that the collection would, should, or ought to be made available to a wider public. It was a reflection of a form of antiquarianism that was both gentlemanly and moderately fashionable.

Two hundred miles north of Cheshunt, another collection was assembled in a country house for the enjoyment of its owner, Walter Fawkes II of Farnley Hall. Fawkes was a public figure who had been MP for Yorkshire in 1806–07 and later High Sheriff, and in his own words, 'a great big whig all my life'.¹³ He was a prominent anti-slavery campaigner, in the chair at the inaugural meeting of the Hampden Club in 1812 and an advocate of parliamentary reform. Given these political affiliations it is perhaps unsurprising that he was interested in the civil war. His biography in the *History of Parliament* goes so far as to describe it as an *obsession*.¹⁴

The Fawkes estate extended beyond Farnley Hall and included some properties that had previously been owned by the Fairfax family, most notably Menston Hall. Fawkes gathered together at Farnley some objects associated with Fairfax and the civil war, including swords of Cromwell, Lambert and Fairfax, and Fairfax's wheelchair, along with books, documents and some other small items. A contemporary account described that, 'The breakfast room is fitted up with old oak chest and in a magnificent cabinet are preserved some curious memorials of The Troubles in the 17th century'.¹⁵

Fawkes though is best remembered not for his enthusiasm for Fairfax and Cromwell, but for his friendship with, and patronage of, JMW Turner. Turner was a frequent visitor to the family and sketched and painted local scenes; in addition, Fawkes involved Turner in his civil war enthusiasm and

his plans for a museum of the civil wars to be call 'Fairfaxiana'. This is the first reference I am aware of to a proposed civil war museum. A visitor in October 1823 recorded, 'I visited Farnley where besides the family of my friend Mr Fawkes, I found several guests and amongst them most celebrated landscape painter of our time, I mean Turner, who was employed in making designs for a museum intended to contain relics of our civil wars and to be call Fairfaxiana'.¹⁶

Not only was there to be a museum, but it was to be designed by the leading artist of the day. The drawings survive and can be found on the Tate Gallery's website.¹⁷ There are almost 20 drawings including Fairfax's wheelchair, the same one now on display at the National Civil War Centre in Newark, and one of a large dark cabinet with open doors, displaying amongst other things a leather jug, most likely also now on display at Newark.

Turner, I suggest, not only painted what he could see at Farnley but also illustrated other items which he had researched and included in his compositions. For example, there is an image of a set of eight colours; of those identified, they include Ireton's, Fleetwood's, Edward Montagu's and that of the Earl of Essex. The chance that such an enormously significant set of colours had survived all together in one place is so tiny as to be unbelievable. By the 1820s they had all been published, so Fairfaxiana was to be a combination of the actual objects and images from elsewhere. That does seem to be quite modern in its approach. The title *Fairfaxiana*, and the dating to the early 1820s, suggest that this may have been Fawke's response to the collection of text and images by James Caulfield published in 1810 under the title of *Cromwelliana*.

Walter Fawkes II died in 1825 and Fairfaxiana with him, but during the later 19th-century, parts of the collection were displayed from time to time for special occasions in Leeds and York, and the British Archaeological Association took time from the Leeds meeting in 1863 to view the collection at Farnley Hall.¹⁸

The Bush collection and the Fawkes collection were both private collections though parts of both are now on display in public museums. Of the two, the Bush family collection was the more substantial but the family connection

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016
INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

to the protagonist was stronger, although that does not of itself strengthen the provenance of the objects that it contained. There is an interesting comparison to be made between their contents: both had swords supposedly owned by Cromwell and both had his hat or at least a hat at one time owned by Cromwell, though the one in the Bush collection was only given to the family in 1816. That Cromwell owned swords and hats is beyond dispute but how much an image of Cromwell as a hat-wearing, sword-waving individual was shaped by Benjamin West's painting of the 1780s, is an interesting question.¹⁹

The transition from private collections of Cromwelliana and Fairfaxiana, and associated civil war material, to public collections, should be seen in the context of the rise of the modern museum, which was a consequence of a combination of rapid urban development and supportive legislation in the later 19th century.

1845 is a critical date in both Cromwell studies and museum studies. For Cromwellians it is the year of publication of Carlyle's *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*. The great revival in Cromwell's reputation can be linked directly to this event which promoted Cromwell as the great national and religious hero of the non-conformist movement. It is very much Carlyle's Cromwell after whom countless roads are named, statues erected and 50 years later the tercentenary celebrated. Post-Carlyle other key figures of the parliamentary side of the civil war, most notably Hampden and Fairfax, diminish in popular consciousness in favour of Cromwell.

1845 is also the date of the first Museums Act which gave permission to local authorities with a population of more than 10,000 to raise a halfpenny rate for the provision of public museums.²⁰ The motivation for the Act was not primarily educational, but a moral one to provide a space of refuge from the ugliness and drunkenness of rapidly expanding industrial cities. It was trying to introduce higher standards of social behaviour primarily, rather than attempting to impose any standardised national story, which for Cromwell and the civil wars did not, and does not, exist.

The permissive nature of the legislation, and museum provision by local government in this country, has always been non-statutory, which inevitably has led to a hugely uneven pattern of development, dependent on political

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016

INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

champions and generous benefactors, which is why, almost two centuries later, local museum provision is both less than satisfactory or comprehensive.

Public museums in the 19th century contained collections of art, natural history and antiquities. Collections that exhibited local manufacturing were shown as examples of good art and design, but collections that reflected the social development of a town or city, particularly in the previous 300 years, were practically unknown.

The idea that a public museum should collect and display material about a period of civil war and regicide did not sit happily with the new public museum movement. Museums were meant to encourage *good* behaviour. It would have been inappropriate to have Levellers in the galleries whilst there were Chartists on the streets. So despite the presence of statues of Cromwell in cities like Manchester, Bradford and Newcastle, as far as I am aware there was no collection of note that explained his significance, or that of any other leading figure of the civil war, in any relevant local, let alone national, museum. That is not to say that civil war objects did not appear in municipal museum collections in the great expansion of public museums in the second half of the 19th century, but they were not presented as a dedicated, coherent and didactic presentation. That style of presentation was still some way in the future.

A major report on museums and galleries in 1888 was already despairing of the state of local museums: Those who would visit local museums in Britain's smallest towns should be prepared to find dust and disorder reigning supreme. The orderly soul of the museum student will quake at the sight of the Chinese lady's boot encircled by a necklace made of shark teeth or a helmet of one of Cromwell's soldiers.²¹

There was also a contradiction deep in the psyche of the post-Carlyle enthusiasts for all things Cromwellian. This is nowhere better illustrated than in the collection of, and collecting by, the Rev. John de Kewer Williams. He was born in Hackney in 1817 and his interest in Cromwell was a consequence of two things: a notion that his Williams family name linked into the Cromwells, whose origins were Welsh, and his own deep religious conviction that was evident by his early twenties, when he switched his

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016
INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

intention to study medicine to train for the ministry. After serving in the Congregational Church in Ireland, he returned to London and was a founder member of the Evangelical Alliance established in 1846. The purpose of the Alliance was, 'to associate and concentrate the strength of an enlightened Protestantism against the encroachments of Popery and Puseyism and to promote the interests of a scriptural Christianity'.²²

It is unsurprising that Cromwell was his hero. His ministry was spent in what were then villages north of London, Tottenham and Edmonton, and later his birthplace of Hackney, which was rapidly becoming part of the metropolitan sprawl. He maintained an independent ministry, his reputation as a preacher was outstanding and he was much in demand as a popular lecturer. His Cromwell collection started in the 1860s when he wanted to illustrate a lecture on Cromwell with some portraits, and over the next twenty years or so he built up what was to become a very large collection of Cromwelliana and his own private museum devoted to Cromwell. He collected widely, including on his travels in Europe, and very enthusiastically. By the 1880s he had over 800 items, including over 400 representations of Cromwell in prints, paintings, coins and statuettes.²³

His collection was displayed in specially made bookcases in his house: Number 6, The Paragon, Hackney, known to the 1881 census enumerator and the Board of Works as Number 73, Paragon Road. It had a painted glass window in the entrance hall with Cromwell's coat of arms and motto, which has sadly not survived, although the house is still standing. His collection received a number of distinguished visitors but was not open to the general public. In 1883 it was the focus of a special weekend of events in the village of Houghton, in Huntingdonshire, between Cromwell's birthplace of Huntingdon and St Ives.²⁴ The whole collection was transported there and a celebration of Cromwell was organised by the local independent chapel. What distinguished the Williams' collection from that of Walter Fawkes or the Bush family, was that he deliberately eschewed relics, a position which was in part due to a more scrupulous view of provenance; for example, he turned down a Bible claimed to have been owned by Cromwell, as he could prove it was not genuine, but also because his religious outlook, his theological doctrine, would not sit comfortably with the idea of relics. Relics were consistent with the Catholic Church and the devil, and Williams was *iconophobic*. Perhaps another collector, collecting

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016

INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

at the same time, with a less rigid policy, might have acquired some significant material, but we will never know what objects Williams rejected and therefore what he might have collected.

There were calls from others for the collection to be purchased and maintained as a monument to the Protector's memory, but it fell on deaf ears. It is an interesting side note that of historic house museums, dedicated to famous persons, the majority are connected to writers, and two of the earliest in the UK are Carlyle's house in Ecclefechan, opened in 1881 and Milton's cottage in Chalfont St Giles, opened in 1887. It has been suggested that the 'museumisation' of writers' houses has more to do with assertions of national identity than literary merit.²⁵ So despite Cromwell's champion and Cromwell's literary contemporary having museums in the 1880s, Cromwell, as a more divisive political figure, had yet to wait a few more years.

Williams did not doubt the importance of his own collection and offered it to the nation through the National Portrait Gallery, but it was rejected on the grounds that it was composed of reproductions and imaginative works, and so no obvious public home for it was found. With some reluctance it was consigned to the saleroom of Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge and scheduled for sale on 6 May 1889, but another significant private collector, Richard Tangye, intervened and the integrity of the collection was maintained.

Tangye was a Cornish-born industrialist who had risen from a poor background to developing, along with his brothers, a major international industrial company specialising in the manufacture of hydraulic jacks. His company employed over 3,000 people in Birmingham and his entry in the Dictionary of National Biography describes him as a paternalistic and philanthropic employer.²⁶ He was also a collector and was fascinated by the history of English dissent. He built up a fine collection of Wedgwood which he lent to the new Birmingham City Art Gallery, a building which his firm helped to fund. He also, from the mid-1870s, built up his own collection of Cromwelliana and the De Kewer Williams collection was joined to it; the collection was exhibited in his country house at Glendorgal near Newquay in Cornwall. A privately published catalogue of his collection in 1905 lists the contents and it is apparent that his collecting practice was not as

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016

INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

restrictive as that of Williams, including as it did the skull of Richard Brandon, the supposed executioner of Charles 1st. So we have some idea of what was on offer.²⁷

Tangye was knighted in 1894 on the recommendation of Lord Rosebery, a fellow Cromwell enthusiast who later funded the Thornycroft statue of the Lord Protector at Westminster. On Tangye's death in 1905 the collection passed to his eldest son, Harold Lincoln Tangye, who was persuaded to gift it to the new London Museum by Lewis Harcourt, co-founder of the museum and Secretary of State for the Colonies, and another claimant to descent from Cromwell. Harold Tangye received a baronetcy in his own right in the honours list of June 1912, not perhaps an unrelated event. And so for the first time a significant collection of Cromwell-related material passed into the public domain for exhibition, and was unveiled when the new London Museum moved to Lancaster House two years later.

Following the Second World War the museum moved back to its original home in Kensington Palace, and so the major collection of Cromwell material on display from the late 1940s until the 1960s was exhibited in a royal palace. It stayed there until it was united with the collections of the Guildhall Museum to form the new Museum of London, which opened in the Barbican in 1976. It formed part of a chronological sequence of London's history, and by the 1960s and 1970s, although still contested by historians, Cromwell's role in history, and the civil war in general, was less controversial in society at large.

At the 300th anniversary of Cromwell's birth, in 1899, when in several places large commemorative meetings were held, one might have expected that would have stimulated a range of temporary exhibitions and displays about Cromwell and the civil war, but there is little evidence that this was the case. In part this may be explained by a reluctance to display personal curios linked to a Protestant hero, but also because the idea of short-term temporary displays in museums, other than perhaps at art museums, was not yet properly developed. The only example I can find of an exhibition at that time is that of the Cromwell Room and relics in the Sparrow's Nest, a public park, in Lowestoft in Suffolk.²⁸ The origin, provenance and fate of this collection is unknown, but it is interesting to note that it contained at least two hats as well as swords, furniture and firearms. As Cromwell was only in

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016

INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

Lowestoft for a couple of days in March 1643 the chances of him leaving two hats behind seems unlikely!

Popular enthusiasm for Cromwell had peaked with the tercentenary, and the 1930s prompted, what at least in retrospect, if not for many at that time, were uncomfortable comparisons between Cromwell and the European dictators. There was one other major collection assembled and exhibited during this period. The collector was Captain Christy Crawford, one of the founder members of the Cromwell Association in 1937, and a retired army officer. Unlike the previous collectors referred to, he claimed no descent from, or any personal connection with, Cromwell. By the time Crawford appears to have started collecting, in the 1920s, he was already well into his sixties, and his principal interest was in portrait paintings of the main characters of the civil war, which he collected along with books, prints and some miscellaneous armour. He was fortunate to be collecting at a good time, with little interest from others in the subject, and a reasonable amount coming to the market, so he rapidly built up a substantial collection of well over 60 paintings. In 1931 he gave most of his collection to the Cotswold town of Stow-on-the-Wold. His selection of Stow as the recipient of his gift was partly because it has the honour of being the site of the last field-battle of the first phase of the civil war, in March 1646, but also because his wife was well treated there during an illness.²⁹

It is a very mixed collection in terms of its quality but it contains some very good as well as some indifferent paintings, and some later copies. St Edward's Hall in Stow, to which it was given, was already in existence and the gift of the collection to it was enthusiastically received by the management committee. As far as can be seen, no endowment to support the collection was sought, and the collection was seen as an addition to the amenities of the hall, which included a collection of local archaeology and the opportunity to play billiards, badminton and table tennis. That rather eclectic mix of activities still continues in the Hall as it needs to generate income to maintain itself, so shuttlecocks continue to whizz past portraits of 17th century luminaries and possibly even, on occasion, graze them on the nose. Some of the original 1930s labelling for the collection is still in place and it is noteworthy because it does more than describe each painting with title, attribution and date. In some instances date and attribution are omitted all together because the information is not there. What the labels do have,

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016

INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

though, is some measure of interpretation, an explanation of who the subject was, plus their career and significance.

Although the collection at St Edward's Hall is not a museum collection in the conventional sense, it was neither set up as a formal museum, nor run as a museum; it is an interesting link between the style and type of collections which preceded it based on personal collections and enthusiasms, and those which followed it, which deliberately followed a more didactic and educational approach. By the time the Museum of London opened in 1976 the style of exhibition had mutated from that of the 19th century to that with which we are familiar in the 21st century; Crawford's presentation is a step in the evolution of display technique which isn't obvious elsewhere.

Crawford's connection to the Cromwell Association has already been referred to, and the role of the Association in developing the first public museum dedicated to Cromwell and the parliamentary side of the English Civil War, was critical to its success. In June 1949 the Association, acting on behalf of the Bush family, passed the Cromwell-Bush collection, referred to in the paperwork as 'the curios', on loan to Hinchingsbrooke House on the edge of Huntingdon. The Bush collection had resided with various parts of the family since the dispersal of the Cheshunt Estate in the mid-19th century, but the family's enthusiasm for their famous ancestor ensured that it survived as a coherent assemblage of material. It achieved some publicity at the 300th anniversary of Cromwell's birth but had never previously been on public exhibition. Lord Hinchingsbrooke had opened up the family house to the paying public in early 1948, presumably in an attempt to raise some revenue. Lord Hinchingsbrooke and Isaac Foot, another founder member of the Association, must have known each other at Westminster, and it was this connection which led to the Bush loan going to Huntingdon.

During the 1950s the Association pursued the objective of creating a permanent museum about Cromwell, and local interest in Huntingdon grew, perhaps stimulated by the presence of the collection at Hinchingsbrooke. This culminated in an exhibition of Cromwell and civil war material in July 1958 at Huntingdon Town Hall, to mark the 300th anniversary of his death.³⁰ It was the success of this exhibition that encouraged one determined local councillor, Dr Edward Powley, to try to achieve a museum dedicated to Cromwell in the town. The availability of the Old Grammar

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016

INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

School Building, referred to at the time as the Norman Building, and a combination of support from local councillors and council officers led to Huntingdonshire County Council taking up the challenge, which led to the opening of the museum in the refurbished building in October 1962. The displays were densely packed, with a considerable number of loans from individuals and institutions, many of whom had initially lent to the 1958 exhibition. Powley wanted to show everything possible and supplemented the displays with a guidebook which provided the supporting interpretation.³¹

The museum opened with a rather motley collection of second-hand showcases, reminiscent of the style of presentation at Lancaster House in 1914, rather than the new style of museum exhibition that was beginning to be seen in the 1950s and 1960s. The museum survived local government reorganisation in 1974 but there was no radical alteration until the late 1980s. The design and display department of the relatively new Area Museum Council had made a series of proposals for a new display in the mid 1970s, but they were all deemed inappropriate and rejected; the eventual revamped display in 1988 was conservative in its approach, with modest levels of interpretation introduced into the exhibition.

The purpose of the Cromwell Museum at Huntingdon was first and foremost an educational one, with a traditional view of museums as primarily being about interpreting collections for public benefit. It was educative and serious in its purpose, and was seen as more than a local endeavour.

Since the mid-1980s there have been several new developments, but the motivation of all of them, the Commandery in Worcester, the failed Civil War Centre in Great Torrington, Oliver Cromwell's House in Ely, and the new National Civil War Centre in Newark, has been a slightly different one. In all of these, the promise of economic development through growth in tourism, stimulated by a new or enhanced attraction, has been the prime motivation. That emphasis has inevitably helped to steer the approach each has taken and the visitor offer they have made.

The interpretation of Cromwell and the civil wars has gone through several distinct phases: the initial triumphalism of war booty, swiftly followed by the

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016
INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

silence imposed by the Restoration and Act of Oblivion; gentlemanly antiquarianism stimulated by actual or assumed family and proprietorial connections; veneration arising from, and adoration of, Cromwell as a Protestant hero; and finally the more systematic and ordered approach of didactic interpretation in an attempt at objectivity. In each phase, the number of well-provenanced, high-quality objects has declined.

George Orwell wrote in an essay in 1944, 'History is written by the winners'.³² Perhaps one of the biggest challenges that faces all of those engaged in attempting to interpret Cromwell and the civil wars is the complexity of dealing with a conflict that ultimately had no clear winner. Even at this distance in time, perhaps the role of curators should be to engage in debates about the civil wars, the personalities, their significance and the consequences of the events, and encourage visitors to reinterpret them for themselves.

Postscript:

As noted earlier, this paper was presented at the annual study day of the Cromwell Association on the theme of *Interpreting Cromwell and the Civil War*, held at the Royal Armouries in Leeds in November 2016. As a consequence this paper deliberately did not refer to the collections of the Royal Armouries. The principal collection of civil war material held by the Armouries is the magnificent Littlecote Collection which was acquired in 1985. (See Thom Richardson and Graeme Rimer, *Littlecote: the English Civil War Armoury* (2012) for full details). What was not mentioned at the study day is the presence of the figure of King Charles Ist in the 'Line of Kings' at the Tower of London (which depicts the armour of successive sovereigns, mounted on carved wooden horse and dummies). This post-Restoration exhibition dates from possibly as early as 1660.

¹ The term 'contemporary collecting' is used in museums to describe an active and structured policy of acquiring objects at the point of creation and/or use.

CROMWELL STUDY DAY: NOVEMBER 2016
INTERPRETING CROMWELL AND THE CIVIL WAR

- ² A. Young (ed.), *The English emblem tradition 3. Emblematic flag devices of the English civil wars 1642-1660* (Toronto:1995)p. xxvii, fn30
- ³ Captain William Stuart, *A full relation of the late victory obtained(through God's providence) by the forces under the command of Generall Lesley, the Lord Fairfax, and the Earl of Manchester.* (London:1644) p.12
- ⁴ Stuart, *ibid.*p.12
- ⁵ Young fn.31
- ⁶ Young fn.39
- ⁷ Matthew Neufeld, *The civil wars after 1660. Public remembering in late Stuart England* (Woodbridge:2013) p.20
- ⁸ 12 Car.II c.11 *An act of free and general pardon and oblivion* 1660
- ⁹ Richard D.Altick, *The shows of London* (Harvard:1978)
- ¹⁰ John Goldsmith, 'Does Cromwelliana exist?' in Jane Mills (ed.), *Cromwell's legacy* (Manchester:2012) p.49
- ¹¹ Neufeld, *ibid.*,p.6
- ¹² Goldsmith, *ibid* pp.33-56
- ¹³ M.Sharple, 'The Fawkes Turner connection and the art collection at Farnley Hall., Otley 1792-1937' *Northern History* 26 (1990) p.136
- ¹⁴ <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1790-1820/member/fawkes-walter-ramsdens-1769-1825> Winifred Stokes and R G Thorne
- ¹⁵ John Preston Neale, *Views of the seats, mansions and castles of noblemen and gentlemen in England, Wales and Scotland* v4 (London:1829) p.50
- ¹⁶ John Cam Hobhouse, *Recollections of my life by John Cam Hobhouse, Baron Broughton 1768-1869* (Cambridge: 1901) p.28
- ¹⁷ To see, search holdings <http://www.tate.org.uk/search?q=fairfaxiana>
- ¹⁸ The British Archaeological Association, Leeds meeting, October 12th-19th in *The Gentleman's magazine and historical review* (December 1863) pp.709-723
- ¹⁹ West's painting *Oliver Cromwell and the mace to be taken away when he expelled the Long Parliament* was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1783. West was concerned with accuracy and would have used any available contemporary prints as evidence for his composition. He published a print of the painting in 1789 and different versions of it were published throughout the 19th century. The imagery of the painting, I suggest,

influenced subsequent interpretations of Cromwell. The painting is now in the Montclair Art Museum, New Jersey, USA.

- ²⁰ 8 & 9 Vict.c43 *The Museums Act* 1845
- ²¹ Thomas Greenwood *Museums and Galleries* (London:1888) quoted in Tony Bennett *The Birth of the Museum* (London:1995) p.2
- ²² E A Livingstone (ed.), *The Concise Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford:2006)
- ²³ Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge, *Catalogue of the Cromwellian Museum of the Rev.J.De Kewer Williams* (London:1889)
- ²⁴ *Houghton Festival July 1883 Cromwellian Celebration programme* (St.Ives:1883)
- ²⁵ Linda Young, 'Literature, museums and national identity; or why are there so many writers' house museums in Britain?' *Museum History Journal* 8:2 pp.229-246
- ²⁶ W.B.Owen, 'Tangye, Sir Richard (1833-1906) rev.H.C.G.Matthew *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford:2004) [<http://oxforddnb.com/view/article/36413>, accessed 13 October 2016]
- ²⁷ Sir Richard Tangye, *The Cromwellian Collection of mss., miniatures and medals etc. in the possession of Sir Richard Tangye, Glendorgal, Newquay, Cornwall* (Privately printed:1905)
- ²⁸ *Illustrated London News* 22nd July 1899 p.96
- ²⁹ *The Captain Christy Cranford English Civil War Collection* (Stow-on-the-Wold:2016)
- ³⁰ Huntingdonshire County Council, *Oliver Cromwell exhibition tercentenary celebration. The Shire Hall Huntingdon July 24th-30th 1958* (Huntingdon:1958)
- ³¹ E.B. Powley, *The Cromwell Museum in Huntingdon* (Huntingdon:1965)
- ³² George Orwell 'As I please' 4th February 1944 in Sonia Orwell & Ian Angus (eds.), *The collected essays, journalism and letters of George Orwell* v.3 (London:1970) p.110

John Goldsmith is a former curator of the Cromwell Museum and since 2016 has been the chairman of The Cromwell Association.

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

by Dr Clive Holmes

This lecture was given on the 10 December 2016 as part of the day celebrating the unveiling of the blue plaque which was placed at the site of the Bear Inn, the first blue plaque connecting Cromwell to the city.¹

On 14 October 1662 Samuel Pepys, visiting his relatives and on business for his patron, the Earl of Sandwich, stayed in the Black Bear Inn in Cambridge. He breakfasted next morning with Dr Fairebrother, a fellow of King's, who told the diarist 'how the room we were in was the room where Cromwell and his associated officers did begin to plot and act their mischiefs in these counties'.² The mythologizing of Oliver Cromwell was already underway. But the Bear had played an important role in the early stages of the Civil War. It was the official meeting place of the Committee of the Eastern Association for about a year until the spring of 1644. The foundation texts, first juxtaposing the Bear and the Committee are dated 15–16 April 1643. Two printed orders were signed off by the clerk of 'the Commissioners of the association now sitting at Cambridge'. The first dealt with the garrisoning of the Castle and town – the soldiers should not desert their colours; they should not embezzle, pawn or sell their equipment; they should not tipple in alehouses 'to the waste of their pay'. The second appointed a sub-committee with particular responsibility for the issue of passes for those who sought to enter or leave Cambridge. To this was appended a note: 'all are to take notice that the subcommittee aforesaid do sit at the signe of the Bear in the chamber next to the grand Committee chamber'.³

On the 20 January 1644 Parliament passed a key Ordinance for the Eastern Association, and it was on this legislation that the Army of the Association, the army that played the key role in the shattering defeat of the northern Royalists at Marston Moor, was based. It was a powerful, coherently organised force of 10 regiments of infantry, one of dragoons, and 44 troops of horse, with a strong administrative structure to back it. The Ordinance had one consequence relevant to our theme. Sometime in the spring of 1644 the newly reconstituted Committee of the Association moved to more upmarket accommodation in Trinity College, which had been taken over for his lodgings by the new commander of the Association's forces, the Earl of Manchester.⁴ The Bear was still used by the Committee responsible for local

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

taxation and defence in Cambridgeshire. Their papers were still stored in cupboards in the Inn when Pepys took his breakfast there in 1664.⁵

What is the Association, and who were these commissioners meeting at the Bear? The first question is easily answered: the Association is a territorial unit. Initially it conjoined the five counties of Essex, Hertfordshire, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, and Norfolk, but it was expanded to include Huntingdonshire on 26 May 1643, and Lincolnshire on 20th September of that year. The history of the commissioners is less clear cut: that history and Cromwell's role within it will oblige us to examine some obscure legislative and political manoeuvres.

I - The creation of the Eastern Association

The formal origin of the Association is to be found in two rather different documents. First a Parliamentary Ordinance of the 20th December 1642; second, in an agreement between representatives of the constituent counties, meeting in Bury on 9th February following, where it was agreed to implement the legislation. The Ordinance instructed the local committees to offer an oath of association to the inhabitants of their counties, in which they acknowledged parliamentary authority. They were empowered to seek subscriptions for the levying of new forces and to raise compulsory taxes to meet the costs of fortifications and the purchase of munitions. And they were to disarm anyone who refused to contribute or to pay taxes, and to employ their weapons and horses for the defence of the Association. Finally, the forces raised in the Association, to be commanded by Major General Lord Grey of Warke, could be employed beyond its borders.

Essex, that 'place of most life of religion in the land', 'the first-born of the parliament' began soliciting for subscriptions almost immediately after the passage of the Ordinance. In Hertfordshire the execution of the Ordinance was considered in January, but abandoned after it was assailed by a local lawyer. Elsewhere, nothing was done. The attitude of the moderate local governors who neglected the legislation was caught by the MP, Sir Simonds D'Ewes: the Ordinance was 'full of dangerous consequence'; it was more likely to set Norfolk and Suffolk 'into a combustion instead of joining them in an association'. But the county governors eventually acted. In late January 1643 rumours of an invasion by Prince Rupert in support of a rising by the

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

local papists finally galvanised the constituent counties. The result was the Bury conference, and its (rather understated) agreement to implement the Ordinance. At the end of the month Lord Grey arrived at Norwich; he demanded that the Ordinance's provision for the seizure of the arms of those who had refused to commit themselves to the cause by loans on the Propositions, accepting the Militia ordinance, or entering the Association, be strictly enforced. Sir John Potts, the Norfolk MP who had attempted to retain local unity by 'quiet and connivance' returned to London 'seeing I cannot do the service here which was my aim, to preserve the country in peace'.⁶ His foreboding, and those earlier expressed by D'Ewes, were quickly realised. A series of insurrections broke out in Norfolk and Suffolk, swiftly crushed by the energy and vigilance of, of course, Oliver Cromwell.

Galvanised by the fear of Royalist incursion, the diffident local governors in the five counties began soliciting contributions and raising the volunteer forces mandated by the December Ordinance. At Cambridge in March, new fortifications were erected at the Castle, supplies of arms and munitions arrived from London, monies were solicited from the surrounding villages. Cromwell vigorously participated in all these activities, embodying his own regiment of horse, co-operating with the committee of local worthies designated by Parliament to rule in Cambridgeshire, encouraging the committees for the various counties that formed the Association to send their newly raised troops and, of course, cash to the rendezvous in Cambridge. His involvement at Cambridge was interrupted by the need for swift action to suppress the threat of a Royalist coup at Lowestoft, and from 12–23 March he and his troopers rode a taxing circuit that took him to Norwich, then Lowestoft, then Yarmouth, then Lynn, then Thetford. His energy seemed inexhaustible.

II - The Committee at the Bear

But throughout March there was no Committee of the Association at Cambridge. No overarching structure had been mentioned in the December Ordinance, and the Committee makes its first appearance only in April. On 7th April Lord Grey moved the bulk of the infantry and a few of the troops of horse that had assembled at Cambridge to co-operate with the Earl of Essex, the parliamentary commander-in-chief in the Thames valley and the Chilterns. On that date Cromwell and a group of men mostly from

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

Cambridgeshire, but with representatives from the other four counties, sent out a request for contributions to the fortification of Cambridge.⁷ Three days after this Cromwell with his cavalry moved to Huntingdon to defend the northern and north-western flanks of the Association. The Committee of the Association effectively existed from 7th April, and we know something of its operations in the 'Bear text' of the 16th, already noted. But they were not formally constituted and empowered until a commission from Lord Grey, later confirmed by the Earl of Essex, was signed on 21st April. Grey nominated a pool of local governors from whom two from each county (and one from Norwich) were to meet at Cambridge; the men appointed could rotate, providing 11 were always present. They were empowered to take command of all local forces within the counties, to purchase necessary supplies, to receive money, and to seize the weapons and horse of 'malignants'.

Cromwell was not nominated as a Commissioner by Grey, though as an MP he had an automatic right to attend their meetings when in Cambridge. But in the next three months he was never there – his military activities kept him in the east Midlands. Only when those activities provoked the lethargic Royalist commander, the Earl of Newcastle, to advance his forces (if only temporarily) from their endless siege of Hull, when Lincoln and the bulk of that county was lost, do we find Oliver intermittently back in Cambridge – he was there on 5th August and on the 29th he joined the commissioners of the Association in complaining to the Essex committee that their new levies had been sent to Cambridge without proper equipment – indeed, without equipment at all.

But if Cromwell played little direct role in the Committee of the Association in the spring and summer of 1643, he was constantly involved in seeking to get them to act, and to emulate his own energy and conviction.

Two of his letters to them during this period are worth analysing:

1. 6 August 1643 [from Huntingdon, forwarding a desperate letter from Lord Willoughby of Parham, commander in Lincolnshire].⁸ Willoughby reported that his forces, having been obliged to surrender Gainsborough, had abandoned Lincoln to the Royalists, and that those of his men who had not deserted cowered in Boston 'very poor

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

in strength'. It is no longer disputing, but out instantly all you can. Raise all your bands; send them to Huntingdon; get up what volunteers you can; hasten your horses ... I beseech you spare not, be expeditious and industrious ... You must act lively; do it without distraction'.

Oliver's letter pulsates with energy – but we should note the irritation implicit in its phrasing: 'no longer disputing'; 'do it without distraction'. The next, earlier, letter should explicate something of these frustrations.

2. 13 June 1643 [from the vicinity of Newark].⁹ Cromwell insists on the need for pursuing an aggressive strategy, and the folly of standing on the defensive. His specific target is Col. Sir John Palgrave, whose Norfolk infantry will not move from Wisbech, where they can defend the route into their county: 'Let him not keep a volunteer at Wisbech – I beseech you do not. He hath a mind to this company and the other company to please himself in composing his regiment. This is not a time to pick and choose for pleasure. Service must be done. Command you and be obeyed ... the Lord give you and us zeal'.

Command you and be obeyed! That is precisely what the Cambridge Commissioners could not do for most of 1643.

Despite the issue of Grey's 22nd April commission, the Cambridge Committee was consistently neglected by the authorities in the constituent counties. The key issue here was control of the purse strings: this was located in 'the particular committees of the several counties'. The Cambridge Committee made several attempts to secure legislation providing more revenue, and, more significantly, establishing a central Treasury: two initiatives to these ends were undertaken in May, and another in June. A little more money was made available by Parliament, but control of its collection and disbursement remained with the counties.

Several unfortunate consequences followed from this arrangement:

1. General, 'common', charges – eg for the general officer cadre of Grey's brigade, for his artillery train, for scouts and messengers, for

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

the fortifications of Cambridge – went unpaid. Not until June did Parliament agree on the rates at which the constituent counties should be proportionally charged for these expenses. A consequence of this was that much energy was wasted at Cambridge as the counties argued the proportions that each should bear (the long-standing feud between Norfolk and the city of Norwich was enthusiastically resurrected) and quibbled about the accuracy of sums charged against them.

2. The counties, controlling the disbursement of money, neglected the orders from Cambridge concerning the movement of ‘their’ troops. Local considerations took precedence over the orders of the directive body of the Association. In June only one of the three companies of infantry that Essex was requested to send to Cambridge had been mobilised. The requests for money and supplies from the Cambridge Committee, aware of their impotence, were phrased in language that was hysterical and self-righteous, and were increasingly seen as ‘crying wolf’ by the counties. In July William Cage, the radical MP for Ipswich, calmed his constituents’ fears of impending assault, raised by the ‘Cambridge informations’: these, as usual, were ‘causeless alarms’. Cage rather undercut his scepticism by hinting that the Royalists might have some designs against the Association and (typically of the predominance of local concerns) went on to suggest that it might be wise to expend money on renewing the fortifications of Ipswich.¹⁰
3. By July it was proving difficult to ensure that the counties sent the commissioners they were required to provide by Grey’s instructions. By the end of July the supposedly representative body of the Association consisted almost entirely of Cambridgeshire men (leavened by one from Huntingdonshire) whose horizons were thought by the Earl of Essex, by MPs, and by the county committeemen of Essex and Suffolk, to be no wider than the interests of their own county.¹¹

It was the military crisis in August, the loss of Lincolnshire at the beginning and the revolt of King’s Lynn at the end of that month, which changed the situation. It precipitated a new burst of legislation concerning the Association and began a serious reconsideration of its material and

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

constitutional arrangements. The Parliamentary response was rapid as the crisis developed, though it indicated no coherent plan: a series of enactments were passed piecemeal. First, to raise men: 10,000 foot and dragoons were voted to be raised on 8th August, and the Earl of Manchester was appointed as commander; the next day a powerful cavalry force was voted; on the 16th August an Ordinance was passed empowering the Association to impress 20,000 men for military service.

Votes could not be turned into soldiers rapidly, as Manchester complained. But he had a more fundamental gripe. Parliament had voted men, but no financial provision to equip or support them. The bulk of the levies sent to the siege of Lynn were, wrote Manchester, ‘in so naked a posture, that to employ them were to murder them’. Some short-term expedients were voted, but the key legislation filling the obvious gap was passed on 20th September and on 11th October. The first Ordinance (which also added Lincolnshire to the Association) instructed the counties to raise a weekly tax of £5,630 for three months, but disbursement of the sums raised was still left to the county authorities. The second allowed Manchester to take a third of all sums raised by the sequestration of Royalists’ estates, and empowered him to reassess those who had not made voluntary contributions to the Parliamentary cause commensurate with their wealth. Here we have the first glimmer of a central Treasury.¹²

So by October 1643 a much more substantial army, far better financed, had been created from the Association by Parliament. Did Cromwell play a role in any of this? Certainly not directly, nor in any way that has left much trace in the record. Cromwell was in Lincolnshire throughout this period. He had little time for considered reflection on the weaknesses, logistical, fiscal and political, of the system, though he continually experienced them very directly – in late September he ‘wept when he came to Boston and found no monies for him from Essex and other counties’; he was in tears again in mid-November. Basically, he sought to make a flawed system work, bombarding Cambridge and the authorities in the counties with requests for levies, for supplies and for cash. Two letters from this period suggest that he did recognise the need not merely to harangue and cajole the locals, but to lobby Parliament for legislation that would strengthen his forces and meet their perpetual shortages of funds. This emerges in his letter of 11th September to Oliver St John, his cousin and fellow-MP, in which he

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

complained not only of his own lack of money but emphasised that ‘There is no care taken how to maintain that force of horse and foot raised and a-raising by my Lord Manchester...the force will fall if some help not. Weak counsels and weak actings undo all’.¹³ A week later the Ordinance that gave Manchester the required provision was passed. In early October Cromwell wrote to another MP, Sir Thomas Barrington, also a relative, acknowledging that the last Ordinance ‘hath provided for me’ but noting ‘paper pays not, if not executed’.¹⁴ He asked Barrington to give further consideration to the matter.

III - The Ordinance of the 20th January 1644

This enactment, as I suggested in my introduction, is the key constitutional document in the history of the army of the Eastern Association. The piecemeal legislation of the autumn of 1643 had left a series of problems and anomalies, which were resolved by the new Ordinance. Three key issues, in particular, were settled. First, the confused command structure in Lincolnshire, which had been added to the Association without considering the commission given earlier to Lord Willoughby of Parham to command in the county, was clarified in Manchester’s favour. Second, the relationship between the forces of the Association and the Parliamentary commander-in-chief, Lord General Essex, was resolved. Essex had been antagonised by the establishment of Manchester’s quasi-independent command in the autumn, both because he had lost some of his forces that had been raised within the Association in the spring, and because he saw the new army (correctly) as a slight upon his own ineffectual generalship in 1643. As with Willoughby, the issue was resolved in Manchester’s favour; the legislation contained no suggestion of his subordination to Essex.¹⁵ Thirdly, and most germane to my theme in this essay, the relationship between Manchester and his central administrators, and the county committees was put on a new footing.

Two difficulties had plagued the fiscal administration of the Eastern Association in 1643. The first was the sheer lack of adequate financial provision; this was to a large degree obviated by the slew of Ordinances passed in September and October – though the 20th January legislation raised the rate by a further 50% to £33,780 a month. The second was that the counties retained fiscal control, a practice that largely continued even after the autumn legislation. This was complex and inefficient and created a

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

series of anomalies which, collectively, were damaging to morale and to military efficiency. Soldiers from one county might be better paid than those from another, and they might be differently equipped. The county authorities disputed endlessly about which county was responsible for what payments. Capt. Poe's Suffolk troop was one of the first to blockade Lynn after its revolt, and it requisitioned local money and supplies to enable it to perform this role: subsequently the Norfolk Committee angrily badgered their Suffolk colleagues to repay the sums Poe had raised. And the system also placed a disproportionately heavy burden on frontier counties, such as Huntingdonshire, subject to intermittent Royalist incursions.

Worse, the system of financing still encouraged the local authorities to think of the forces as theirs, despite Manchester's commission. Not only might they have their own patronage agenda (the Essex Committee complained bitterly when Manchester chose the officers for the newly-raised levies from their county in late August) but they might seek to deploy their men in accordance with their own strategic preferences – once again, usually local defence. So in mid-October the county of Essex did nothing when Cambridge warned, almost hysterically, of a serious attack by a Royalist raiding party – 'your forces must march night and day to get into the town to relieve it, as you love religion, the laws, your country, the Church of God'.¹⁶ This desperate plea produced (in the sarcastic denunciation by Lady Judith Barrington of her husband Sir Thomas and the other Essex governors for their supine behaviour) 'twenty people with pitchforks'.¹⁷

And, as before the August crisis, the decentralised system weakened the diurnal administrative role of the Cambridge Committee of the Association. Their treasury was bare, they had mortgaged their credit, they spent endless time and ink seeking payment from the counties which, again, responded with quibbles over the sums demanded of them. The authority of the Committee was further undermined by the failure of the counties (after an initial euphoria occasioned by Manchester's appointment) to send representatives, to the point where the Committee was 'in danger of dissolution through the non-appearance of commissioners'. On 23rd October, Sir William Rowe, who had played a major role at Cambridge for the preceding month, returned to Essex in high dudgeon: his local colleagues had been 'deafe' to his letters, and failed to send 'men, money or commissioners'.¹⁸ The new legislation also produced a constitutional

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

challenge in October to the weak authority of the Cambridge Committee: the Ordinance of 20th September had nominated new committeemen for each of the constituent counties, and outlined their powers. But it made no mention of the overarching Committee of the Association. In consequence ‘our very subsistence is questioned’. Did the legislative omission ‘null and make voyde this generall Committee of the Association’ void the authority of the latter, ‘as is conceived and objected by some?’¹⁹

Manchester’s absolute control of his army, and of its budget, was instituted and emphasised in the Ordinance of 20th January 1644. The federalist fiscal system was abandoned, and the counties were instructed to raise the required sums and bring them to Manchester’s treasury at Cambridge. The counties were a milk cow, heavily taxed to support a powerful army. This was a situation that angered many of the local elites, but they could do nothing about it save protest. The ‘horrible oppressions’ by Manchester’s appointed fiscal agents – ‘persons of mean rank & strangers in the country’, ‘harpies’ – were the subject of complaint to Parliament. Similarly, the Essex Committee, warned of a threatened Royalist incursion in the summer of 1644, pointedly reminded Westminster of ‘our forces at York at this time’.²⁰ The problem was, they were no longer our forces.

With the Ordinance of 20th January to back him, Manchester was able to build a proper administrative structure at Cambridge: treasurers; an audit department; purchasing departments for horse and equipment; a medical staff. All this was supervised by a new standing committee, dominated by a permanent caucus of minor gentlemen and lawyers, all demonstrably Puritans, paid at a daily rate for their services – 7/6d a day, provided they resided at Cambridge for a month at least – guaranteeing considerable continuity.

This transformation was accomplished by the radical and middle group MPs in the Commons, but it was pushed through after a carefully planned lobbying campaign which involved the London press, particularly the *Parliament Scout* newspaper, by petitions from the godly in the counties, by the presence of Manchester himself at Westminster. But the two foci of this essay were also active. Cromwell spoke in favour of the new legislation in the Commons on 17th January, and went out of his way not to antagonise the Earl of Essex and his supporters in the Commons; on 22nd he assailed

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND
THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

Lord Willoughby's incompetent command and undisciplined troops in Lincolnshire. In December a deputation from the Cambridge Committee came up to Westminster with petitions pressing for Manchester to be given further authority over the militias in the constituent counties, and protesting the attempts by the Earl of Essex to command detachments of their army over Manchester's head.

Such action by the Bear Committee, in conjunction with Cromwell, guaranteed the former's novel role in relation to the army of the Association – and the move to their more salubrious quarters in Trinity!

- ¹ The argument of this paper is largely derived from my book *The Eastern Association in the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1974: re-printed 2007), part II, pp. 31-116. I have not cited this in detail in the paper. Citations are limited to points where I have developed arguments suggested in the book. I am grateful for assistance with and comment on this paper from Jon Fitzgibbons, Graham Hart and Ismini Pells.
- ² Robert Latham and William Mathews (eds), *The Diary of Samuel Pepys: vol. 2 1662* (London, 1971), p. 24
- ³ The original printed orders are in vol. 2 of the Bowtell collection in Downing College. They are reproduced in C.H. Cooper (ed.), *Annals of Cambridge: vol. III* (Cambridge, 1845), pp. 343-44.
- ⁴ SP 28/25 fo. 459, a bill presented to the Committee sitting at the Bear; BL Add. 15672 f.37 v, an order for hearing of charges against a 'Scandalous Minister' at the Bear.
- ⁵ TNA E 134 16 Charles II/Mich.23, Deposition of John Millicent.
- ⁶ Holmes, *Eastern Association*, pp. 64-7
- ⁷ British Library, Stowe MS 807 ff. 117v-118v. The signatories consisted of Cromwell and twenty men from Cambridgeshire, plus one man from Essex, and two each from Hertfordshire, Norfolk and Suffolk.
- ⁸ W.C. Abbott (ed.), *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: vol. 1, 1599-1649* (Cambridge, Mass., 1937), p. 251.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 235-6.
- ¹⁰ Ipswich and East Suffolk Record Office, HD 36/2781 no. 28.
- ¹¹ Holmes, *Eastern Association*, pp. 85-88
- ¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 89-107

THE BEAR INN, OLIVER CROMWELL AND
THE COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION

- ¹³ *Letters and Speeches*, I, p. 259
¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 264-65
¹⁵ Holmes, *Eastern Association*, pp. 107-108 (Willoughby); 107, 109-114 (Essex)
¹⁶ British Library, Egerton MS 2647 f. 344.
¹⁷ British Library, Egerton MS 2646 f. 273
¹⁸ British Library, Egerton MS 2647 f. 359.
¹⁹ Bodleian Library, Nalson MS III, 46.
²⁰ Holmes, *Eastern Association*, pp. 187, 190-1.

Dr Clive Holmes taught at Cornell University (1969-1988) and Lady Margaret Hall Oxford (1988-2013). He is the author of *The Eastern Association in the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1974 and 2007) and *Why was Charles I Executed* (London, 2006).

ELIZABETH MURRAY, COUNTESS OF DYSART AND
DUCHESS OF LAUDERDALE (1626–1698)

by Serrie Meakins

For the past two years I have been studying the life of Elizabeth Murray as part of my Masters in Biography at the University of Buckingham. I was drawn to her partly because, since retiring as a history teacher, I have been a volunteer guide at her home, Ham House in Richmond, Surrey, but mainly because she is such a complex and interesting woman.

Elizabeth Murray's life covered the major events of the seventeenth century – Civil War, execution of a king, Interregnum, Restoration, plague, fire and the Glorious Revolution. She lived through a period when ideas about politics and religion, about loyalty, to your family and to your king, were turned upside-down, and her life was lived at the centre of the action. She was an heiress in her own right, property owner, aristocrat, spy, political hostess, patron of the arts and an elite member of the British establishment. She was, indeed, one of the outstanding women of her time.

Elizabeth was the eldest daughter of William Murray, who had been 'whipping-boy' for, and later, courtier to, Charles I. As well as being a loyal Crown servant, William became a member of the Whitehall group, a set of connoisseurs and collectors of art surrounding Charles I. He was an educated man, of refined taste, albeit Bishop Burnet famously described him as 'very false; and of so revengeful a temper that rather than any of the counsels given by his enemies should succeed, he would have revealed both his king and them'. In the absence of more reliable evidence, Burnet's assessment has held good. He goes on to say of Mr Murray, 'he had one particular quality, that when he was drunk which was very often, he was upon a most exact reserve, though he was pretty open at all other times'.¹ William could claim royal blood through a distant illegitimate line from James II of Scotland, yet his father was a mere minister from Dysart in Fifeshire, so he married well when he wed Catherine Bruce, niece of the Laird of Clackmannan. Catherine was a dignified, brave and courteous woman, as her later fights with Parliament testify, and together they raised five daughters, one of whom died in infancy. For his services to the Crown, in 1626, William had been rewarded with Ham House, near Richmond in Surrey, where Elizabeth and her three sisters ('pitifull crooked things' according to a visitor in 1644) were raised.² Elizabeth was well-schooled by her father, receiving an intellectual education as well as learning the more

ELIZABETH MURRAY, COUNTESS OF DYSART AND
DUCHESS OF LAUDERDALE (1626–1698)

domestic skills expected of a woman of her class. It was foreseen that Elizabeth would, through marriage, ally her family with another powerful landowning family and would go on to produce many children. It was never anticipated that she would become one of the leading ladies of the century.

Elizabeth was born in 1626, so she was sixteen when Civil War broke out in 1642. Up till that point, she had led a quiet life in peaceful Ham. After 1637, when her father acquired the Lordships of Ham and Petersham as well as the lucrative monopoly on the import of sweet wines, Elizabeth was exposed to the acme of seventeenth century taste. Franz Klein, superintendent of the Mortlake tapestry factory oversaw the work of several of the king's craftsmen as they built the magnificent staircase and created fabulous ceilings at Ham House. Her mother furnished Ham with luxury and taste.³ Catherine Murray ensured Elizabeth was taught how to run a house efficiently, how to recognise herbs and use spices. Yet Elizabeth relished her study of philosophy, divinity, mathematics and history and enjoyed a level of erudition well beyond that expected of a young woman of her class. In September 1650 a neighbour, Dorothy Long, wrote of Elizabeth, 'Our lady has grown a great student. She reads Dr Donne and Sir W Rawley; works exquisitely in gum work; hath entered herself head of the 2nd Form in our Academy...' ⁴ Mistress Long makes fun of Elizabeth's undoubted studiousness.

The clearest picture we have of her as a young woman comes from Thomas Knyvett, a Norfolk squire in London to plead with Parliament against the sequestration of his estates. Knyvett was staying with neighbours of the Murrays, Lodowick and Joan Carlile, a colourful couple who were part of the 'Richmond Circle' of Royalist supporters living around Ham and Petersham. The Carliles occupied Petersham Lodge, inside Richmond Park, as Lodowick had been Keeper of the Park since 1637 and retained his post during the Interregnum. In addition, he had been 'Gentleman of the Bows and Grooms of the Chamber' to the Queen, and was a minor poet and dramatist; indeed, he had dedicated his first play *The Deserving Favourite* to William Murray. His wife, Joan, gained a reputation as a painter, and she was to paint Elizabeth with her first husband and sister. Other members of the Richmond circle included Justinian Isham, who lodged with the Carliles in 1649 whilst he fought sequestration of his estates, becoming a close friend of Elizabeth. Isham was also friendly with Brian Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury

ELIZABETH MURRAY, COUNTESS OF DYSART AND
DUCHESS OF LAUDERDALE (1626–1698)

who had been tutor to the future Charles II, who lived in Richmond. This was a close circle as evidenced by Duppa's letter to Isham in August 1650, 'I was honoured with a visit from the Lady of Ham who is not only inquisitive after you, but desires that you should know it...' ⁵ In 1665 the will of Jane Duppa, the Bishop's widow, noted that she had left 'Mistris Joane Carlile my greate Maudlin Silver Cupp'. ⁶ Thomas Knyvett became a temporary member of the group and wrote frequently to his wife of his impressions of them. On 18 April 1644, he wrote, 'I am grown very well acquainted at Mistress Murrays. She very courteously invited us all to dinner on Monday last, where I was kindly entertained... her eldest daughter is the jewel and indeed a pretty one, but for her deep coloured hair. I know not how such a notion would relish but it is said she is to have a very great fortune... Indeed, sweetheart, such a pretty, witty lass with such a brave house and state she is like to have, methinks might make a young fellow think her hair very beautiful. I could find it in my heart to woo her for my son, for I am much in her favour. She seems to be a very good, harmless, virtuous, witty little bable'. ⁷

Marriage with the financially challenged Master Knyvett was not to be, and at the end of 1648 the twenty-one year old Elizabeth married Sir Lionel Tollemache, a gentleman with estates in Suffolk and Northamptonshire. The family seat was at Helmingham Hall, and the Tollemaches were an old, apolitical family who could date their ancestry back to the Norman Conquest.

Elizabeth moved with Lionel to Fakenham Magna near Thetford, close to the family seat and sometimes stayed in London with Lionel's grandfather at the White House near Charing Cross. On 15 November 1648 Lionel made Framsdon Hall, in Suffolk, over to Elizabeth 'for a lyvelyhoode provision of jointure' and in March 1649 Elizabeth and Lionel jointly were assigned the properties of Ham and the manors of Ham and Petersham. ⁸ Elizabeth and Lionel had eleven children in the following twelve years, five of whom survived infancy. Indications that the marriage was a little tempestuous are given in the famous letter written by Lionel to his son in which he says, wives 'are but too apt to take advantage of the fondness of theire husband, and upon it growe insolent and imperious'. ⁹

ELIZABETH MURRAY, COUNTESS OF DYSART AND
DUCHESS OF LAUDERDALE (1626–1698)

After the death of her mother in 1649, Elizabeth and Lionel moved to Ham House to keep up the fight against sequestration, which they finally won in 1651. During the 1650s the Tollemaches lived between Ham House, Fakenham Magna and the White House. Elizabeth was occupied with her growing family and domestic duties.

At some point in the 1650s, probably after 1653, Elizabeth became acquainted with the Cromwell family. Antonia Fraser maintains that it was her initial friendship with Betty, Oliver's favourite daughter, which brought Elizabeth into the circle around the Cromwell family, based at Hampton Court.¹⁰ A popular novelist has suggested that Elizabeth might have provided Mrs Cromwell with medicines for Oliver's ailments, but I can find no supporting evidence for this claim.¹¹ It seems more likely that Oliver Cromwell relished the company of this educated, intelligent and witty woman, although later pundits enjoyed poking fun at the unlikely couple:

'She is Bess of my heart, she was Bess of Old Noll
She was once Fleetwood's Bess, now she's Bess of Atholl...'¹²

Once Cromwell realised what the gossips were implying about his relationship with Lady Tollemache, the relationship cooled. Nevertheless, Elizabeth enjoyed a degree of protection throughout the Protectorate. This was politically expedient as several of her friends and relatives were involved in Royalist plots, and at some point in the late 1650s Elizabeth herself worked for the Sealed Knot, the secret organisation aiming for the restoration of a Stuart monarchy. Coded letters between herself and Royalists-in-exile were intercepted by John Thurloe, Cromwell's spymaster, containing hints that she was working on creating an invisible ink. Elizabeth also travelled frequently to the Continent, ostensibly to visit her daughter living in Paris, but just possibly carrying messages or money to the Court in exile. Her exact contribution to the Royalist cause is unclear, yet in 1660 Charles II rewarded her with an annual pension of £800 for her services. Following the death of her father in 1655, Elizabeth was also confirmed as the Countess of Dysart in her own right, so by the start of the Restoration her fortunes were definitely improving.

Elizabeth's last child was born in 1661, so during the early years of the Restoration she would have been occupied with a full nursery. As Doreen

ELIZABETH MURRAY, COUNTESS OF DYSART AND
DUCHESS OF LAUDERDALE (1626–1698)

Cripps, who wrote a biography of Elizabeth in 1975, says, ‘Elizabeth was a mature woman with a wealth of experience of intrigue and danger behind her. She had the gratitude of the King and an unassailable position in society through birth, marriage and possessions’.¹³ Mid-decade, she was involved in London society as both a political hostess at Ham and as a member of the circles around the royal family at court. By the end of the decade Lionel Tollemache was an invalid, and in 1669 he died in Paris. Rumour had it that Elizabeth was already having an affair with John Maitland, 2nd Earl of Lauderdale, who was to become her second husband.¹⁴ Certainly by 1669 Lauderdale was spending long periods of time at Ham House ostensibly comforting the widow. As he wrote to Lord Tweeddale in January 1669, ‘I am going in a visite of charity to my Lady Dysert who is a most melancholy woman upon her double losse’.¹⁵ [Lady Katharine Murray, Elizabeth’s sister, having died just after Lionel Tollemache.]

Lauderdale had been a key player during the Civil War. Firstly, as a Covenanter and one of the Scottish Commissioners to the Stuart court, then as a negotiator for the Engagement, and eventually as a supporter of Prince Charles. It was in this capacity that he was arrested after the Battle of Worcester in 1651 and kept imprisoned by the Protectorate regime until 1660. After the Restoration he became a central figure at Court: a member of the Cabal – Charles II’s inner cabinet after 1667 – and Secretary of State for Scotland. Lauderdale was an educated, powerful, ambitious and gifted man with few friends and several enemies. This well-matched couple married in 1672, the year that Charles II elevated him to a dukedom. Elizabeth was forty-six and well past childbearing and Lauderdale was fifty-five, with no male heir. Yet he clearly considered her a fitting mate for his power and ambition, disdaining the advice of his friends to ally himself with a younger woman.

Throughout the 1670s Elizabeth poured her energies into renovating Ham. She intended to create a house worthy of her position in society. In 1672/4 the couple added a new south front, doubling the internal space at a cost of around £10 million in current terms.¹⁶ Elizabeth used superb craftsmen to carry out internal renovations and she scoured the world for the very best interiors, buying Coromandel work from India, China and Japan as well as the most sumptuous furnishings Europe could provide. The estimated expense of her interior decorations in today’s money is £6 million.¹⁷ John

ELIZABETH MURRAY, COUNTESS OF DYSART AND
DUCHESS OF LAUDERDALE (1626–1698)

Evelyn, even though he was accustomed to grandeur, wrote after his visit in 1678, ‘After dinner I walked to Ham to see the House and Garden of the Duke of Lauderdale, which is indeed inferior to few of the best villas in Italy itself; the House furnished like a great Prince’s; the Parterres, Flower Gardens, Orangeries, Groves, Avenues, Courts, Statues, perspectives, Fountains, Aviaries and all this at the banks of the Sweetest River in all the World’.¹⁸

Lauderdale ruled Scotland with an iron fist, and as religious problems escalated and the political objections to his imposition of rigid royal rule spread, Elizabeth was increasingly blamed for his policies, although perhaps the difficulties of ruling an increasingly chaotic Scotland made the prospect of a scapegoat in the form of Elizabeth attractive to some Scottish peers. She was accused, not without cause, of greed and corruption on a spectacular scale. A number of attacks were made on Lauderdale himself in the 1670s as his autocratic rule was increasingly unpopular, but he enjoyed royal support so the attacks were often diverted to Elizabeth. As Dixon states, ‘Accusations of corruption and greed are heard increasingly during this period but there is no doubting the power and status of the couple’.¹⁹

By the late 1670s Lauderdale’s health had deteriorated. He had suffered from the stone on and off for several years, and in 1680 he had a stroke whilst staying at Ham, and later developed scurvy. By September his illness had defeated him and he resigned. He lingered on, cared for by Elizabeth, but finally died in April 1682.

The dukedom lapsed as Maitland had no heir and his earldom passed to his brother, Charles Maitland. The 3rd Earl of Lauderdale had an acrimonious relationship with Elizabeth and their arguments over who should pay for her husband’s funeral led to endless legal exchanges and cost them both in terms of money and friendship.

During the 1680s Elizabeth led an increasingly lonely and pain-filled life at Ham. Her children were away, daughters married to Scottish nobles, her heir living in Suffolk and her younger sons abroad fighting (both died in 1694). Elizabeth became increasingly litigious, gaining much pleasure from fighting for what she considered rightfully hers. Yet these battles were costly and Elizabeth mortgaged jewels and plate as security for loans to pay the

ELIZABETH MURRAY, COUNTESS OF DYSART AND
DUCHESS OF LAUDERDALE (1626–1698)

interest on the Ham mortgage. She also became increasingly lame, troubled by gout, so that she lived almost entirely on the ground floor of Ham. Letters show that her intellect was unimpaired and she wrote constantly to her daughters, asking for news and gossip.

Elizabeth Murray, Countess of Dysart and Duchess of Lauderdale, died at Ham on 5 June 1698 at the grand age of 72. Her son and heir was at her side, as was her devoted cousin and servant, Mrs Henderson. She was buried alongside her mother, three sisters and three of her children in the chancel of St Peter's Church in Petersham.

- ¹ *Bishop Gilbert Burnet, History of My Own Time, Vol II*, ed. by Osmund Airy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897) p. 436.
- ² Doreen Cripps, *Elizabeth of the Sealed Knot* (Warwick: Roundwood Press, 1975) p. 12.
- ³ Victoria and Albert Museum, Dept of Furniture and Woodwork, Ham House inventory 1655.
- ⁴ Pritchard, Evelyn, *Ham House and its Owners through Five Centuries 1610-2006* (Richmond: Richmond Local History Society, 1995, republ. 1998 and 2007) p. 7.
- ⁵ Pritchard, p. 7.
- ⁶ Margaret Toynbee and Giles Isham, 'Joan Carlile – An Identification', *Burlington Magazine*, 96 [1954] 273-277.
- ⁷ Pritchard, p. 7.
- ⁸ Cripps, p. 14.
- ⁹ Quoted in Cripps, p.36.
- ¹⁰ Antonia Fraser, 'Bess and Old Noll', *Horizon Magazine*, vol xiii (1971), 106-111.
- ¹¹ Anita Seymour, *Royalist Rebel* (Croydon: Claymore Press, 2013).
- ¹² Fraser, *Horizon*, p. 107. Fleetwood had been a Parliamentarian general, and Cromwell's son-in-law. Atholl was a Scottish Privy Counsellor.
- ¹³ Cripps, p. 70.
- ¹⁴ National Trust, *Guide to Ham House and Garden* (London: Park Lane Press, 2010) p. 43.
- ¹⁵ Quoted in Cripps, p. 77.
- ¹⁶ Estimate by the Curator of Ham House, Victoria Bradley.

ELIZABETH MURRAY, COUNTESS OF DYSART AND
DUCHESS OF LAUDERDALE (1626–1698)

¹⁷ As above.

¹⁸ John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1945) Vol II, p. 55.

¹⁹ Douglas Dixon, 'The King's Secretary', *History Review*, 9 (1957), 428.

Serrie Meakins taught 17th century history in London schools for over 12 years. Since retiring, as well as studying for her Masters, she has been mentoring state schools pupils who are applying to Oxford and Cambridge to read History. Serrie is a Trustee of the Cromwell Association, with responsibility for improving its links with schools.

by David Woodall

Windsor Castle is one of the greatest icons of British royalty. Founded c.1070, it is by far the oldest of the occupied Royal Palaces; every monarch since Henry I has used it as their home, and it has long been a favourite residence of our kings and queens. The current Royal House, of course, chose to take their name from the ancient stronghold – a decision which has its centenary this year. It may, therefore, come as a surprise that it was as a Parliamentary fortress, not a Royalist one, that it played its part in the Civil Wars. When peace came, Windsor once more became a palace, but this time for the Lord Protector – a palace that Oliver Cromwell seems to have taken a particular interest in.

Windsor Castle initially played little, if any, part in the run up to the Civil Wars. However, by the start of 1642 Charles I, alarmed by the increasing tensions in the Kingdom, felt compelled to take refuge with his family behind the sturdy walls of his palace-fortress, arriving on January 12th.¹ He stayed for about a month, and it was events that took place whilst he was there that seem to have helped push the nation over the edge. Charles was raising funds – apparently for defence – by selling off the Castle's silver plate. On 14th a Mr Bagshaw of Windsor reported to the House of Commons that he had sighted several Troops of Horse, along with a number of ammunition wagons, en route for the town. He also estimated that around 400 Horse were already in residence.² This sudden military build-up was seriously disturbing news. In the eyes of Parliament, Charles was obviously preparing to use force in order to restore his authority. In response to this and other threats, they gave orders that the Kingdom should be placed in a posture of defence.

Parliament looked to the protection of London. Windsor Castle dominated the main western approach to the city – one of the reasons it had been built in the first place – so Colonel John Venn was equipped with 12 companies of Foot and ordered to secure it.³ Venn arrived towards the end of October and took control without a hint of resistance. How is it that Royal Windsor fell so easily to the King's enemies? Partly it is simply a case of there being no one to defend it, the troops reported by Mr Bagshaw evidently having long since departed to join the main Royalist army. However, Windsor was a staunchly Puritan town, and so local feelings were naturally inclined

against the Laudian King. Venn's arrival, therefore, was to be welcomed. Even in the Castle itself, all was not well, with many of the servants deserting their sovereign to fight for Parliament.⁴ Venn and his troops may not have been conquering heroes as such, but to many in Windsor their presence must have been a relief.

Venn arrived only just in time, as Prince Rupert was also heading for Windsor. The town had no exterior defences, and many of the 1,500 inhabitants fled into the Castle or the nearby woods.⁵ The Castle itself was a tougher nut to crack. Despite its age, it was still a formidable prospect. The outer (dry) moat was still at least partly in place, the walls were high and thick, and the north side – on a 98 ft cliff – was further protected by the River Thames. Around 25 artillery pieces commanded the approaches.⁶ Rupert arrived on 7th November and established a battery on the Eton side of the river. Attempts to establish entrenchments were frustrated by the defenders' sallies. In any case, dangerously close to London as he was, Rupert had no time for a protracted siege. Instead he began a furious bombardment, but with only 4 or 5 guns (probably only light field pieces) his only hope was to frighten the garrison into surrender. After a 7 hour barrage Rupert had made little or no impact on the Castle, although the town was severely mauled. However, Venn, one of the most prominent pre-war critics of the King, and therefore on the select list of those to be automatically executed if caught, was not about to be intimidated. With all the odds against him, the Prince was forced to withdraw.⁷

Windsor had been saved for Parliament. With the immediate threat over, Venn was able to settle down to the daily business of his new role as Governor. The garrison were ordered to 'take some especial care of Windsor Castle', and in due course it was specified they should 'take care that there be no disorders and disturbances made in the Chapel... and that the evidences, registers, monuments there and all things that belonged to the Order of the Garter may be preserved without defacings'.⁸ This may seem surprising, but one has to remember that few could have foreseen that the wars would end in the abolition of the monarchy. Therefore, once Parliament's grievances had been dealt with, the King would need his Castle back, so it was best to keep it in good condition. However, these orders were not obeyed to the letter. The claims that St George's Chapel was used for stabling may well be Royalist propaganda.⁹ Whilst parts of the

associated buildings may have been converted, the Chapel itself continued as a place of worship for the garrison throughout the 1640s and 1650s. However, the Chapel treasury and many of the ornaments were stripped out, not only to cleanse it of 'Popish' superstition, but more pragmatically because the valuable items could be sold off or melted down to be converted into much needed cash.¹⁰

In January 1643 it was decided to expand the Castle's functions, and so it became home to prisoners of war and other Royalist 'delinquents'. The first 55 arrived that month. Several would leave evidence of their presence in the form of graffiti. Conditions were grim, although this was not entirely Venn's fault. He wrote to Parliament protesting that he needed money to pay for the basic needs of his new inmates, but was informed that if prisoners wanted 'luxuries' (as Parliament deemed them) like beds, they would have to pay for them themselves.¹¹

In April a further blow fell on the Chapel, as an order arrived to expel the Dean and Canons from the Castle. They were, of course, of High Church inclination and therefore of little use to the Puritan garrison, but they were also staunch Royalists¹², so naturally a distinctly unwelcome presence in this Parliamentary fortress. Originally, Parliament had allowed them to remain, provided they lived quietly and offered no threat to the security of the Castle, but by now opinion had obviously shifted, perhaps encouraged by Sir Ralph Hopton's string of victories in the West on behalf of the King. A petition was sent by the Canons to the House of Lords to overturn the expulsion order. Although the Lords allowed them to remove their possessions, the expulsion went ahead.¹³ One group of Castle residents who, to a large extent, survived the depredations of the new masters of Windsor – thanks largely to their charitable status – were the Alms Knights, or Military Knights as their present-day successors are known. An adjunct of the Order of the Garter – the senior order of chivalry in the Kingdom – they had been established by Edward III c.1348 as a means of support for captured knights bankrupted by ransoms, but by the 17th century had evolved into a haven for impoverished army officers. In May, orders were given that they should be maintained using the income from the sequestered estates of St George's. A few moved out of their lodgings to make way for prisoners, but they were suitably compensated.¹⁴

In August 1643, 50 barrels of gunpowder, 300 swords and 200 muskets were sent to the Castle. However, since by this time Windsor was acting as a headquarters and supply base for the armies of both the Earl of Essex and Sir William Waller, we cannot be sure that these munitions were intended for the garrison.¹⁵

Across the country the conflict continued to intensify, but this had little direct impact on the Castle and its garrison. Almost from the start, one of Colonel Venn's chief concerns had been the lack of funding from his political superiors, and this remained the case. He frequently petitioned Parliament for money, usually to little avail. In April 1644 it was decided to partially disband the garrison, not because of a reduced threat but simply because of what in modern parlance would be termed 'defence cuts'.¹⁶ Even this was not enough. In June and August Venn appealed again for money, without success. Things were becoming desperate; the Governor was forced to seek alternative solutions, sequestering the estates of suspected Royalists in and around Windsor without authorisation from above so that he could pay his troops.¹⁷ In October the garrison was again reduced, this time to 200, a mere fraction of its original size, but still no money was forthcoming.¹⁸ It was, admittedly, expensive to maintain, the wages alone costing around £14 per day.¹⁹ The garrison, though, doubtless didn't care about the cost to Parliament, only that they weren't getting their money. Ultimately they lost patience and mutinied. Parliament was forced to send in 300 soldiers from the Middlesex Trained Bands to restore order.²⁰

The government, however, had other matters on their mind. The decisive victory at Marston Moor in July 1644, followed swiftly by the disastrous defeat at Lostwithiel less than a month later, helped to bring the increasing divisions amongst Parliament's senior commanders to a head. The military reformers, such as Cromwell, at last got their way, and the Self-Denying Ordinance was passed in early 1645. Under its terms John Venn, like every other MP, was forced to resign his commission. He was replaced as Governor of Windsor by Colonel Christopher Whichcot, an experienced soldier who had previously commanded the London Brigade. Whichcot was immediately faced with Venn's old problem of funding, and Parliament finally voted £400 'for the present Supply and Subsistence of the Garison [sic]', little enough compared to the scale of arrears. A committee –

including Colonel Venn – was also appointed to consider how the garrison could be funded in future.²¹

Meanwhile, the Parliamentarians' military reorganising was proceeding apace. Sir Thomas Fairfax travelled to Windsor to oversee the creation of the New Model Army. The disparate elements, new recruits reinforced with veterans drawn from various provincial units, had to be welded into a unified, cohesive force and thoroughly trained, most of which took place in the Little Park (to the east and south east of the Castle, roughly equating to the modern Home Park Private). The new Lord General worked fast, and the Army was ready to march by 30th April. On 14 June 1645 they finally caught up with the King at Naseby. The crushing defeat of the Oxford Army marked the beginning of the end, and on 5 May 1646 Charles surrendered to the Scottish Covenanters' Army in England, essentially ending the First Civil War.

With the King in their hands and the Royalists (seemingly) a spent force, Parliament now began the reduction of their troops, including planning the disbandment of the New Model Army. The Windsor garrison, however, was to be retained for the present, although all new works at the Castle were ordered to be slighted.²² Gradually, it seemed as if the Castle was set to become a palace again. The soldiers in the Castle must have thought their role was more or less over, but it was not to be. For a start, Whichcot was still struggling with his garrison's finances. In March, shortly before the end of the war, a petition had been sent to Parliament protesting that their pay was now an astonishing 90 weeks in arrears.²³ Parliament responded by selling off a brass statue and some other items from St George's Chapel, raising a paltry (compared to the debt) £400. The Chapel itself was suffering, however: the Lay Clerks petitioned the House of Lords, which ordered that measures should be taken for their relief.²⁴

The financial troubles of the Windsor garrison were a mere snapshot of the high-handed way the army as a whole were being treated by their political masters. The increasingly radicalised troops were nearing open revolt. One of the results was Cornet Joyce's stunning coup of 2 June 1647, taking the King into the army's custody. Although Charles remained a prisoner, at this point he still retained a surprising amount of freedom. It was up to him to choose where he should be held, and in July he elected to move to Windsor,

where he was well looked after. He arrived on the 1st, although stayed only until the 3rd before moving to Reading. It must have been a source of some irritation to the garrison to see money laid out for the comfort of their defeated enemy, when they themselves were *still* short of cash. Fairfax was well aware of their plight, but needed to tread carefully. On 23rd July, almost as if nothing had happened, he wrote to Parliament, informing them that he had attached 100 more soldiers to the Windsor garrison, adding that he was disturbed to find the existing troops were still owed a year's wages.²⁵ Despite this intervention by the Lord General himself, no money was voted to the bankrupt soldiers by the now thoroughly disgruntled government. The garrison were not the only veterans suffering. In November, large numbers of recently disbanded soldiers arrived at the Castle demanding either money to pay their way home, or permission to return to their regiments. The New Model Army's pay had also failed to arrive, however, so Fairfax had nothing to offer them financially. Sympathetic to their plight, though, he allowed them to rejoin the army.²⁶

The army's attitude to the King was also starting to harden. On 11 November 1647 a meeting of the Army Council was held at Windsor, during which it was proposed that Charles be brought to trial as a criminal. One account tentatively ascribes the startling proposal to Cromwell,²⁷ although it seems unlikely to have been him; only a few days before he had been insisting that the King could be restored. However, on the 23rd Cromwell was still in the town when (or so the story goes) an anonymous tip-off arrived from someone close to Charles, advising the Lieutenant General to go to the Blue Boar Inn at Holborn, where he could intercept a courier with a secret letter hidden in his saddle. Disguising themselves as ordinary cavalry troopers Cromwell and Henry Ireton rushed to the scene. All was as the informant had predicted: the mysterious letter proved to be from Charles to Henrietta Maria, detailing his deceptions and planned alliance with the Scots. The furious Generals returned to Windsor, irrevocably resolved to bring about the King's downfall.²⁸

In the meantime there were more mundane matters to be dealt with. The army still had its grievances, and on 5th December the Army Council decided to send a petition to Parliament.²⁹ Parliament dispatched Commissioners to the army at Windsor to discuss the problem; they left again on the 14th, leaving the Council satisfied, at least for the time being.³⁰

During this month Windsor played host to a series of Courts Martial, including one for a mutineer in Colonel Lilburne's Regiment.³¹ On 15 March 1648, the House of Lords discussed a proposal from Colonel Whichcot to carry out restoration work in St George's Chapel, a far cry from the despoiling practices usually attributed to Parliamentary troops in Anglican churches! The Lords referred the matter to the House of Commons, though no action seems to have been taken.³² In April it was decided to clear the Tower of London of prisoners, with some of them moved to Windsor. Little did they know that there would be many more to come.

Within a couple of weeks Berwick and Carlisle were occupied by English Royalists, there was open rebellion in Wales, and the Covenanters were assembling another army in Scotland, this time in support of the King. In the face of this threat Parliament and its soldiers were reconciled. The New Model Army abandoned politics for the time being, broke camp and marched west from Windsor: the Second Civil War had begun.

On 27th May, probably more out of a desire to need the troops 'on-side' than genuine concern for their welfare, Parliament voted £1,500 for the garrison of Windsor (although it is worth noting it was never actually paid). They also sent 100 beds from the Tower of London for use by the troops – one can only speculate as to what they had been sleeping on before!³³ In June, rumours reached Parliament of a plot to capture the Castle, with the Royalists using the Midsummer Fair as a cover whilst they concentrated their forces. Extra troops were ordered to the area. However, the plot – if it ever existed – did not last long and Whichcot was soon ordered to send whatever cavalry he could spare to deal with a threat to Winchester.³⁴ Elsewhere the New Model Army and its provincial comrades were swiftly dealing with the rebels across the country. The decisive action occurred at Preston between 17th and 19th of August. Cromwell engaged a larger mixed force of English Royalists and Scottish Covenanters, and annihilated them. As well as fatalities, around 10,000 prisoners were taken at Preston, in addition to those captured elsewhere. Large numbers were held at Windsor. On 25th September, four barge-loads were moved downriver from Windsor to Gravesend, en route for transportation to the Colonies.³⁵

With the Second Civil War over, Parliament and the army were divided once again. The latter was by now firmly convinced that Charles was the ultimate cause of all the bloodshed in the last few years. They were disgusted when Parliament reopened negotiations with the King, and sent a protest – known as the *Remonstrance of the Army* – to their political masters, demanding that the proposed treaty be abandoned. The *Remonstrance* was largely the work of Henry Ireton, and probably drawn up whilst he was in Windsor. When this was dismissed, Colonel Pride's 'Purge' of hostile MPs swiftly followed.

Events now began to move quickly. On 15th December the Army Council ordered that the King should be moved to Windsor. On the 19th the Earl of Pembroke was appointed as Constable of the Castle. His role was separate to that of Governor, which continued to be held by Colonel Whichcot, who maintained seniority. Charles arrived on 22nd, accompanied by his pet dogs Gypsy and Rogue and escorted by 100 Horse. His arrival at the Castle was a cause for tumult in the town. Fights broke out in the local inns between Royalists and Parliamentarians, which in turn led to a full scale riot in which three were killed.³⁶ Charles was treated reasonably well, allowed his old rooms and staff, and permitted to take exercise on the North Terrace. At Christmas he was denied the usual celebrations, in accordance with the various laws passed against religious festivals both before and during the Civil Wars, but he did receive a new suit.

In Westminster, plans to bring the King to trial were proceeding apace. In the matter of where the trial would be held, Windsor Castle was seriously considered, as both appropriately symbolic and totally secure. However, in the end it was decided that it was also too private. The King had to be prosecuted in full view of the public, so Westminster Hall was settled on. The trial went ahead and Charles was duly found guilty and sentenced to death as a 'tyrant, traitor, murderer and a public enemy'. Among the 59 Commissioners who signed the death warrant was John Venn, former Governor of Windsor Castle. Another of the Commissioners, though not a signatory, was William Heveningham, who, after the Restoration was imprisoned in the Castle for his role in the affair. Windsor's MP, Cornelius Holland, was also a Commissioner but (curiously, as he apparently played a leading role in arranging the trial) another non-signatory. A few days after the trial, on 30 January 1649, Charles was beheaded outside the Banqueting House in Whitehall.

There followed several days of debate about what to do with the body; Westminster Abbey was initially favoured, but was deemed too public and vulnerable to relic hunters. Eventually, St George's Chapel at Windsor was settled on. On 7th February the cortege began its journey to the Castle. On arrival the deceased King was placed in the Deanery, before being moved to his old bedroom.³⁷ An impressive £500 had been allocated for Charles's burial, but given the very basic arrangements it seems unlikely that it was all used.³⁸ It was decided to entomb the body in Henry VIII's vault, though as it was unmarked it had to be located with the aid of an elderly Alms Knight and much tapping on the floor until a hollow spot was discovered!³⁹ Whichcot pointed out that since the Book of Common Prayer had been outlawed, he could not allow its use at Charles's funeral, and so on 9th February the King's coffin was lowered into the vault with few formalities. However, a mysterious entry in the Burial Register of Windsor Parish Church reads '9 – King Charles in the Castle'. From this, it has been suggested that a secret funeral was held in the Church.⁴⁰ The grave does not appear to have been marked. Curiously, after the Restoration Charles II abandoned his plan to erect a mausoleum for his father on the site of the present Albert Memorial Chapel, and it was not until 1837 that a permanent monument – a simple black marble ledger stone – was put in place to commemorate the occupants of the vault.⁴¹

As an interesting aside, the Castle Porter at this time was an imposing figure of 7 ft 6 in, as commemorated by a mark on the wall near the Norman Gate. Later he had a breakdown associated with religious mania, and a few years after the Restoration was confined to Bethlem Mental Hospital, where he could be found surrounded by Bibles and with Bibles stuffed down his breeches. He became the model for the statue of 'Raving Madness' that once stood over the entrance to the hospital.⁴²

The republican rulers who took over from the deceased King were faced with two major problems. One, as ever, was money. Not only did the Commonwealth have its military and other costs, but the King had left many debts behind him and the new regime felt obliged to pay them, providing those owed money were not notable 'delinquents'. One of the fastest ways to do this, it seemed, was to sell off the late King's art collections and his estates. Windsor was briefly under threat at this point,⁴³ but on the recommendation of the Council of State the Commons agreed it

should become one of a number of former royal properties to be saved for official use.⁴⁴ The contents of the Castle were not so lucky, and much of it was sold off, including large numbers of hangings showing various biblical and classical scenes.⁴⁵ The sale was something of a farce; the sudden glut on the market kept prices artificially low. Even so, relatively few could afford the goods, and those that could often employed agents canny enough to strike a deal distinctly advantageous to the buyer. It didn't help that many of the best goods (including some of the Windsor hangings, which ended up in the Speaker's apartments in London⁴⁶) were reserved for the use of the State; the Commonwealth was aware that if they were to be taken seriously as a political power by other nations, they had to look like one.

The other major problem the Commonwealth faced was political unrest, this time not so much from Royalists, who had for the most part either fled or gone into hiding in a state of shock, but from radical movements. The Diggers established an early community not far from Windsor.⁴⁷ Rather more alarming were the activities of the Levellers: in September news reached Parliament of a Leveller plot to seize Windsor Castle, although nothing seems to have come of it.⁴⁸

More significant still, however, was the ongoing conflict in Ireland, followed swiftly by the outbreak of the Third Civil War. The latter has an indirect link to the Castle. The army was expanded for Cromwell's 1650 Scottish campaign, and amongst the newly raised units were Sir Arthur Haselrig's Regiment of Horse (not to be confused with his more famous, but earlier, 'Lobster' cuirassiers), which today survives as the Blues and Royals of the Household Cavalry. George Monck's Regiment of Foot, another new creation, later became the Coldstream Guards.⁴⁹ Both have detachments in Windsor (the Household Cavalry riding school and Armoured Regiment are at Combermere Barracks, and the 1st Battalion, Coldstream Guards, are currently based at Victoria Barracks), and both regularly mount guard at the Castle.

By the end of 1651 the Civil Wars were effectively over. Things were looking bright for the new regime, though money was still tight. On 29 December 1652 there was a proposal to sell Windsor Castle, but it was defeated by 29 votes to 19.⁵⁰ However, two days later it *was* decided to

dispose of the Little Park – presumably it was felt the army no longer needed their old training ground.

Internal divisions meant the Republic did not last long, but its death throes do not seem to have noticeably affected the Castle. Once Cromwell was established as head of state in 1653, however, he was provided with Windsor as one of his official residences – perhaps an early example of the Protectorate’s pseudo-monarchical nature. Whichcot remained as Governor, although on the Earl of Pembroke’s death his deputy, the distinguished lawyer and leading Parliamentarian Bulstrode Whitelocke, took over as Constable, and would later publish a guide to the job. The First Protectorate Parliament recommended the garrison be maintained, and the Castle continued to serve primarily as a fortress and prison. As such, it is perhaps not surprising Cromwell spent little time at Windsor, preferring the comforts of Hampton Court.⁵¹ However, he does seem to have taken a close interest in the Castle’s affairs. In 1654 he bought the Little Park back for the nation at a cost of £3,473 5s.⁵² Cromwell had always had a strong concern for the welfare of his old soldiers, and this was reflected in his actions at Windsor. Accommodation was provided for the families of soldiers who had been killed or severely wounded in battle.⁵³ Even though the Order of the Garter had been swept away as a symbol of monarchy, the Alms Knights had escaped the cull, and under Cromwell they not only continued but flourished. Any who had been appointed by Charles I were allowed to remain, but the Lord Protector, who took them directly under his wing, filled any vacancies that had arisen from retired or invalid officers of the Commonwealth forces, and increased the number from thirteen to eighteen. Additional, purpose-built accommodation was provided on the site of the current Guard Room, paid for out of the estate of the late Sir Francis Crane, a former Chancellor of the Order of the Garter who had left money in his will to the Alms Knights.⁵⁴ Their living conditions were improved and they were also given new uniforms in the form of grey cloaks.⁵⁵ This may seem a rather dull choice, but it is worth noting that grey was also the colour of the uniform of the Lord Protector’s Life Guard of Foot,⁵⁶ and the cloaks bore the Arms of the Commonwealth on one shoulder, further evidence of the esteem Cromwell seems to have held them in; not for nothing did one Royalist describe them as ‘Cromwell’s old Trojans’.⁵⁷ The affection was evidently mutual, as all of them – some possibly Carolian appointments – attended his funeral, as did Colonel

Whichcot. Most of the surviving Cromwellian appointments seem to have been ejected following the Restoration, although the additional numbers were maintained until 1919.

The Commonwealth was thrown into chaos by Oliver Cromwell's death in 1658 and his son Richard's abdication after a short rule as the new Lord Protector. Despite this, the Rump Parliament – now recalled to try and hold things together – found time to discuss the funding of the Alms Knights of Windsor.⁵⁸ The upheaval, however, was forcing the Castle to return to its military role, facing threats of uprisings. On 31 July 1659 Whichcot was sent instructions from Whitehall, warning him to prepare for a possible attempt to seize Windsor Castle.⁵⁹ In December, Colonel Henry Ingoldsby took 300 men to secure the Castle for Parliament.⁶⁰

The worst of the disturbances, however, were over. George Monck, now Lord General of the Army, soon had things under control. A new Parliament declared unanimously that the government of the nation was, and should be, by Commons, Lords, and King. A certain Captain Henry Nicholl took command of the Castle garrison on behalf of the now pro-Royalist government.⁶¹ On 12 May 1660 the Mayor of Windsor, accompanied by a trumpeter and escorted by a troop of Horse, rode into the Castle and announced the accession of King Charles II.⁶² The Roundhead Fortress was, once more, a Royal Palace.

¹ R. Tighe and J. Davis, *Annals of Windsor: Volume II* (London: 1858), p.162.

² 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 2, 1640-1643 (14th January 1642)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol2/pp378-380 [accessed 5 February 2017].

³ Tighe and Davis, op. cit., p.168.

⁴ C. Hibbert, *The Court at Windsor: A Domestic History* (London: 1964) p.65.

⁵ Anon, *Joyful Tidings from Windsor* (1642) quoted in R. South, *Royal Castle, Rebel Town* (Buckingham: 1981), pp. 35-36.

⁶ South op. cit., p.63. Two of the Civil War era guns are still in place: one is in the Curfew Tower, commanding Eton Bridge, though unfortunately not accessible to the public (but see C. Henry, *English Civil War Artillery*

- 1642-51 (Oxford: 2005), pp.18, 30, 46). The other is inside the Round Tower, defending the entrance, and can be viewed during guided tours of the Tower.
- ⁷ Ibid., pp. 33-34. Rupert finally took control of the Castle in 1668, when he was appointed Constable and Governor of Windsor, a position he held until his death in 1682.
- ⁸ Anon, 'Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 6, 1643 (4th May 1643)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol6/pp30-32 [accessed 9 January 2017].
- ⁹ Hibbert op. cit., p. 65.
- ¹⁰ B. Graeme, *The Story of Windsor Castle* (London: 1964), p.254.
- ¹¹ Ibid. pp.251-252.
- ¹² Canons David Stokes and William Brough later served Charles I at Oxford and elsewhere as Royal and Military chaplains, and were noted for their open hostility to Parliament. S. Taylor, 'The Restoration of the Dean and Canons in 1660' in N. Saul and T. Tatton-Brown (eds.), *St George's Chapel Windsor: History and Heritage* (Stanbridge: 2010) p.127.
- ¹³ South op. cit., pp.39-41.
- ¹⁴ R. Moore and J. Moore (Eds.), *The Military Knights of Windsor 1348-2011* (Windsor: 2011), pp.7-8.
- ¹⁵ Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 3, 1643-1644 (9th August 1643)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol3/pp198-200 [accessed 9th February 2017].
- ¹⁶ South op. cit., p.43.
- ¹⁷ Graeme op. cit., p.255.
- ¹⁸ Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 3, 1643-1644 (29th October 1644)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol3/pp680-682 [accessed 9th February 2017].
- ¹⁹ Ibid. The cost of wages can be calculated from a detailed table in the Commons Journal, giving the establishment and individual rates of pay for the reduced garrison. It only lists officers, NCOs and specialists. However, the pay rates appear to be the same as those of the New Model Army (see K. Roberts, *Cromwell's War Machine* (Barnsley: 2005), p.98), so we can assume Privates were being paid 8d a day.

- 20 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 3, 1643-1644 (15th November 1644)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol3/p697 [accessed 11th February 2017]; Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 3, 1643-1644 (18th November 1644)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol3/pp698-699 [accessed 11th February 2017].
- 21 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 4, 1644-1646 (5th July 1645)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol4/pp195-198 [accessed 11th February 2017].
- 22 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 5, 1646-1648 (23rd February 1647)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol5/pp95-96 [accessed 11th February 2017]. It is not clear what these 'new works' were, but some sort of earthwork defences seems likely.
- 23 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 8, 1645-1647 (31st March 1646)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol8/p247 [accessed 11th February 2017].
- 24 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 8, 1645-1647 (11th February 1646)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol8/pp155-162 [accessed 11th February 2017]. The Choir, established in 1348, was eventually abolished in 1649, although re-established in 1660. Anon, *The Choir of St George's Chapel*, www.stgeorges-windsor.org/worship-and-music/music.html [accessed 18th February 2017].
- 25 Sir Thomas Fairfax, quoted in Tighe and Davis, op. cit., p.211.
- 26 South, op. cit., p.57.
- 27 Hibbert, op. cit., p.66.
- 28 A. Fraser, *Cromwell: Our Chief of Men* (London: 1973), pp.180-181.
- 29 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 5, 1646-1648 (7th December 1647)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol5/pp375-376 [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 30 Tighe and Davis, op. cit., pp.216-217.
- 31 Ibid. p.217.

- 32 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 10, 1648-1649 (15th March 1648)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol10/pp115-116 [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 33 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 5, 1646-1648 (27th May 1648)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol5/pp574-576 [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 34 South, op. cit., pp.65-66.
- 35 Tighe and Davis, op. cit., p.225.
- 36 South, op. cit., pp.68-70.
- 37 Ibid., p.71.
- 38 O. Hedley, *Windsor Castle* (London: 1994), p.100.
- 39 Ibid., p.101.
- 40 South, op. cit., p.72.
- 41 J. Litten, 'The Royal Vault at Windsor' in Saul and Tatton-Brown op. cit., pp.157-8.
- 42 Hedley, op. cit., p.105. Hedley describes the statue of the Porter as 'Acute Madness', but the name 'Raving Madness' is more usually used (c.f. The BBC and The British Museum, 'Melancholy and Raving Madness: Statues' in *A History of the World*, www.bbc.co.uk/ahistoryoftheworld/objects/T-CNu-EuS3mX38Ee649_cQ [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 43 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 6, 1648-1651 (18th April 1649)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol6/pp188-190 [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 44 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 6, 1648-1651 (30th June 1649)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol6/pp246-247 [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 45 M.A. Everett Green (Ed.), 'Calendar of State Papers (Domestic – Interregnum): 'Warrants of the Council of State, Generals of the Fleet, &c. 1651-2' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1651-2/pp545-577 [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 46 M.A. Everett Green (Ed.), 'Calendar of State Papers (Domestic - Interregnum): Volume 75 (August 23rd-31st 1654)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-

- papers/domestic/interregnum/1654/pp325-350 [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 47 Fraser, op. cit., p.390.
- 48 South, op. cit., p.80.
- 49 B. White-Spunner, *Horse Guards* (London: 2006), pp.39-40.
- 50 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660 (29th December 1652)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/pp237-239 [accessed 13th February 2017].
- 51 South, op. cit., p.74.
- 52 Tighe and Davis, op. cit., p.255.
- 53 South, op. cit., pp.74-75. They were rapidly evicted following the Restoration.
- 54 Moore and Moore, op. cit., p.138. The new houses were demolished in 1863.
- 55 Ibid., p.13.
- 56 Fraser, op. cit., p.577.
- 57 South, op. cit., p.76.
- 58 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660 (20th September 1659)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/pp781-783 [accessed 14th February 2017].
- 59 M.A. Everett Green (Ed.), 'Calendar of State Papers (Domestic – Interregnum): Volume 203 (July 1659)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1659-60/pp1-63 [accessed 15th February 2017].
- 60 Anon, 'Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660 (28th December 1659)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/p798 [accessed 15th February 2017]. Ingoldsby seems to have been acting on his own initiative, but received retrospective approval from Parliament.
- 61 M.A. Everett Green (Ed.), 'Calendar of State Papers (Domestic – Charles II, 1667): Volume 220 (13th-23rd October 1667)' in *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/chas2/1667/pp523-542 [accessed 15th February 2017].

Nicholl appears to have received precious little reward for his services and seven years later petitioned the King for aid.

⁶² South, *op. cit.*, p.93.

David Woodall has been fascinated from childhood by the turbulent times of the mid-17th century, ever since his parents took him to a re-enactment event by the English Civil War Society. Prior to undertaking an MA in Museum Studies at Newcastle, he studied for a BA (Hons.) in History at the University of East Anglia, where he specialised in the subject of ‘Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution’ under the tutelage of Professor Colin Davis.

DOES OLIVER CROMWELL MERIT A STATUE OUTSIDE THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT?

by Rebecca Bowers

This was the Cromwell Association schools prize-winning essay 2016, funded by Frederic L Borch III.

Few figures in British history have engendered so much controversy as Oliver Cromwell. From a humble background, Cromwell began his political career as an MP for Huntingdon and eventually went on to become the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of the Three Kingdoms between 1653 and 1658. To some, Oliver Cromwell was a sincere and brave defender of religion, able to restore peace and economic prosperity during the political and social turmoil that followed the execution of Charles I. To others, however, he was a dictatorial and murderous hypocrite, whose deeply Puritanical beliefs were used to mask his lust for power. Nevertheless, a statue of Cromwell stands outside the Houses of Parliament in Westminster, along with some of the great figures of British history such as Winston Churchill and Richard the Lionheart. The statue, funded privately by the former Prime Minister Lord Rosebery, and erected in 1899, has inevitably fuelled a wide division of opinion, and the question is raised as to whether Cromwell is deserving of such an accolade.

Oliver Cromwell's attempt to reform the intolerant and uncompromising religious system in England, created under Charles I, into a relatively broad and flexible Church is certainly commendable. Non-conformist services which inevitably followed the upheavals of the Civil War were encouraged by Cromwell in an attempt to allow a degree of religious diversity within a framework of acceptable doctrine. He remained a consistent advocate of tolerance for all Protestants. His personal sympathies for the more radical religious factions are epitomised by the case of James Nayler, a Quaker who, in 1656, re-enacted the entry of Christ into Jerusalem through the gates at Bristol. Viewed as deeply unacceptable by the more conservative members of the Second Protectorate Parliament, Nayler narrowly escaped a death sentence, rescued only by Cromwell's personal intervention.

Cromwell's dilemma was balancing the fears of MPs who saw the collapse of social order all around them, whilst achieving his vision of a godly and unified nation. This became a key reason for an often strenuous relationship. He maintained close relations with figures as far removed from

DOES OLIVER CROMWELL MERIT A STATUE OUTSIDE THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT?

his personal views as George Fox, the founder of the Quaker movement, and convinced Parliament to pass the Toleration Act of 1650. This abolished the requirement to attend services of the National Church, thus granting some freedom to non-conformists. Furthermore, Cromwell's establishment of the Committee of Triers and Ejectors in 1654 was established in order to nominate and eject suitable ministers. Emphasis was placed on the quality of preaching rather than the Christian denomination, leading to an increase of ministers who were Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist sympathisers. Finally, Cromwell's genuine respect for the consciences of others can be shown through his removal of the Edict of Expulsion in 1657, a ban on Jewish settlement within England that had been enforced by Edward I in 1290. Although his motivation was largely economic, this was nonetheless illustrative of his religious tolerance.

Attitudes towards Catholics and Anglicans during this period, however, remained largely unaltered from those of Elizabeth I's rule and therefore there were limitations to Cromwell's flexibility. Although Cromwell argued consistently for a unified National Church in which freedom of worship was granted to many Protestant groups, Catholics and supporters of bishops remained excluded from toleration laws throughout his rule. The most infamous and savage case of suppression of the Catholics was Cromwell's campaign in Ireland in 1649, where he stormed the Royalist strongholds of Drogheda and Wexford with severe brutality. Thousands of allegedly unarmed soldiers were killed but what made the invasion so unprecedentedly barbarous was the slaughtering of innocent civilians and clerics. Frequently considered as the most hated man in Irish history, Cromwell has been classed by some in the same league as figures such as Adolf Hitler. The 'curse of Cromwell' remains deep in Irish tradition, and the destruction of many buildings in Ireland is blamed on him. Cromwell's actions can in part explain the historic Irish resentment of the English. However, historians such as Tom Reilly have challenged the credibility of the events in Ireland and have argued that Cromwell's methods and attitude were relatively standard of 17th century siege warfare. Nonetheless, Cromwell and his troops fought with unnecessary levels of violence and brutality. The hatred of Cromwell can be shown firstly by the bitter opposition of the Irish Parliamentary Party when the government initially proposed a statue of him in 1895, and secondly by numerous petitions presented to modern day parliaments, demanding the removal of the statue.

DOES OLIVER CROMWELL MERIT A STATUE OUTSIDE THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT?

Although the beginning of the British Empire can be traced back to the reign of Elizabeth I, the colonial expansion that occurred under Cromwell's rule was unprecedented and the policies implemented during the Interregnum allowed for Britain's eventual imperial domination. This is another key argument for meriting a statue outside Parliament. Under Cromwell, the Protectorate committed itself to strengthening British sovereignty and disrupting the Spanish monopoly on trade: between 1646 and 1659, for example, 109 vessels were built and 111 were captured. This vast investment was initially intended to counter the threat of the Dutch and the Spanish, but Britain soon became powerful enough to intervene in the Caribbean and in 1655 Jamaica was captured from the Spanish. This achievement was fundamental to the development of the sugar trade as well as the enforcement of British supremacy at sea. Furthermore, the Navigation Act of 1651 ensured that all goods imported to England and its territories were carried on English ships by a crew that were at least half English – this reflected the increasingly popular policy of mercantilism, which aimed to keep all the benefits of trade within the British Empire whilst minimizing the loss of gold and silver to foreigners. The Act was the first time in which British territories were integrated into British law and politics – Britain and her colonies were treated as one entity. Cromwell's colonial policies were the foundation of Britain's commercial expansion and success and their significance is emphasized by their continued use following the Restoration.

Cromwell has been labelled a hypocrite, who, having murdered the king and abolished the monarchy, then failed to create a suitable constitution. Charles I's deeply unpopular absolutist methods involved the persecution of those who did not follow what he perceived as the true faith of the Church of England – respected Puritan gentlemen such as Prynne, Burton and Bastwick, for example, were impeached and mutilated for publishing attacks on the bishops of the Laudian church. Cromwell's methods were arguably no less oppressive. The abolition of the House of Lords in 1649 increased the power of the House of Commons and with it the social diversity of Parliament. However, its power was curtailed when it challenged Cromwell's will. He forcibly dissolved the Rump Parliament with the assistance of army troops in April 1653, increasingly frustrated by its inability to maintain the momentum needed to pass laws as well as its refusal to hold a general election. The legality of Cromwell's actions was questioned by Parliament,

DOES OLIVER CROMWELL MERIT A STATUE OUTSIDE THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT?

and, following its dissolution, failed attempts were made to reduce the power of the Protector by minimizing the size of the standing army.

Furthermore, when dissatisfied with the developments of the First Protectorate Parliament, Cromwell refused further cooperation and instead turned to the advice of the major-generals who were unrepresentative of the views of the majority of Parliament. This mirrored Charles I's approach, who had relied on the advice of unpopular councillors such as the Lord Admiral, Buckingham, the Earl of Strafford and the Arminian Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud. Direct military rule was imposed on England between August 1655 and January 1657. England was divided into twelve districts, each under the control of a major-general who implemented strict regulations to prevent conspiracies against the government. Those who protested were dealt with harshly. This had revealed the Protectorate to be a military despotism rather than a moderate and progressive government. Therefore, when focusing solely on Cromwell's autocratic methods and ruthlessness, a statue would not be merited.

However, when concluding whether Cromwell merits commemoration outside the Houses of Parliament, it is worth examining the other statues which stand there. These include representations of great figures such as Winston Churchill, Abraham Lincoln, Nelson Mandela and Mahatma Gandhi. Although from hugely different eras, backgrounds and positions, there are arguably themes which connect these men with Oliver Cromwell. All were instrumental in taking their nations through periods of radical change and leaving marks on their country which had positive implications long in to the future. Cromwell, for example, was key in the promotion of religious toleration for which Britain arguably still has a positive reputation. Similarly, these figures are known to have at some point used unpopular or controversial methods – Lincoln, for example, was prepared to embark on a course of civil war and Churchill is deemed responsible for the disastrous Allied failures at Gallipoli between 1915 and 1916. However, the more contentious events of their careers are greatly outweighed by their ultimate achievements, and the same can be said for Oliver Cromwell.

The paradoxical nature of Cromwell's rule makes his assessment particularly difficult. His religious toleration is undermined by his undoubtedly ruthless approach to the Irish Catholics, and his support for the parliamentary cause

DOES OLIVER CROMWELL MERIT A STATUE OUTSIDE THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT?

is weakened by his arguably autocratic methods. Overall, however, Cromwell's ability to rule and maintain unity in England, Ireland and Scotland following the chaos of the Civil War, whilst enforcing progressive religious and economic policies which would benefit Britain long into the future, ultimately proves he is worthy of a statue outside the Houses of Parliament. Cromwell's ecclesiastical arrangement may have been removed following the Restoration of 1660, but his influence on religious development in England was so great that the comprehensive and tolerant ideology that he inspired was not. Similarly, the increase in the importance of parliament following the abolition of the monarchy and the House of Lords was not simply a phenomenon which would fade away after the death of the Protector in 1658. The ideas, encouraged by Cromwell, which formulated and spread across England under his rule became his fundamental legacy and would ultimately help in causing the Glorious Revolution in 1688. During these events, religious toleration became a law permanently engrained into British society and parliamentary power was officially secured in the establishment of the constitutional monarchy. These developments greatly benefitted both England and Britain and merits Oliver Cromwell's statue at the geographic and spiritual heart of British governance.

Rebecca Bowers is currently in Year 13 at Oxford High School studying History, German and Economics. She hopes to study History and German (Joint Honours) at Edinburgh University next year.

by Dr Andrew Barclay

Any Cromwellian tourist or pilgrim visiting Cambridge in search of evidence of the life of Oliver Cromwell faces a paradox. The city centre contains quite a few of the most famous and best preserved historic buildings in Britain.¹ Some of them, Cromwell himself would recognise, but there are almost none with which he can be directly associated. This was why the new blue plaque, sponsored by the Cromwell Association, had to be erected on the site of a building (the Black Bear Inn) that no longer survives.

An understanding of the city's history helps make sense of this apparent oddity. The historic buildings that tend to survive are the colleges. One hesitates to praise the dons as guardians of their architectural heritage; too much was rebuilt by the Victorians for their record in that respect to be considered unblemished. But most of the older colleges have at least preserved some earlier buildings. The idea that the colleges ought to appear old and venerable has held sway, if not always uncontested, for the past two centuries. Even when modern architecture has been allowed to intrude, it has done so because older buildings have been allowed to remain. The city, in contrast, has had a notably poor record in preserving other old buildings. The feeling usually seems to have been that keeping some of the buildings associated with the university was enough. Houses, shops and other business premises were less celebrated, less glamorous and much more vulnerable to commercial pressures. Most notoriously, the Lion Yard shopping centre and the redevelopment of Petty Cury in the 1970s find a dishonourable place on any list of questionable post-war building projects. Much else, however, had already been lost well before then. One will therefore search the centre of Cambridge mostly in vain for pre-eighteenth century buildings that are not part of a college or a parish church.

The building with the most obvious Cromwellian link is the one where his connections with Cambridge begins and ends. Sidney Sussex was the college where Cromwell matriculated as a fellow commoner in April 1616. Most of his biographers have assumed that he probably studied there only until the following year, when his father died, and he certainly never completed his degree. He has been a rather more permanent resident since 1960, when his head was buried in a secret location in or close to the college chapel. A plaque in the antechapel records that event. Its simple inscription is

carefully neutral and leaves unexplained the reasons why it was felt necessary for the actual burial site to be unmarked. For those who know more, that silence is telling. There is also something appropriate in knowing that we can never be quite sure how close we have been to Cromwell's physical presence.

That memorial is probably the only reason most tourists visit the college. Pevsner had a point when he declared that, 'There is no getting away from the fact that Sidney Sussex College is architecturally the least attractive of the old colleges of the universities'.² Cromwell would recognise little. Although founded under Elizabeth I, alterations by James Burrough and James Essex in the eighteenth century and more especially by Sir Jeffry Wyatville in the nineteenth have left it more as an unconvincing pastiche of a sixteenth-century building. The oldest part, Hall Court, has mostly been refaced. A tradition of uncertain vintage claims that Cromwell's rooms were on the first floor of the north side.³ The south range of the Chapel Court dates from Cromwell's lifetime, but only after he had been there as a student. The chapel was completely rebuilt in the eighteenth century. The college has also commemorated the Lord Protector in the name of Cromwell Court, a very undistinguished 1980s block of student accommodation five minutes walk away in King Street.

Cromwell's time as a student at Sidney Sussex was almost certainly the longest period he spent living in the town. Indeed, it may well have been longer than all his subsequent stays combined, as those may have amounted to little more than four months in total. He was never (at least in life) a permanent resident nor is he known to have owned property there. The likelihood is that when he visited during the 1640s he stayed with friends. One of those friends can be identified. James Heath's *Flagellum* claimed that Cromwell stayed with a local grocer, Edward Almond, prior to his election as one of the town's MPs in 1640, while a letter from February 1643 written by Cromwell's distant kinsman and Cambridge resident, William Welbore, mentions that Cromwell planned to stay with Almond on his forthcoming visit to the town. Unfortunately, all that can be said about the location of Almond's house is that it was somewhere in Trinity parish.⁴ Beyond that, all we have are some dodgy nineteenth-century oral traditions. The most interesting of those claimed that he had stayed at the White Bull Yard, the entrance to which was on Bridge Street. What makes that intriguing is that

one of his known associates in the town, Robert Ibbott, owned a house close by. None of those survive and where they stood is now the front garden of the Master's Lodge of St John's College.⁵ This was considered and rejected as a possible location for a blue plaque. It is difficult to disagree, as the evidence is (even by my standards!) all a bit speculative. A third house, known in the nineteenth century as 'Cromwell's House', was close to the castle. That too no longer survives and the evidence linking it to Cromwell is equally tenuous.⁶ Panelling salvaged from it when it was demolished in the nineteenth century was re-used in the Master's Lodge of St Catherine's.⁷ As Peter Gaunt has pointed out, folk traditions about Cromwell do tend to be associated with areas he actually visited and yet that makes them no less likely to be hopelessly wrong.⁸

One Cambridge site certainly linked to Cromwell is the castle. As with Sidney Sussex, that too has been much altered. In 1642, when civil war broke out, no one knew that Cambridge would not see any fighting. Preparations therefore had to be made for the worst possible eventualities. Like communities elsewhere, the town did its best to repair existing defences and to build new ones. This was a task in which Cromwell, the local MP, played the leading part. In August 1642 he seized Cambridge castle. The high ground to the north of the bridge over the Cam on the main road to Huntingdon had long been recognised as one of the few defensible positions in a famously flat landscape. That was why, six centuries earlier, William the Conqueror had fortified it. This castle had later been rebuilt in stone by Edward I. By 1642, however, much of it was in ruins. Cromwell dealt with this with his characteristic energy. In 1643 money was raised to build new banks and ditches around its perimeter and to build other earthworks to surround those sides of the town not protected by the river.⁹ Equally radical redevelopments on Castle Hill in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when it became the site first of a prison and then of the Shire Hall, swept much of this away. The Norman motte does survive as a large artificial mound on the summit of the hill. This is one of the few vantage points from which to admire the city's skyline. Some traces of the earthworks constructed in 1643 survive in the private gardens of the houses to the north and the east. Excavations in 2005–6 uncovered other parts of the surrounding ditch.¹⁰

The defences built around the town are even more difficult to discern. A smaller fort was constructed to the south-east of Jesus College. That is now the site of the roundabout at the junction of Jesus Lane and Victoria Avenue. Perhaps appropriately, this is literally just down the street from Sidney Sussex's Cromwell Court. Lensfield Road may preserve the line of part of the bank and ditch built to the south of the town.¹¹

One reason why Cromwell was able to gain control of Cambridge so swiftly in 1642 is that he had a number of friends on the town corporation. Two years earlier they had helped get him elected as one of the town's two MPs. Then they had been relatively junior members of the corporation challenging an old guard of more established figures. Gradually, however, this group established itself as the dominant faction among the aldermen. They were as keen as Cromwell in wanting to see Parliament prevail. Their support for him throughout the war was never in doubt.

The Guildhall of Cromwell's day, a small building dating from the late fourteenth century, stood on the south side of Market Hill, somewhat further back than the front of the present Guildhall. It was demolished in 1782.¹² Market Hill, although still functioning as the marketplace, has also been completely altered over the intervening centuries. None of the street frontages follow those of the seventeenth century. The only older landmark, St Mary the Great, would then have been separated from the square by other buildings.¹³ In 1614 'Hobson's Conduit' was constructed to supply water to Market Hill. The original fountain was moved to Lensfield Road in the nineteenth century and the water supply from this branch of the conduit was another casualty of the Lion Yard development. It was on Market Hill that an effigy of Cromwell was burnt in 1661 to celebrate Charles II's coronation. It was paid for by a local man who, perhaps significantly, had once been one of Almond's apprentices.¹⁴

The town also served as the headquarters of the Eastern Association. Cambridgeshire was the only county adjacent to the other four original counties of the Association (Essex, Hertford, Norfolk and Suffolk) and was also closer to any likely action. The Association's central committee therefore based itself in Cambridge. Its usual meeting place seems to have been the Black Bear Inn, which is why its former location is the site now marked by the new blue plaque. That is in Market Passage, an alleyway

leading off Sidney Street on the side opposite Sidney Sussex.¹⁵ The town once had many such inns. Now only the Eagle in Bene't Street, famous as the pub in which Crick and Watson celebrated their discovery of the structure of DNA, gives some idea of how those older inns of Cambridge would have looked, and even it is mostly nineteenth century. When he was resident in Cambridge during 1644, the major-general of the Eastern Association, the second Earl of Manchester, stayed in Trinity College. The immediate purpose of that visit was to dismiss all suspect dons from their college fellowships. While the Earl was in town, the Association committee met in his rooms.¹⁶ Their location is not known.

Many in Cambridge opposed Charles I's religious policies, especially as personified by the local bishop, Matthew Wren of Ely.¹⁷ That was probably the main reason why the freemen of the corporation chose Cromwell as their MP in 1640. Wren is notable for sponsoring not just one but two college chapels, Peterhouse and Pembroke. They almost face each other from either side of Trumpington Street. Their contrasting styles sum up the differences in High-Church ecclesiastical fashions between the reigns of Charles I and Charles II. At Peterhouse the chapel was constructed during Wren's period as master (1625–35), although it was only under his successor, John Cosin, that the most controversial elements of its interior decoration were installed. As one would expect, much of this 1630s decoration did not last long. In December 1643 and January 1644 William Dowsing oversaw the removal of many of the more offensive features from the Cambridge churches. Yet, perhaps because it had been hidden, the 1639 glass in the east window of the Peterhouse chapel does actually survive and does so *in situ*. The design by Bernard van Linge was based on Rubens' *Le Coup de Lance*. A similar story applies at King's College chapel. There, many of the images that one might have thought Dowsing would have removed survive intact, including the vast east window. In his rush to move on, Dowsing may well have expected others to complete a job that was just so much bigger than those he faced anywhere else. There is no doubt, however, that Dowsing left his mark on most of the Cambridge churches and chapels. The difficulty is that, for the most part, later restorations have removed most direct traces of his activities.¹⁸ One later chapel is Wren's other commission, that at Pembroke, which was rebuilt at the bishop's expense in the 1660s. When he died in 1667 he was buried in the crypt below the chapel's east end. Although unmarked, the location of his grave is

known – he lies on the south side beneath the far corner of the last bay in front of the chancel arch.¹⁹ Thomas Eden, who, as chancellor of the diocese of Ely, was Wren's senior lay enforcer and who was MP for Cambridge University in several parliaments of the period, is buried in the chapel of Trinity Hall, the college of which he was the master.

Perhaps the least known survival in Cambridge from this period can be found in the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. In the late 1630s Inigo Jones designed a large Classical choir screen for Winchester Cathedral. This was done because Charles I had been unimpressed by the existing screen and what Jones replaced it with was an important example of the full-blown Laudian style.²⁰ Jones's screen was in turn removed by a later generation of ecclesiastical improvers. Then, in the early twentieth century, the architect of the new Cambridge museum, Sir Thomas Graham Jackson, happened also to be the surveyor of Winchester Cathedral and so was able to re-use parts of the Jonesian screen as the central feature of the museum's main gallery.²¹ Cromwell's head is thus not the only seventeenth-century relic to have ended up in Cambridge in a rather improbable way.

Anyone seeking a suitable souvenir before leaving Cambridge should consider buying a Cromwell postcard. In 2009 the university marked its 800th anniversary by commissioning a large cartoon celebrating its history from Quentin Blake. That now hangs in Addenbrooke's Hospital. Since then the university has sold postcards showing details of the twelve most famous people depicted in it. One of them is Cromwell. The postcards are usually on sale in the Fitzwilliam Museum and in the university shop on King's Parade. Mind you, it is not the most flattering cartoon of him. Even his *alma mater*, in celebrating him as one of its own, perpetuates the old stereotypes.

¹ Cambridge was granted the status of a city in 1951. Here I use the terms 'city' and 'town' as appropriate to the context.

² Nikolaus Pevsner, *Cambridgeshire* (1954, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2002), p. 158. Simon Bradley paraphrases this in the 2014 revised edition (p. 211), although, rather oddly, he qualifies it by

equating Sidney Sussex with St Catharine's. Bradley provides the best short account of the college's architecture.

- ³ Peter Gaunt, *The Cromwellian Gazetteer* (1987, reprinted Wren Park Publishing, 2000), p. 13.
- ⁴ Andrew Barclay, *Electing Cromwell: The Making of a Politician* (Pickering & Chatto, London, 2011), p. 49.
- ⁵ Barclay, *Electing Cromwell*, p. 49.
- ⁶ Barclay, *Electing Cromwell*, p. 205 n.49.
- ⁷ William Henry Samuel Jones, *A History of St Catherine's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1936, reprinted 2010), p. 34.
- ⁸ Peter Gaunt, 'A Cromwellian landscape? Oliver Cromwell and the urban and rural environment of Britain', pp. 67-8, in Jane A. Mills (ed.), *Cromwell's Legacy* (Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York, 2012).
- ⁹ Alison Taylor, *Cambridge: The Hidden History* (Tempus Publishing Ltd, Stroud, 1999), pp. 51-9; Frederick John Varley, *Cambridge during the Civil War 1642-1646* (W. Heffer & Sons Ltd., Cambridge, 1935), pp. 103-4.
- ¹⁰ Craig Cessford, 'Excavation of the Civil War bastion ditch of Cambridge Castle', in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, XCVII, 2008, pp. 137-48.
- ¹¹ Mike Osborne, *Cromwellian Fortifications in Cambridgeshire* (Cromwell Museum, Huntingdon, 1990), pp. 23-4.
- ¹² Thomas Dinham Atkinson, *Cambridge Described & Illustrated* (London and Cambridge, Macmillan and Co. Ltd. and Macmillan and Bowes, 1897), pp. 81-7.
- ¹³ Peter Bryan and Nick Wise, 'A Reconstruction of the Medieval Cambridge Market Place', in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, XCI, 2002, pp. 73-87; Evelyn Lord, *The Great Plague: A People's History* (Yale University Press, London and New Haven, 2014), pp. 15-17. Lord's book uses Cambridge as a case study for the impact of the 1665 plague and thus serves as a fine social history of the town in the decade following Cromwell's death.
- ¹⁴ Barclay, *Electing Cromwell*, p. 172.
- ¹⁵ The relevant evidence is summarised in an article in the March 2017 issue of *The Protector's Pen* (XIX, issue 1, March 2017, pp. 6-7). See also

the article by Clive Holmes ‘The Bear Inn, Oliver Cromwell and the Committee of the Eastern Association’ in this edition of *Cromwelliana*.

- ¹⁶ Clive Holmes, *The Eastern Association in the English civil war* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 123.
- ¹⁷ Graham Hart, ‘“Government according to the Holie Scripture”: Cambridgeshire’s Petition against episcopacy (1641)’, in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, CV, 2016, pp. 81-98.
- ¹⁸ *The Journal of William Dowsing: Iconoclasm in East Anglia during the English Civil War*, ed. Trevor Cooper (Ecclesiological Society, Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 2001), pp. 155-205
- ¹⁹ A.V. Grimstone, *Building Pembroke chapel: Wren, Pearce and Scott* (Pembroke College, Cambridge, 2009), pp. 55-8.
- ²⁰ Graham Parry, *Glory, Laud and Honour: The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation* (Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 2008), p. 53.
- ²¹ Bradley and Pevsner, *Cambridgeshire*, p. 258.

Dr Andrew Barclay is a Senior Research Fellow of the 1640–1660 Section of the History of Parliament Trust. His publications on Cromwell include *Electing Cromwell* (2011), a study of him in the years before the Civil War. He is also one of the editors of the forthcoming Oxford University Press edition of Cromwell’s correspondence and speeches.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

by Prof Peter Gaunt

The life and career of the parliamentarian soldier and politician Thomas Saunders (or Sanders) (1610–95) are fairly well known. He has a crisp *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry written by David Scott, a substantial biography in the Cromwell Association's 'Online Directory of Parliamentarian Army Officers' and, by dint of his election to all three Protectorate Parliaments, when they are published he will receive an entry in the History of Parliament volumes on members of the Commons, 1640–60. Indeed, his life can be quite quickly summarised.

Born into a Derbyshire landed family, Saunders was educated at Derby and Repton grammar schools, was admitted to the Inner Temple and married the daughter of a landed Staffordshire family. He supported the parliamentarian cause from the outbreak of the civil war, serving as an officer in several dragoon, horse and foot regiments in the north Midlands. He (and his close friend Nathaniel Barton) repeatedly clashed with Sir John Gell, parliament's prickly commander-in-chief in Derbyshire; this led to his rather eventful war record, for several times relations with Gell – who at one point alleged that he was a 'Brownist' and a coward – reached such low ebb that he took service outside Derbyshire, in neighbouring Staffordshire or Nottinghamshire or under Sir William Brereton and his Cheshire-based army. He played a supporting role on the fringes of Cromwell's Welsh campaign of 1648 and fought as Major in Francis Thornhaugh's horse regiment at the battle of Preston. Shortly afterwards he succeeded Thornhaugh as the regiment's Colonel, leading it at Worcester in 1651 and on campaign in Scotland. But his relations with Cromwell soured early in the Protectorate, when in autumn 1654, during the opening weeks of the first Protectorate Parliament, he signed a petition strongly criticising Cromwell and aspects of the Protectoral constitution and seeking the return of a 'free parliament' and a more republican system. As a consequence, he was forced to relinquish his army commission, though he retained a role in local government in Derbyshire and Staffordshire. He was elected to, but excluded from, the second Protectorate Parliament and declined to assist Major General Edward Whalley in running his region. He was elected to the third Protectorate Parliament in 1659, though appears not to have been active within it. With the fall of the Protectorate and return of the Rump, Saunders was restored to his Colonelcy of a horse regiment. He opposed the

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII: THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

army's removal of the Rump in autumn 1659 and was viewed as a threat by the generals' short-lived Committee of Safety, which had him arrested. He was released and restored to military command at the beginning of 1660, when the Rump returned once more, and he broadly supported Monck's plans. He lost military and political office at the Restoration, but retained most of his Derbyshire property. Although occasionally under suspicion, he lived quietly for another thirty-five years, until his death in 1695.

Thomas Saunders is interesting for two (linked) reasons. Firstly, although never a very senior officer or a key player on the national stage, a surprising amount of primary source material, by or about him, survives. Thus we have the texts of petitions which he signed or which he and his regiment drew up, a couple of letters which he wrote to and received from Cromwell, copies of political papers which he collected and retained, and a batch of his own letters and papers spanning much of the 1640s and 1650s, now in the Derbyshire Record Office in Matlock,¹ as well as the text of the anti-Protectoral petition which he and two fellow-Colonels signed in 1654. Secondly, and springing from this, it is possible in unusual depth and reasonable clarity to chart the emerging views and outlook of a man who, in a few years, moved from being a firm parliamentarian and admirer of Cromwell to an opponent of the Protector and his regime. This paper follows the path that Saunders took, from the early 1640s to autumn 1654, by reproducing (in full or in part) some of the key surviving documents which illustrate his route.

On 28 March 1642, as civil war loomed, Saunders attended a meeting of the principal Derbyshire gentry at the White Hart in Derby. Under Gell's emerging leadership, the county had recently addressed a petition to the House of Commons, mildly supportive of the reforms being effected by parliament but also urging that the King, Lords and Commons work together in pursuit of unity and harmony. News that the king was now based not far away in York, and that a trio of other north Midlands counties

¹ The acquisition of the Saunders family papers was the trigger for an article by J.L. Hobbs, 'The Sanders family and the descent of the manors of Caldwell, Coton-in-the-Elms and Little Ireon', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, 68 (1948), which includes an assessment of Thomas Saunders's career and a detailed family tree.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

were preparing to send petitions to him there, probably prompted the meeting which Saunders attended in late March and the Derbyshire petition to the king which was drawn up there and which he signed, one of 76 Derbyshire gentry and aldermen to do so on the spot, before copies were circulated throughout the county to garner wider support, ahead of its presentation to the king at York on 6th April. The petition which Saunders helped draft and to which he immediately put his name is conspicuously mild and moderate in its wording and overall tone, a fairly bland document which, for example, unlike some other north Midlands county petitions of late March and early April, did not explicitly ask the king to listen to, or to follow, parliament's advice. Indeed, one historian has suggested that it is symptomatic of a mood of neutralism which pervaded Derbyshire and most of its landowners – Gell and one or two others excepted – not only through spring and summer 1642 but also into the opening months of the civil war.² Certainly, in helping to draw up this petition and signing it, Saunders was giving no hint of radicalism.

To the Kings most excellent Majesty, your Majesties loyall & peacefull subjects, the Barronetts, Knights, Esquires, Gentlemen, Freeholders & others, inhabitants of the County & Town of Derby, whose names are hereunto annexed, humbly crave leave to shew & pray as follows.

Whereas we are distracted with the general fears of the kingdom that your Majesties removall from your parliament will be a dissolution of your gracious intent & their pious endeavour for the reformation of those great grievances which had crept both into the church and commonwealth & likewise an obstruction to the redress of those pressures under which we groan & an absolute hindrance to the releife of the calamitous distresses of your Majesties subjects of Ireland.

With bleeding hearts we humbly beseech your Majestie that you will be graciously pleased to return unto & reside near your parliament, your highest court and councill, whereby we conceive your royall crown is made most glorious to yourself and your posterity, our religion, lives & libertys secured unto us & ours & is the only means to expedite releife to your Majesties said distressed Protestant subjects in Ireland; without

² A.J. Fletcher, 'Petitioning and the outbreak of the civil war in Derbyshire', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, 93 (1973).

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

which we can conceive no probabylity of safety to your sacred Majesty, to them or us, who shall most readily, according to our protestation, with our lives & fortunes, maintain and defend your Majesties royal person, honour & crown, the power & priviledges of parliament, the rights & libertys of the subject & the power and purity of the Protestant religion. And we shall ever pray that your days may be as the dues of heaven & your posterity kings and princes to all generations.³

Perhaps seared by his experience of waging civil war, including the complex and bitter disputes with some on his own side⁴ as well as engaging the more obvious enemies, the royalists, by the later 1640s Saunders was showing an interest in much more radical ideas. Although there is no suggestion that he was in any way its author – indeed, one historian has noted its similarity to works known to have been produced by John Wildman around this time⁵ – he acquired and copied a paper of late 1647 or early 1648, critical of much of the current political, constitutional and religious position, including the role of the senior army officers themselves, and calling for radical reform very much along Leveller lines. Alas, the original no longer survives amongst the Saunders archive at the Derbyshire Record Office, but its presence within his papers was noted and the text transcribed and printed in the mid-eighteenth century.

The freedome wee were borne to is so justly due to every Englishman, that whoever shall remember the vehemency wherewith the people did

³ The original survives in the Pegge manuscripts in the College of Arms, London, but a full transcript appears in G. Sitwell, 'The Derbyshire petition of 1641', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, 19 (1897).

⁴ Saunders's war-time troubles, including details of allegations levelled at him by Gell in 1644–5 and the defence he mounted when he was given a hearing in London, and of Saunders's own accusations against Gell in 1645–6 when the tables were turned and Gell himself fell from favour and faced a series of charges, can be followed, often in great detail, in his surviving papers in the Derbyshire Record Office, D1232/O 1-O 77.

⁵ B. Taft, "'The Humble Petition of Several Colonels of the Army': causes, character and results of the military opposition to Cromwell's Protectorate", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 42 (1978), pp. 27–28 and n. 52.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

thirst after a parliament before they had this, the zeale wherewith they contributed to the late warre for defence of this freedome and the success wherewith it hath pleased God to blesse those endeavours, will soone be satisfied that there is no better cause in the world to engage upon; and therefore, the cause wee undertake at present, for which wee carry our lives in our hands, beinge the very same, will certainly need no apology for itself, the only thinge that may seeme strange in these our actings being the irregular manner of prosecuting our undoubted rights.

Herein wee desire it may be considered that all ordinary means and some extraordinary have beene already attempted and, after much patience, proved altogether fruitless:

That the parliament hath made noe other use of the many signal opportunities put into their hands than to continue their sitting at Westminster, and dividing the public treasure amongst themselves.

That the chiefe officers of the army (though pretending to keepe up the forces under them for the people's good, and to see the same accomplished in a short time) have yet made noe other use of their power than to continue and enlarge their own commands.

That besides our being disappointed of the fruit so long expected and being made more slaves every day than other to committees and sundry other arbitrary courses, even in the most legal proceedings wee find soe much corruption, tediousnesse, chargablenesse and obscurity practised and abetted by officers of all sorts, that the law itself is become noe protection to us in our properties or liberties.

Wee find that barbarous course still maintained of imprisoning men for debt, thereby hindering them from the use of their lawful callings, though they have nothinge else wherewith to satisfy their creditors or to preserve themselves and their families from starving.

Wee find that the restraining men's persons att pleasure without cause rendered, and during pleasure, was never more frequent.

Wee find that tythes, whose beginning was superstitious, and is found by experience to oppress the poor husbandman and to be vexatious to all manner of people, and prejudicial to the commonwealth, were never soe ingloriously and cruelly exacted as at present.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

Wee find taxes to be multiplied without number or hopes of end and excise soe cruelly exacted that noe man knows what is or what shall be his owne; and although many millions of moneys have been levied and payed, both voluntarily and by compulsion, yet noe accompt is given how they have been expended; but the public debts are dayly increased instead of beinge satisfied and such vast sums of money payed dayly out of the public treasurie for interest unto some with userers, as is almost incredible.

Wee find the trade of the nation (which the parliament promised at the first to advance) to be generally decayed, that without speedy remedy the nation cannot long subsist.

Wee find the poore to be wholly disregarded and oppressed and thousands of families suffered to beg their bread and many to perish with hunger.

But herein our condition hath beene rendered most desperate that wee have not beene suffered to represent our miseries to the parliament, and petition for redress; but persons have been imprisoned for petitioning and orders issued out from parliament to suppress petitions. Considering therefore this deplorable estate of the commonwealth, and the apparent danger of being imbroyled againe each in others blood, unless a speedy settlement prevent it; and considering not only that wee have attempted all regular wayes to procure reliefe for our longe oppressed country, but also that wee cannot with safety any longer offer our grievances and desires to parliament in petitions; and likewise considering that our slavery under arbitrary power is occasioned by the want of a settlement of a just and equal government, which if it were established would speedily ease us of all our common burthens; wee cannot bethink ourselves of a more probable remedy than to put ourselves and invite our countrymen to joine with us in a posture of defence, whereby wee may be secure from danger and from being prevented of our good intentions by the opposition of such as have designed our slavery, while wee propound to all our dear countrymen (who are sure to bee concerned in suffering as much as if they were in office) some certaine grounds of common right and freedome, wherein they and wee might see reason to agree

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

amongst ourselves and thereupon to establish a firme and present peace.

The particulars we offer are as followeth:...

- [1. A date to be set for the ending of the present parliament.
2. Future parliaments, elected with more equal constituencies, to meet at a set date every second year.
3. A contract to be drawn up between electors and elected on election day, giving MPs power to make, alter or repeal laws and judiciaries, to appoint or remove magistrates and other officers, to make war and peace and conduct diplomacy, but with no power to alter religion, to conscript men to serve on land or at sea or to make any 'pernicious' laws.
4. No-one to be molested by future parliaments for actions in the war since 1640.
5. All senior civil and military officers to serve annually or at most for two years.
6. The chancery and other 'arbitrary courts' to be abolished or at least to lose much of their power.
7. Existing laws to be revised, with the number of capital crimes reduced, all proceedings and records to be in English, the legal process to be made quick and cheap and officials to be salaried rather than supported by fees.
8. All real and personal estates to be made liable to debts, but no-one to be imprisoned, except those held on remand awaiting a speedy trial.
9. Tithes to be abolished and instead those liable to tithes to pay a moderate sum to the state; ministers to be maintained by voluntary contributions or from public funds.
10. Speedy accounts to be rendered of all money raised and spent since the beginning of the war.
11. As soon as possible excise and other taxes to be abolished and in the interim care to be taken to manage public revenues and all debts owing to the public to be settled speedily.
12. Care to be taken to encourage trade, including by mitigating customs duties.

13. Better means to be found for setting the able-bodied poor to work, to settle poor children in employment and to review those who can no longer work, especially those rendered incapable by service in the war.

14. Steps to be taken either to settle Ireland or to bring an end to the troubles there through the more vigorous prosecution of war.]

Now considering that the settlement of the nations peace and freedome hath beene constantly declared by the parliament to be their only end in engaging in this last warre and considering the many promises, solemn vowes and oaths made by them to the people to confirme them in the belief of their sincere intentions therein, wee should hope to find no opposition from them in our desires. But, however, wee cannot but be confident that the souldiery of the army (who solemnly engaged at Newmarket in June last [June 1647] to procure the same things in effect for the people which are here propounded) will so remember that solemn engagement as to shew their ready concurrence with us; and we hope it will be clear to them that there is noe other possible way to provide that sufficient indemnity (the want whereof first occasioned their refusal to disband) than what is here propounded; neither that there is any probable way to secure the arrears of the supernumeraries (who are disbanded contrary to the solemn engagement) or of those continuing in armes. And at least wee cannot but promise ourselves the assistance of all the commons who are not blinded by some self-interest or engaged to continue the present consuming distractions by virtue of some asset or employment depending thereon.

But however wee intending wrong to noe man, nor any private advantage to ourselves and the cause for which we appear, beinge soe clearly just, wee repose our confidence in the most hight God to protect us from the malice and rage both of all selfseekinge ambitious men who affect lordlinesse and tyranny and have designed the people's slavery and a perpetuation of their own rule and of all such mercenary vassals as they shall hire to destroy us and keepe the yoke of slavery upon the people's necks. And wee doe hereby promise and engage to all our countrymen that whensoever the settlement of the peace and freedome herein propounded shall be effected (all delays wherein we shall to our

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

utmost possibilities prevent) wee shall gladly and chearfully return to our private habitations and callings, enjoying only our equal share of freedome with all others in the nation.⁶

In June 1648, in the midst of his siege of Pembroke, Cromwell wrote a lengthy letter to Saunders, then operating close to the English-Welsh border in eastern Breconshire, directing him south into Monmouthshire and Glamorganshire, where he was to arrest several prominent and named individuals who were in open rebellion, or were suspected of supporting the royalist rising. Cromwell gave Saunders long and complex instructions about how to apprehend these men, in the final paragraph almost apologising for this:

You perceave by all this that wee are (it may bee) a little too much sollicitous in this businesse, it's our fault, and indeed such a temper causeth us often to overact businesse, wherefore without more adoe wee leave itt to you and you to the guidance of God herein...⁷

This letter, therefore, reveals something of Cromwell's character and his care with details, but it is solely concerned with military and security matters and gives no insight into Saunders's political or wider views at this stage.

Perhaps more revealingly, in terms of Saunders's political and military outlook by the late 1640s, towards the end of 1648 the officers and soldiers of his regiment and those of the regiment of Adrian Scrope joined together in drawing up a petition. Addressed to Lord General Fairfax, it urged the execution of speedy and severe justice against those who had renewed the civil war, from the highest to the lowest and explicitly including the king, as well as firm resistance to those in parliament who were attempting to frustrate the army agenda and ignore the legitimate needs of the soldiers. Just as the presence of a radical, Levellerish document of 1647–8 amongst Saunders's papers does not prove that he was supporting that agenda at that point, so the views expressed by (or put into the mouths of) the officers and men of his regiment in late 1649 do not necessarily reflect Saunders's own

⁶ William Harris, *An Historical and Critical Account of the Life of Oliver Cromwell* (1762), pp. 501-7.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 508.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

attitude towards possible regicide and political opponents of the army's agenda. However, in both cases Saunders's links with these documents are suggestive.

To his Excellency the Lord Fairfax, our ever honored and renowned general, the humble remonstrance of the officers and souldiers in Colonel Scroop's, and Colonel Sanders's regiments of horse.

May it please your Excellency, the consideration of the manifold and wonderful mercies of God manifested unto and upon us, and all the well affected in the kingdom, in treading down our enemies under our feet, because His mercy endureth for ever. The serious thoughts of the hidious cry of innocent blood crying for vengeance to Heaven, together with the meditation upon that peremptory command of the Creator, Who so sheddeth mans blood, by man shall his blood be shed.

The necessity of the due and timely execution of justice, in reference to the appeasing of our present distractions, the settling of a lasting peace and tranquillity in this nation, the terror of the present and future generations, that they may fear to do any more the like, the dangerous consequence of former lenity, and too much pity, and our observation of a present design by a prevailing party in parliament, to frustrate all our undertakings and expectations by a (now furiously driven on, and) most unjust treaty, with our twice conquered enemy, to the reviving of the hopes of the common enemy: Had prest our spirits earnestly to entreat your Excellency, with your General Council of War, that without delay (according to the wisdom and valor given you by God) you would endeavor that justice might take place upon all, from the highest to the lowest, from the king to the meanest subject, that they who (to satisfie their lusts, to support and continue slavery and tyranny in this nation) by their swords have made many mothers childless, and children fatherless, may (as to a sufficient number of the principal actors) have their children orphans, and their mothers childless, in that happy day when judgment without partiality shall flow down as a stream.

That sufficient and timely provision be made for the taking off from the country that unsupportable burden of famine-threatening-free-quarter (the detestation of both soldier and countryman), with divers

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

other things already before your Excellency from other regiments. But whilst these things were in agitation amongst us, there came to our view the heads of the Remonstrance of the Army, abundantly satisfying our expectations, and preventing our requests, by granting our petitions before they came to your Excellencies hands, which we do with all joyfulness receive, and thankfulness imbrace, acknowledging our hands to be much strengthned, and our hearts so encouraged, that we do desire this may be for ever a witness against us, if we do not readily (at your Excellencies command) put our lives in our hands again, resolving by Gods assistance, to break through all difficulties for the accomplishment thereof, and to require the blood of our brethren, and dear fellow souldiers, at the hands of him (or them) who shall dare to stop the currant of justice.⁸

A little over eighteen months later, in mid-September 1650, from London Saunders wrote a letter to Cromwell, who at that point was commanding the English campaign in Scotland, having just won the battle of Dunbar. In it Saunders recommended to Cromwell the services of a physician, John Burges, of his acquaintance. In a letter of recommendation, and one sent from an army officer to a superior officer, we would expect to find lavish, sometimes obsequious praise. However, even bearing that in mind, Saunders's words do seem to reveal a strong admiration for Cromwell and for their shared faith.

May it please you Excellency,

The Lord whoe hethertoo hath holpen his people will still stand by them. That God hath made you the man of his right hand, stronge

⁸ *The Declarations and Humble Representations of the Officers and Souldiers in Colonel Scoops, Colonel Saunders, Col. Waultons Regiment* (1648), pp. 2-3. Around the same time, Saunders himself attended the Whitehall Debates and it has been suggested that his voting pattern there indicates that he broadly supported the cautious line taken by a clutch of officers, including Henry Ireton, though he was keen to protect religious liberties from any encroachment by future parliaments – see Scott's biography in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* and B. Taft, 'Voting lists of the council of officers, December 1648', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 52 (1979).

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

and successefull for himselfe, cause and saints; the same God goe on with your Excellencie; make plaine your waye, counsell you in difficulties, strengthen your hart and lift it up more and more in his wayes. I greatly desired and endeavored to shew my duty in waiting on your Excellency when last at London, but providence ordered it otherwise. Understanding your armyes want of physitions and that the committee here sent one and provided another in readinesse; if you shall signifie your pleasure about another, if the postscript of there letter name not the gentleman, I take the boldnes to signifie that it is one doctor John Barges, one approved on by the said committee, a man willing and desirous to waite on your Excellency and ambitious to do you faithful service; whoe hath been of my acquaintance this twelve yeares and more, of whome I have heard large commendations by many members of the howse; by my own experience and soe far as I can judge, an able physition and honest man. Quarter-Master-General Gravener can say more, from whose knowledge of the gentleman I entreate your Excellency to take a fuller account. Soe not dareing to trouble you in your more weighty affaires, I take the humble boldness to subscribe,

Your Excellencie's most ready and real servant,

Tho. Sanders⁹

Formerly a loyal parliamentarian officer, albeit one with possible radical sympathies or interests by the late 1640s, and hitherto very respectful to Cromwell, the different political circumstances of autumn 1654 seem significantly to have altered Saunders's outlook. These different political circumstances include the ejection of the Rump, the resignation of the Nominated Assembly, the elevation of Cromwell as Lord Protector under a new written constitution and the meeting of the first Protectorate Parliament under the terms of that constitution, from which many MPs were effectively barred from 12 September once Cromwell imposed a new test on readmission to the House. This was the context that led Saunders to join with two other Colonels in signing an anti-Protectoral petition. In this

⁹ J. Nickolls, ed., *Original Letters and Papers of State Addressed to Oliver Cromwell* (1743), p. 22.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

Saunders was possibly part of a wider conspiracy against the regime, involving other army officers, a senior naval officer and the former Leveller, John Wildman – Thurloe certainly thought that Saunders and his two fellow-petitioners were just one element of a broader network of plots and plotters.¹⁰ But Thurloe's vigilance and swift action by the regime nipped things in the bud, for the moment at least little active resistance was encountered and the petition, which had clearly been intended for wider circulation within the army, was seized and largely suppressed – though the regime was unable to prevent some printed copies appearing and circulating – before more than the three principals had added their names to it.

The petition, which is unlikely to have been written by Saunders or his fellow-Colonels Allured and Okey and which was probably the work of John Wildman, had a strongly anti-Cromwellian and anti-Protectoral tone. Harking back to army declarations and pledges of 1647–8 and employing some of the language of those documents and that era, it claimed that the cause in general, and the people's rights and liberties in particular, were now in great danger – this being due to the elevation and enhanced powers of Cromwell, the creation of the office of Lord Protector and key aspects of the Protectoral written constitution, the Instrument of Government, thereby threatening a military-backed tyranny and a return to the worst excesses of Charles I's rule. Their call was for a free parliament, for the restoration of rights proposed within the revised version of the Agreement of the People drawn up in winter 1648–9, and implicitly for the rejection and overthrow of the Protectorate and the restoration of a republican system of government grounded in elected parliaments.¹¹ In consequence, he and his fellow-Colonels lost their military positions and, in Allured's and Okey's cases, for a time their liberty too. Saunders received the mildest treatment; summoned before the Protector in mid-December 1654, he 'declared his dissatisfactions'¹² but was merely required to surrender his commission and was free to retire to Derbyshire. But the radicalisation of Saunders was complete.

¹⁰ T. Birch, ed., *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe* (7 vols, 1742), III, 147–8.

¹¹ The petition, its origins, content and context are all examined in detail by Taft, 'The Humble Petition of Several Colonels of the Army'.

¹² C.H. Firth, ed., *The Clarke Papers* (4 vols, 1891–1901), III, 12.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

To his Highness the Lord Protector etc and our general, the humble petition of several colonels of the army.

Showeth,

That as members of the army we have solemnly declared (not without appeals to God for our sincerity therein) that we did engage in judgement and conscience for the just rights and liberties of our country and not as a mercenary army; yet our high estimation and tender regard of and great confidence in your Highness, who hath engaged with us in the same quarrel, hath made us attend in silence your counsels and determinations to the utmost extremity.

But finding you to have been of late upon transactions of highest moment, whereupon the life or death of a good cause and the public interest of the commonwealth doth depend; and that the price of our blood is brought to the utmost crisis of danger, we hold ourselves obliged in conscience and duty, to God, our country and yourself, to testify to your Highness the integrity of our hearts in adhering to that old cause mentioned in our public declarations and engagements to the parliament and people, and humbly to mind your Highness of the tyranny against which we engaged and of the fundamental rights and freedoms we intended to redeem out of the tyrant's hands with the price of our blood; and in this, we shall confine ourselves to that whereunto the whole army by their general council agreed not only before but also after that high exemplary justice done upon the late king for his tyranny and oppression.

And in order to bring him to justice, we then declared his tyranny to consist in his opposition of the supreme trust of parliaments, concerning the people's safety in their absolute command of the militia, when they judged it necessary, and of their purses to raise moneys, and of their power to call all officers of justice and ministers of state to account, he pretending that none of these powers might be exercised without him; and that the people's chosen trustees in parliament could not provide for the people's safety and welfare but at and according to his pleasure; and that whatsoever he did either with the militia which he

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

challenged or whatsoever mischiefs against the people, neither parliaments or any power on earth could call to an account, attach or meddle with his sacred person.

And we then also declared that the public interest of right and freedom originally contended for by us were constant successive parliaments, to be freely and equally chosen by the people as their representers for all matters of supreme trust and concernment, both for safety and welfare; and that those parliaments should have the supreme power and trust in all civil things whatsoever, in making laws, constitutions and offices, and removing of any public grievances and in giving final judgement concerning war or peace and the whole safety and welfare of the people.

And that nothing should be imposed upon or taken from the people but by their parliaments; and if any attempts be made otherwise, that the people should not be bound thereby but free.

And that no person whatsoever should be exempt from account unto or punishment by the people's parliaments.

That principle of the king's unaccountableness being the grand root of tyranny and declared by us to be begotten by the blasphemous arrogancy of tyrants upon their servile parasites.

Now our consciences bearing us witness that we have dipped our hands in blood in this cause and that the blood of many thousands hath been therein shed by our means, we tremble and fear before the Lord in the sense of that account we must render for all that precious blood if we should by silence give away the freedom purchased for our country at so dear a rate or be instruments to subject the people unto the same or the like kind of thralldom from which God hath delivered them by so many signal providences (little less than miracles).

We having therefore seriously and sadly considered the present great transactions and the government in the settlement whereof our assistance is required and are pressed in our consciences to declare to your Highness in all humbleness and soberness of mind, that we sadly resent the dangerous consequences of establishing that supreme trust of the militia at least for the space of two years and a half of every three

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

years in a single person and a Council of his own whom he may control by a negative voice at his pleasure.

And also that during the session of parliaments the single person's interest therein shall be paramount to the interest of parliaments and this power to be over such a militia as the late king durst not claim; that is to say, a standing army, which may in a short tract of time by the policy of any single person that shall succeed be made wholly mercenary and be made use of to destroy at his pleasure the being of parliaments and render all the blood and treasure expended in this cause not only fruitless but us and our posterities under an absolute tyranny and vassalage, both in our consciences, persons and estates, the danger being beyond comparison higher (if any such single person be corrupt) than it could have been to have allowed the late king's claim to that ancient militia which was to command the country to array, the arms being in the country's own custody and themselves or men of their own choosing to bear them, who had no particular interest to oblige them to obey any of the king's illegal commands against themselves or their country; whereas a standing army under a single person, which in time cannot rationally be supposed to be otherwise than mercenary, will have an interest of subsistence and preferment in opposition to the commonwealth's interest to oblige them to his commands.

And many late examples have evidenced to the whole world that such a commander of the militia will at his pleasure be master of all parliaments, freedoms and resolutions and of all our birth-rights now purchased by our blood, especially considering that according to that which is imposed upon the present parliament, no parliaments shall ever dare to propose anything against a single person's command of the militia, if he should refuse, during their sessions, to dispose the same as they shall advise.

So that whatsoever provisions are seemingly made either for just liberty of conscience or for securing the property of our persons or estates, they are all made void secretly in this, and subjected only to the mercy and will of any succeeding single person whose heart may be

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

corrupted with ambition, covetousness, lust, pride or desire of domination.

And upon the same account we are sensible that the next greatest part of the public interest engaged for, which is the legislative power in parliament to make or repeal laws, constitute offices and to make war or peace, even this shall depend upon the will and pleasure of the single person; for he shall not only have a challenge of a share in the legislative power but an absolute negative voice to all bills containing anything in them contrary to the matters contained in the Government; under which pretence, a corrupted single person may under colour of right prevent any bill passing into a law by averring that something therein is contrary to the Government. But if any bill whatsoever pass into a law without the single person's consent, it must be by the parliament's declaration against him, that he is obstinate and will not consent to the bill, though he cannot satisfy them why he should not; and how probable it is, that the parliament shall dare to declare in such manner against him that hath the command of thirty thousand men obliged to him for their pay and preferment, we conceive every considerate man may judge. And besides, how dangerous a clog this will be upon the power of parliaments, when no law can be made without the single person's consent, without hazard of a war by so declaring against him, as must render him odious to the people, which is not to be supposed will be borne by him.

And how little less this is in effect than an absolute negative voice (the opposing whereof in the late king cost so much blood) is not hard to judge.

And if the single person should attempt the highest tyranny upon the people, such is the power vested in him and in such a manner that the parliament cannot execute justice upon him according to his demerits unless it shall be supposed that contrary to nature, he shall assent to have justice done upon himself; for the parliament cannot by the Government make a law to take away the command of the militia from the single person without his own consent, and how then can they proceed to higher acts of justice against him if cause be? But indeed the power vested in him renders him able to protect himself from justice, as

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

the late king might have done (speaking as men) if he had been guarded by a standing army paid and preferred by him, and the honest people without any formed forces or arms as now. And this we conceive to be of perpetual prejudice to the public interest for which we engaged. For the power of punishment and the subjection of every person unto justice is that essential part of public interest which is the fence and guard of all the rest in the depraved estate of mankind.

And in regard of our former asserting that ancient freedom of our country that no moneys should be levied upon them but by parliaments, we sadly apprehend the evil consequences that may ensure upon the power of the said Protector and his Council to levy upon the people so much moneys as will maintain a fleet and an army of 30,000 men and £200,000 per annum over and above, that the way of levying the same must not be altered but by the consent of succeeding Protectors.

Now having in our deepest thoughts conscientiously weighted the premises, calling to mind our former declarations to the people, with our protestations and appeals to God in our straights, that we did in the integrity of our hearts seek only the security of the public interest of right and freedom and not the advancement of ourselves or any particular party or interest; and considering that we have borne up the name of God in our undertakings and have done all in His name; and finding in our apprehensions the public interest of right and freedom so far from security, that the first foundations thereof are unsettled and the gates are open that may lead us into endless troubles and hazards, the Government not being clearly settled, either upon the bottom of the people's consent, trust or contract, nor a right of conquest, the honest people of England not being conquered, nor upon an immediate divine designation; and our ears being filled daily with taunts, reproaches and scandals upon the profession of honesty, under colour that we have pretended the freedoms of our country and made large professions against seeking our private interests while we intended only to set up ourselves.

These things thus meeting together do fill our hearts with trouble and sadness and make us cautious of taking upon ourselves

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XVIII:
THE RADICALISATION OF COLONEL THOMAS SAUNDERS

rashly any new engagements, although none shall more faithfully serve your Highness in all just designs than your petitioners. And we are hereby enforced to make this humble address and to pray your Highness's most serious thoughts of that high price of blood and treasure which the commonwealth hath paid for its right and freedom, which was naturally and morally due unto it before, and of the account that must be given to the dreadful God for all the blood we have shed; and that we can be deemed no better than murderers if the integrity of our hearts in the prosecution of the just ends of the war do not render us justifiable therein; and to the intent that the whole public interest contended for may be certainly secured to the people and our consciences discharged in that great duty; that a full and truly free parliament may without any imposition upon their judgements and consciences freely consider of those fundamental rights and freedoms of the commonwealth that were the first subject of this great contest, which God hath decided on our side, according as the same have been proposed to the late parliament by the general council of the army in the Agreement of the People, which remains there upon record. That by the assistance and direction of God they may settle the government of the commonwealth and the ways of administration of justice and secure our dearly-bought freedom of our consciences, persons and estates against all future attempt of tyranny; and such a settlement will stand upon a basis undoubtedly just by the laws of God and man; and therefore more likely to continue to us and our posterities. And in your Highness's prosecution of these great ends of the expense of all the blood and treasure in these three nations, your petitioners shall freely hazard their lives and estates in your just defence.

And shall ever pray, etc,

Thomas Saunders John Okey Matthew Allured¹³

Peter Gaunt is Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Chester and President of the Cromwell Association.

¹³ *To his Highness the Lord Protector &c and our General, the Humble Petition of Several Colonels of the Army* (1654), single sheet.

BOOK REVIEWS

Frances Willmoth and Elizabeth Stazicker, *Jonas Moore's Mapp of the Great Levell of the Fens 1658*. Cambridgeshire Record Society, vol. 23, 2016 (16 plates; a DVD; a booklet 120 pp.) ISBN 978-0-904323-25-2. £36.00

reviewed by Dr Clive Holmes

The Cambridgeshire Record Society have done admirably in preparing a work that is in a far from typical format and which makes skilfull use of modern technology for publication. The subscriber to their volume 23 will receive sixteen high quality prints of the sixteen sections that make up Moore's 1658 map, advertising and celebrating the drainage works achieved by the Company of Conservators of the Fens since their acceptance of the scheme proposed by the engineer Sir Cornelius Vermuyden in 1650. They will also acquire a DVD that provides another copy of the original Moore map, with the subsequent editions of 1684 and 1706. Again, clarity and resolution are high, and it is easy, using the usual magnification available with good PCs, to undertake detailed study of some of the tiny plots that survived from earlier drainage attempts – along the line of the Old Croft River for instance. The next obvious step, studying changing patterns of landownership, cannot be undertaken, however. The 1684 map, by Moses Pitt (also wonderfully clear when the DVD copy is magnified) basically reproduces the earlier, now outdated Moore map, and the original of the 1706 map is at too small a scale for detail to be seen.

The subscriber will also receive a 120 page introductory handbook. In this, first, Frances Willmoth provides contextualisations of Moore's map – in relation to the history of the drainage projects in the area; in relation to Moore as a mathematician and surveyor; in relation to the history of mapmaking; in relation to the political background to the resurrection of the Earl of Bedford's Company in the Statute of 29 May 1649. This last theme also engages the second editor, Elizabeth Stazicker, who provides a biographical dictionary of the men involved in the project with whose coats of arms Moore decorated the map.

Moore's intention in providing the coats of arms was to emphasise the status of the drainers and the respectability of their project. Stazicker's section occasionally suggests that she has bought into Moore's polemically charged scheme rather uncritically. The careers of a number of shady

figures, such as the regicide lawyer, William Say, one of the log-rollers who secured the passage of the 1649 Statute – dominating the investigative committees; manipulating the procedures of the house – are not really interrogated in these biographies. But for the political historian of the 1650s it is the conjunction of men of hugely divergent backgrounds that is most notable: Cromwellians predominate, such as Oliver's Lords Whalley, Goffe and Titchbourne; courtiers like Sir Gilbert Pickering; officials like Thurloe and Chief Justice St John. But they were joined by 'Presbyterians' who had abandoned politics after 1649, such as Lord North and Sir Gilbert Gerard; and a good number of Royalists, active or passive, like Lord Gorges, Sir Thomas Chicheley, and Dr Denton. It is this kind of co-operative venture, reintegrating the social elite divided by war and revolution, which might have made Cromwellian rule, even Cromwellian monarchy, feasible had Oliver survived beyond 1658.

Jonathan Worton, *The Battle of Montgomery, 1644: The English Civil War in the Welsh Borderlands*. Helion and Company, Century of the Soldier no.9, 2016 (108 pp.) ISBN 978-1-911096-23-8. £19.95 paperback.

reviewed by Prof John Morrill

This is a really marvellous book, a model study. I do not know a better book on a civil war battle. Jonathan Worton has already written a military history of the first two Civil Wars in Shropshire, as royalist a county as they come, and now he has written a study of an important battle not in the top league, but very much in the second division. Within sight of the walls of Montgomery Castle on Wednesday 18 September 1644, some 4,400 Royalist troops, many English soldiers who had served in Ireland, came up against 3,900 Parliamentarians. The Royalists were commanded by a senior deputy to Prince Rupert, Sir John Byron from Nottinghamshire, and the Parliamentarians were commanded by a Scottish veteran of the German Wars, Sir John Meldrum, who had, over the previous 24 months, fought all over the country. Strikingly, but consensually, he had been put in command by two regional commanders who outranked him militarily and socially, Sir William Brereton and Sir Thomas Myddleton.

There are several contemporary accounts of the battle, but they are best described as sketchy and tantalising. Even the precise location of the battlefield resembles a 'spot-the-ball' competition. Worton has now written a very thorough, clear and engrossing study. He starts with an appropriately broad strategic review, then narrows down first on events along the Welsh border, and then in and around the town and castle of Montgomery. He then offers admirably crisp and effective short biographies of all the major players in the battle itself and a review of the composition and previous military experience of the component parts of both armies. Perhaps the most important chapter is the eleven-page scrutiny of possible battlefield sites. Here he picks up some tiny clues from the primary sources, links them to his own close study of the topography and to the indicative archaeological evidence (important here is the recovery not only of battlefield debris but also evidence of pre-modern pathways and wooden bridges) and he comes up with a highly persuasive resiting of the battlefield NNW of the town. Now at last, he can offer an account of the battle itself drawn from the letters of those engaged in the battle on both sides. Here he makes less change to what is known because there is less to discover, but his account will surely remain the account of first resort.

The book ends with a short and thoughtful chapter on the aftermath and impact of the battle. Here Worton might have broadened out a little from the quite tight local focus on what happened to the 1,500 royalist prisoners and on the sleighting of the Castle to develop a point he made at the start: that the real significance of the battle of Montgomery was that it allowed the national press to shift the mood away from one of demoralisation over the humiliating surrender of the Earl of Essex at Lostwithiel on 2 September, to news of a victory that could be blown up out of proportion. But this is a counsel of perfection. This is a very good work of history that is also magnificently illustrated, and indeed the eight colour plates, thirty black-and-white illustrations and four instructive maps are not just adornments but an essential part of the book's interpretative and analytical framework. The quality of the paper needed for such well-presented illustrations explain the otherwise mildly discouraging price of the book. It is worth every penny.

BOOK REVIEWS

Malcolm Wanklyn, *Reconstructing the New Model Army, volume 2: Regimental Lists 1649–1663*. Helion and Company, Century of the Soldier no.8, 2016 (286 pp.) ISBN 978-1-910777 -88-6. £25.00 paperback.

Laurence Spring, *The Army of the Eastern Association. Officers and Regiments*. The Pike and Shot Society, 2016. (199 pp.) ISBN 978-1-902768-50-7. £15 paperback.

reviewed by Prof John Morrill

Of the many attempts to produce officer lists for the period of the English Civil Wars (and of English armies in Scotland and Ireland) Malcolm Wanklyn's volumes are the most thoroughly researched and authoritative. The direct comparison must be with C.H.Firth and G.Davies, *A regimental history of Cromwell's Army* (2 vols, Oxford, 1940). But as we will see, Wanklyn has produced something much more reliable and usable, at least for those interested in *regimental* histories. Firth and Davies tried to produce a continuous history, taking each regiment over a long period of time and chronicling all changes in its captains, majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels. It has separate accounts of the twenty-five original regiments created by the New Model Ordinance of early 1645, interspersed with chapters on five wholly new horse regiments and eighteen new regiments of foot that they call 'the post New Model regiments'. This is followed by accounts of ten regiments of horse, two of dragoons and twenty-two of foot raised specifically for service in Ireland and seventeen regiments raised for service in Flanders and in the West Indies. Most valuable is the account of the previous military records of those commissioned into the New Model in 1645. The 40-page index at the end of volume 2 is a major asset, but otherwise it is almost completely unusable.

Firth and Davies knew all the printed sources inside out, and they also knew the wealth of material in the papers of William Clarke, Secretary to the Army from before Putney until the Restoration. There was not much in the British Museum (as it then was) or the Bodleian Library that they did not exploit. But they made little use of the riches of what is now TNA (The National Archives) SP28 (The Commonwealth Exchequer Papers – muster lists and pay warrants) and less still of the lists of arrears in the Exchequer records themselves (TNA, E121). It is in the use of these that Wanklyn

scores most heavily. But he has also used a range of other sources and the rich secondary literature of the past 75 years really effectively.

Before we turn to Wanklyn, we need to note that two other sources have approached the problem of identifying officer lists in a completely different way. In 1981, the late Peter Newman published his labour of love, *Royalist Officers in England and Wales, 1642–1660*. Printed straight from a clear typewritten text, this is an alphabetical list of more than 1,600 men commissioned by Charles I and Charles II over the whole period from the outbreak of fighting to the Restoration. And by the time this review is published, there will have appeared, free and on British History Online (<https://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/cromwell-army-officers>), a directory of all parliamentary officers in the various marching armies, national and regional, in the period up to the creation of the New Model. This has been a major investment by the Cromwell Association and is now free to all users. Being online it is also highly searchable. Both this directory and Newman's royalist officer lists are arranged in a single alphabetical listing by surname. For most users, this will be a preferable way of organising material.

There are swings and roundabouts in connection with reconstructing the lists by regiment. Although the Directory of Parliamentary Officers can be used to reconstruct regimental histories by word searches on the database (*very* laboriously), it would take days to reconstruct any royalist regiment from Newman's volume. It takes a lot less time to reconstruct a career from Wanklyn's volumes, given the accuracy of his indexes, but information about every individual is inevitably fragmented. I randomly chose two officers whose political careers I have been studying recently (Daniel Axtell and William Allen), and two who served in the army of Sir William Brereton in the First Civil War (my first love 50 years ago!), Robert Duckenfield and Jerome Zanchy. It took me more than fifteen minutes to find and read the eighteen entries for Axtell, because I had to find him in most cases in the tiny-print footnotes or in the side columns under other names, whereas Zanchy, with seven entries almost all in the regimental lists with specific footnotes, took less than three minutes. The others, somewhere in between, took six and seven minutes.

So Wanklyn is wonderful for giving the reader still photographs of the officer corps at frozen moments – in this volume for regiments in Britain in June 1650, October 1651, November 1656, October 1658, September 1659, February 1660 (and later); in Ireland in video-clips for the period of Cromwell's campaigns there, from June 1650–October 1653, November 1653–September 1655 and from October 1655–June 1659. The Directory of Parliamentary Officers gives a close-up full cine film of the career of each officer, but there is no sense of the regimental contexts.

For each still photograph or clip, Wanklyn gives us a list of officers for each regiment, from captain-lieutenant up; comments on the career (since the last and before the next photo or clip); and in many cases he adds footnotes listing sources, or adding comments about each officer that he has found in secondary discussion or to other relevant military matters. For example, George Westby, captain in the 15th cavalry regiment in October 1658: '[his] company was added to the regiment on 5/58. It had garrisoned Clifford's Tower, York, and also formed part of the garrison at Hull where it had been raised in 1655' [three full references supplied] – this is on p.105 as n.45. Or as a note about Major Richard Scott of the 31st Regiment for 17 February 1660: '[Colonel]Farley, [Major] Scott, [captains] Pride, Corney and [Capt-Lt] Arundel were involved in putting down a riot in London in 1/60. BL Thomason Tracts, *Parliamentary Intelligencer* 9-16/1/60. Corney's replacement by 25/2/60 was Moore Fauntleroy: Worc. College, Clarke Ms 52 fo.49'. There are more than 2,000 officers discussed in volume 2 alone, and this kind of information about several hundred of them. This is more than a treasure trove: it is a cornucopia.

As in volume 1, Wanklyn has provided an introduction in the form of a series of short and discreet essays. The first is an account of the differences between the surviving records for the 1650s as against the 1640s. Then an account of how the volume is arranged and an explanation of the form of his tables. Next an account of the 'imperial dimension', ie the 'occupying forces' in Ireland and Scotland and beyond Britain and Ireland, and of the survival of some of the regiments beyond the Restoration. And finally an important corrective account looking in a convincingly fresh way at the purges of 1659/60 and their effect on the political counter-revolution.

Peter Gaunt, reviewing volume I (*Cromwelliana* 2016, pp.97–8) called it ‘a hugely impressive piece of work of enormous value and many, both historians and a wider readership, will be keenly awaiting the appearance of Professor Wanklyn’s second and accompanying volume’. He was right on both counts. If anything, the achievement and importance of this second volume are even greater.

Alas, I cannot wax so eloquent about Laurence Spring’s book on the Army of the Eastern Association. He is an expert on armies more than on the English civil wars, having written books on Russian (and Cossack) armies and on Bavarian armies in the Thirty Years War. He contributed a similar volume on Waller’s Southern Association Army for the Pike and Shot Society a decade ago, and ten years before that (in 1997) a study of the battle of Cheriton (Waller’s victory over Hopton in March 1644). What makes this a book to welcome is its inclusion in some/many of its regimental listings of NCOs – such as quartermasters, sergeants, corporals, trumpeters, drummers and (the undefined) lance pasidores. But for the officers themselves this book has already been completely superceded by the Directory of Parliamentary Officers Online, referred to above. This is hardly Spring’s fault but his book suffers from a much narrower search of the sources and this shows all too often. For example, many of the officers appear under their surnames only, even when their forenames are easily discoverable in standard sources. To give just one example: Captain Titus, of Colonel Aylofffe’s regiment, has a Christian name [Silius] easily retrievable from many secondary books and from *ODNB* (and even from Firth’s life of him in *DNB* (1897)). Crucially the book lacks an index and that renders it useless as a biographical guide, and the order of the regiments appears to lack logic or clarity. Cromwell’s own regiment of horse was created in March 1643, but there is no information about it here before the spring of 1644. And so on. So this is a slightly untidy haystack containing randomly hidden needles of some considerable value. The introduction offers some very overfamiliar information about weapons, colours, uniforms, etc. I’m sorry, but this is not a book for the digital age, however worthy its intentions.

BOOK REVIEWS

Laura A.M. Stewart, *Rethinking the Scottish Revolution: Covenanted Scotland, 1637–1651*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016. 291+xv pp. ISBN 978-0-19-871844-4. £65 hardback.

reviewed by Dr Patrick Little

The last ten years or so have seen a change in emphasis in early modern political history. There has been a move away from the traditional dichotomy between ‘high’ politics (the study of kings and queens, parliaments, the nobility, etc) and ‘popular’ politics (the lower orders, radical movements, local histories, rioting and localised violence) towards a more nuanced approach, which emphasises the interconnectedness of the centre and the locality, the rulers and the ruled. The mid-seventeenth century in England has seen a lot of important work recently, especially on the way in which the explosion of printed material led to uncontrolled (and unmediated) political debate at all levels of society, and on the fuzziness of the boundaries between popular politics and high politics more generally.

Laura Stewart’s new book seeks to apply these new approaches to Scottish history in the same period: the Covenanting rebellion against Charles I, Scottish interventions in the English Civil War, the royalist Engagement of 1647–8, and the ill-fated attempt of the Covenanters to work with Charles II. There were differences between the two kingdoms, of course, and Stewart is at pains to stress that Scotland was not a ‘carbon copy’ of England: it was more hierarchical socially, with fewer opportunities for participation for the lower orders, and a less well-developed print culture.

The aim of this book is not to provide a narrative account of the Covenanting period – the chronology has already been established by David Stevenson and others, and the basic outline of events is not in doubt. Instead the chapters form a set of individual case studies, grouped together in two sections depending on whether the subject matters falls before or after the establishment of an autonomous ‘Covenanted Scotland’ in 1641. The first chapter looks in detail at the Scottish ‘crisis’ triggered by the riots in Edinburgh against Charles I’s Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 and considers the nature of the rebellion against the crown and its policies that followed. It focuses on print culture and public debate, the involvement of crowds in politics (including the role of women), and the failure of the king’s side to

mount an effective campaign against their opponents. Chapter two looks more closely at the National Covenant of 1638, its origins and its importance as a tool of popular political engagement. This is followed by a contextual chapter, dealing with the development of theories of a 'Covenanted commonwealth' from the reign of James VI and I through to the early 1640s.

The second section of the book starts with a rather different topic: the way in which the Covenanted state raised money to finance its armies, including innovations such as an excise on the sale of goods and complicated borrowing strategies. Chapter five considers the nature of governance within this fiscal-military state, how its position was legitimised and internal dissent dealt with by using the moral authority and distinctive language associated with the Covenant. The final chapter returns to the theme of print culture, taking as an example the Engagement crisis which followed the king's deal with the Duke of Hamilton and other moderate politicians at the end of 1647. The conclusion brings these diverse chapters together, justifies the description of this period as a 'Scottish Revolution', and explores its lasting consequences for the people of Scotland.

A few minor quibbles. From the title onwards the period is described as the 'Scottish Revolution', but the precise definition of what a revolution was, and whether Scotland was experiencing one at this time, is not directly addressed until the start of the conclusion, on p.303. Secondly, Stewart dismisses the 'New British History', which explored political interconnections between England, Scotland and Ireland (p.4); she also rejects comparisons between the Covenanters and the Irish Catholic Confederates, as the latter 'remained an alternative government' rather than taking over the whole of Ireland (p.305). Yet in doing so she misses interesting areas of enquiry. For example, the Scottish Engagement of December 1647, which was backed by many secular politicians but denounced by the religious leadership – leading to fatal divisions – looks on the surface very much like the First Ormond Peace between the royalists and Confederates in Ireland. An Irish dimension might help to provide important context. Finally, Stewart chooses in her conclusion to take the story beyond 1651, looking at the impact of the Covenanting period on later centuries. That makes perfect sense, but embarking with too much enthusiasm upon the choppy waters of present-day Scottish politics is more

problematic, not least because any comments risk becoming dated. In any case, Stewart herself admits that the Covenant, with its overtly religious clauses and its violently anti-Catholic rhetoric, has naturally been given a wide berth by politicians at Holyrood, and ‘has now largely slipped from public view’ (p.339). These are minor points that do not affect the overall conclusion that this is an important book, well-researched and thought-provoking, which provides a refreshing new analysis of Covenanting Scotland.

Simon Marsh, *The Train of Artillery of the Earl of Essex*. Pike and Shot Society, 2016. (254 pp., 9 b&w illustrations.) ISBN 9781911512523. £15 paperback.

reviewed by Prof Peter Gaunt

This interesting and informative volume, written and edited by a senior member of the Battlefields Trust, comprises in the main a transcript of a surviving set of financial accounts compiled for Sir Edward Peyto in 1642–43. Both the man and his papers, most of which are now held at the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust archive in Stratford, are reasonably well-known to historians: Ann Hughes in her study of Warwickshire over the civil war period and Jan Broadway in her *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* account of the Peyto family not only discuss Sir Edward’s contribution to the parliamentary war effort, but also reference his papers at Stratford. But if not unknown or overlooked, hitherto surprisingly little has been made of these particular accounts – they do not, for example, appear in the bibliography of Stephen Bull’s 2008 study of *‘The Furie of the Ordnance’: Artillery in the English Civil Wars*. That such detailed accounts, throwing light on a rather neglected part of the main parliamentary army during the opening year or so of the civil war, are now readily accessible, is thus to be warmly welcomed.

Peyto was a wealthy south Warwickshire landowner who, by inheritance and marriage, became one of the most prominent members of county society. An intellectual and bibliophile who dabbled in architecture – the rather strange, classically-influenced windmill which he designed and had built on his estate at Chesterton in the early 1630s survives and is illustrated in this volume – Peyto also probably gained some military experience on the

Continent, for at the outbreak of the civil war he was very active as second-in-command of the successful resistance mounted by Warwick Castle when the town briefly fell to the king in August 1642. From shortly thereafter until his death in September 1643 he was lieutenant-general of the ordnance in the Earl of Essex's army. It was in this capacity, as deputy to Sir John Merrick, Essex's general of the ordnance, that Peyto had these accounts maintained, spanning a period of a little under a year, from mid-November 1642 until mid-September 1643; thus opening just after the battle and campaign of Edgehill, though Peyto seems to have been connected with Essex's train by the time of the battle, until shortly after Essex's army had relieved Gloucester. Peyto was with the army en route to and at Gloucester, and his death shortly afterwards might suggest that he contracted one of the diseases then prevalent in the army camp, though, as Simon Marsh speculates in the introduction, some of the oils and exotic items he was purchasing during summer 1643 could indicate longer term or underlying health problems.

Drawn up by Richard Deane, an associate or employee of Peyto from before the civil war, who served as one of the gentlemen of the ordinance and comptrollers in Essex's train, and addressed to Sir Edward himself, the accounts record the weekly or fortnightly outgoings and payments which Peyto made, or for which he was responsible in his official capacity. Thus, like so many of the surviving official or semi-official military records of the civil war, they are dominated by seemingly rather dry lists of payments, in this case to various employees in Essex's train of artillery, especially gunners, engineers and labourers, and to other workers and suppliers. But close reading enables us to build up a much richer and more rounded picture. Because most of the accounts open with a date and location, we can reconstruct the itinerary of Essex's artillery over this period. As payments were occasionally made and recorded to sick and injured artillerymen or to their widows and children in the case of their death, we can gain some insight into the risks which they ran. Above all, we can get a feel for the complexity of running and maintaining a large train of artillery and for the myriad of employees, contractors, suppliers, goods and services entailed in keeping the war effort going, and in maintaining the guns themselves – their ammunition and crews, carriages and transport, horses and horse furniture. There are many, though often tantalising, entries relating to batteries and fortifications built in and around Windsor – 'for the batteries behind his

Excellencies lodgings in Windsor', for work at 'the redoubt and line att the west end of the towne', 'for fortifications from the Castle way to the rivers side', 'for the sconce att Eaton colledge' and so on. There are also insights here into the more personal spending authorised by Peyto – 'to a poore boy by your order', for 'a booke for your use', 'to buy books att London', to a woman in recompense 'for spoiling her orchard', 'to the drummer of your companie...to buy drum heads', to a servant 'to go to London for your pistolls', 'to the tent maker to buy you a bed', for 'canvas for a horse tent', for 'Speeds map' and for items of clothing, including silk buttons and six 'handkercheifes', boots or armour intended for Sir Edward's own use or for his son or personal servant. Peyto obviously checked the accounts and against most of these items he added a marginal note that they were his own 'private and personal disbursements' and were to be omitted from the sum claimed from the state. However, most of Sir Edward's personal expenses were kept in a separate account, also transcribed here (pp. 204–14), such as payments for his own food – he obviously had a taste for pheasants, though he also enjoyed a carp and a salmon over this period and he paid more than £2 'for provisions...bought in the xmas hollidaies' – and fodder for his horse, sugar, nutmeg, currants and syrup of roses, saffron, melons and oranges, barrels of beer and bottles of wine, batches of coal and wood, a new suit of clothes, having his linen washed, 'hogsgrease to dresse your horse', 'charcoal to sett sights on the peeces of ordnance', senna and 'scorpions oyle', kid leather gloves and 'a paire of scales to weigh gold'. Campaigning could be a messy business, but Sir Edward obviously sought to maintain a certain style.

The main transcribed accounts are topped and tailed by an informative introduction and three useful appendices, naming and showing the positions of the 500 or more individuals who were employed in, or worked for, the train of artillery at this time; they tabulate the quantities of, and dates when, a range of key items, from match, powder and round shot, to tents, horseshoes and wheelbarrows, were supplied to the train and transcribe a number of other and much briefer accounts of deliveries to Essex's train of artillery in 1642–43, most now held in the National Archives at WO/460 and 1937. (These could be complemented by a broadly similar set of accounts, showing the provisioning of Essex's train of artillery during the opening weeks of the war, surviving at the National Archives, SP28/131/2 – presumably they are not covered in this volume because they relate to the

period before Peyto seems to have been directly involved in the train.) In his introduction, which itself ends with a useful glossary, explaining the sometimes specialist terms relating to artillery and found in the accounts, Simon Marsh puts Peyto and his manuscript within the wider context of ordnance and the civil war. He explores the organisation and personnel of the train of artillery, the types of guns and their crews, the roles of the various officers and employees of Essex's train, and the munitions and supplies received in 1642–43. He also reviews the operation and somewhat mixed performance of Essex's artillery over this period: from the aftermath of the king's attack on Brentford and his approach to west London in early November 1642, though the winter months spent around Windsor, to the siege of Reading in spring 1643, followed by a period of inactivity, minor operations and growing sickness in the Berkshire and Buckinghamshire area over the summer, such that by August the train was back near London, at Kingston-upon-Thames. The final pages of the main account note a few of the expenses incurred on the march to, and relief of, Gloucester in late August and early September and show that £2 was then spent carrying a sick Peyto by coach with a mounted guard back to Gloucester and attending him there. For those interested in Essex's army, in the operation of a civil war train of artillery and in the administrating and financing of the parliamentary war effort, as well as much else besides, this excellent, accessible and affordable volume will be essential reading and a quarry of valuable information.

Jonathan Worton, *To Settle the Crown. Waging Civil War in Shropshire, 1642–1648*. Helion and Company, *Century of the Soldier* 1618–1721 no. 5, 2016. (279 + xxxvi pp.) ISBN 978-1-910777-98-5. £25 hardback.

reviewed by Dr Stephen K Roberts

Shropshire was a county not visited by postgraduate gold prospectors during the rush into doctoral county studies during the 1960s and 1970s. This is at first sight strange, given the scope and richness of the materials that Jonathan Worton has mined for this full and convincing study. The answer might lie in the paucity of the surviving quarter sessions records, archives which were then often the primary focus of historians' interests in civil governance. And for military historians, Shropshire was perhaps not of

immediate attraction: not a county of set-piece battles, rather one of garrisons and incursions from mobilized military units from elsewhere; but as Jonathan Worton emphasizes, the county was in that sense more typical of the civil war experience than those regions where the decisive battles were fought. Moreover, there is no shortage of archival documentation relating to military administration, and the author has made the fullest and most enterprising use of this to construct a very thorough account of how each side in the civil war managed its war effort.

At the very heart of this book are three sections on the military units, on 'financing the war effort' and on logistics; and here Jonathan Worton makes his most authoritative contribution to civil war studies. Owing to the efforts of those engaged in what we might call the 'new military history', concerned with the detailed practicalities of recruitment, supply, communications and even rudimentary medical services, we now understand a huge amount more about the conduct of civil warfare in England than was known as recently as twenty years ago, let alone in 1926, when the last academic study of Shropshire in this period was published (W. J. Farrow, *The Great Civil War in Shropshire, 1642–49*).

In assessing the relative strengths and weaknesses of the parliamentarians and royalists in Shropshire, Dr Worton concludes that the latter were able to benefit from 'being part of a more cohesive regional command' (p. 247) than their opponents; but as if to compensate for this disadvantage, the Shropshire parliamentarians could call upon the external forces of Sir William Brereton, based in Cheshire, and of Sir Thomas Myddelton, whose London-recruited army entered Shropshire en route to its ultimate goal, the winning of Wales for Parliament. Judicious and thoughtful though these conclusions are, they rather pit the opposing sides as if they were rival teams enjoying a degree of autonomy that in fact they could hardly ever, if at all, attain. The author is very willing to concede that the conclusion of W. J. Farrow in 1926, that Shropshire's experience exemplifies the civil war 'in miniature', remains valid. Part of that typicality lies in the sense in which the county did not determine or even shape the outcome of the war.

Just as the civil war was not won or lost because of events in Shropshire, this book does not present any striking new theory or argument, but rather reinforces the conclusions that others have reached on the military history

of the period, and provides valuable corroborative evidence relating to a neglected Midlands county. However, this book aspires to be more than a detailed guide to the nuts and bolts of civil warfare. It includes analysis of the work of the Shropshire parliamentary county committee (in a study that invites comparison with the conclusions of Donald Pennington on Staffordshire and Ann Hughes on Warwickshire), and offers reliable tabular listings of members of committees and commissions on either side of the partisan divide. The bigger picture of national politics is handled competently but more tentatively than the local analysis, and there remains more to be said on the impact of political developments in Westminster and London on the county, or indeed on the two-way relationship between regional politics and Westminster politics.

This book is a revised doctoral thesis, and Dr Worton has done much to soften the austere idiom of its original format. There are many attractively produced maps, 33 illustrations and 10 colour plates. The colour plates include photographs, reproductions of paintings and some specially commissioned action scenes painted by Peter Dennis, one of which, of the lifting of the siege of High Ercall (July 1645) adorns the cover. Bright and attractive though the cover is, its message of accessibility might, to some readers, seem in somewhat incongruous conflict with the very detailed academic content of this volume. However, the standards of accuracy and of scholarship are high, and Jonathan Worton's book deserves now to be the first port of call for all those interested in how civil war impacted upon Salopians.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

by Dr Jonathan Fitzgibbon

BOOKS

Amussen, Susan, and Underdown, David, *Gender, Culture and Politics in England, 1560–1640: Turning the World Upside Down* (Bloomsbury, 2017)

Ash, Eric, *The Draining of the Fens: Projectors, Popular Politics, and State Building in Early Modern England* (John Hopkins UP, 2017)

Barducci, Marco, *Hugo Grotius and the Century of Revolution, 1613–1718: Transnational Reception in English Political Thought* (Oxford UP, 2017)

Barratt, John, *Better begging than fighting: The Royalist Army in exile in the war against Cromwell 1656–1660* (Helion & Company, 2016)

Bergin, John, and Lyall, Andrew (eds.), *The Acts of James II's Irish Parliament of 1689* (Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2016)

Blanchard, Gill, *Lawson Lies Still in the Thames: The Extraordinary Life of Vice-Admiral Sir John Lawson* (Amberley, 2017)

Braddick, Michael, and Withington, Phil (eds.), *Popular Culture and Political Agency in Early Modern England and Ireland: Essays in Honour of John Walter* (Boydell, 2017)

Buchanan, Katherine; Dean, Lucinda, and Penman, Michael (eds.), *Medieval and Early Modern Representations of Authority in Scotland and the British Isles* (Routledge, 2016)

Campbell, Alexander, *The Life and Works of Robert Baillie (1602–1662): Politics, Religion and Record-Keeping in the British Civil Wars* (Boydell, 2017)

Chapman, Alison, *The Legal Epic: "Paradise Lost" and the Early Modern Law* (University of Chicago Press, 2017)

Collins, John, *Martial Law and English Laws, c.1500–c.1700* (Cambridge UP, 2016)

Corns, Thomas (ed.), *A New Companion to Milton* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2016)

Craven, Alex (ed.), *The churchwardens' accounts of St Mary's Devises, 1633-1689* (Wiltshire Record Society, 2016)

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- Curelly, Laurent, and Smith, Nigel (eds.), *Radical voices, radical ways: Articulating and disseminating radicalism in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Britain* (Manchester UP, 2016)
- Dauber, Noah, *State and Commonwealth: The Theory of the State in Early Modern England, 1549–1640* (Princeton UP, 2016)
- Daybell, James, and Gordon, Andrew (eds.), *Cultures of Correspondence in Early Modern Britain* (Pennsylvania UP, 2016)
- Ereira, Alan, *The Nine Lives of John Ogilby: Britain's Master Mapmaker and His Secrets* (Gerald Duckworth, 2016)
- Fraser, Sarah, *The Prince Who Would Be King: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (William Collins, 2017)
- Gaudio, Michael, *The Bible and the Printed Image in Early Modern England: Little Gidding and the pursuit of scriptural harmony* (Routledge, 2016)
- Goldie, Mark (ed.), *Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs: the Entring book, 1677–1691* (Boydell, 2016)
- Green, Adrian, *Building for England: John Cosin's architecture in Renaissance Durham and Cambridge* (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2016)
- Gribben, Crawford, *John Owen and English Puritanism: Experiences of Defeat* (Oxford UP, 2016)
- Hitchcock, David, *Vagrancy in English Culture and Society, 1650–1750* (Bloomsbury, 2016)
- Hodkinson, Robert, *Cromwell's Buffoon: The Life And Career Of The Regicide, Thomas Pride* (Helion & Company, 2017)
- Horspool, David, *Oliver Cromwell: The Protector* (Penguin, 2017)
- James, Leonie, *'This Great Firebrand': William Laud and Scotland, 1617–1645* (Boydell, 2017)
- Johnson, Anthony; Sell, Roger, and Wilcox, Helen (eds.), *Community-Making in Early Stuart Theatres: Stage and audience* (Routledge, 2016)
- Jones, Serena, *No Armour But Courage: Colonel Sir George Lisle, 1615–1648* (Helion & Company, 2016)

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- Keay, Anna, *The Last Royal Rebel: The Life and Death of James, Duke of Monmouth* (Bloomsbury, 2016)
- Kesselring, Krista (ed.), *The Trial of Charles I* (Broadview Press, 2016)
- Killeen, Kevin, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 2016)
- Klemp, Paul, *The Theatre of Death: Rituals of Justice from the English Civil Wars to the Restoration* (University of Delaware Press, 2016)
- Knights, Mark, and Morton, Adam (eds.), *The Power of Laughter and Satire in Early Modern Britain* (Boydell, 2017)
- Lake, Peter, *How Shakespeare Put Politics on the Stage: Power and Succession in the History Plays* (Yale UP, 2016)
- Langley, Chris (ed.), *The Minutes of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 1648–1659* (Scottish History Society, 2016)
- Larman, Alexander, *Restoration: The Year of the Great Fire* (Head of Zeus, 2016)
- Levin, Carole; Bertolet, Anna Richl, and Carney, Jo Eldridge (eds.), *A Biographical Encyclopedia of Early Modern Englishwomen: Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts, 1500–1650* (Routledge, 2016)
- Louth, Warwick, *The Arte Militaire: The Application of Seventeenth Century Military Manuals to Conflict Archaeology* (Helion & Company, 2016)
- Manterfield, John (ed.), *Borough Government in Newton's Grantham: The Hall Book of Grantham, 1649–1662* (Boydell, 2016)
- McCormack, Danielle, *The Stuart Restoration and the English in Ireland* (Boydell, 2016)
- Miller, John, *Early Modern Britain, 1450–1750* (Cambridge UP, 2017)
- Mortimer, Ian, *The Time Traveller's Guide to Restoration Britain: A Handbook for Visitors to the Seventeenth Century: 1660–1699* (Pegasus, 2017)
- Moshenska, Joe, *A Stain in the Blood: The Remarkable Voyage of Sir Kenelm Digby* (William Heinemann, 2016)
- Murphy, Andrew, *Liberty, Conscience, and Toleration: The Political Thought of William Penn* (Oxford UP, 2016)

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- Murray, Catriona, *Imaging Stuart Family Politics: Dynastic Crisis and Continuity* (Routledge, 2016)
- Parker, Matthew, *Willoughbyland: England's Lost Colony* (Thomas Dunne, 2017)
- Pells, Ismini, *New Approaches to the Military History of the English Civil War: Proceedings of the First Helion And Company 'Century of the Soldier' Conference, 2015* (Helion & Company, 2016)
- Pestana, Carla Gardina, *The English Conquest of Jamaica: Oliver Cromwell's Bid for Empire* (Harvard UP, 2017)
- Platt, Arleen, and Platt, Jerome, *British Historical Medals of the 17th Century: Medallists, Books, Authors, Collectors, Booksellers & Antiquaries* (Spink, 2017)
- Porter, Linda, *Royal Renegades: The Children of Charles I and the English Civil Wars* (Macmillan, 2016)
- Rees, John, *The Leveller Revolution: Radical Political Organisation in England, 1640–1650* (Verso, 2016)
- Rideal, Rebecca, *1666: Plague, War and Hellfire* (John Murray, 2016)
- Riden, Philip (ed.), *The household accounts of William Cavendish, Lord Cavendish of Hardwick, 1597–1607* (Derbyshire Record Society, 2016)
- Ryrie, Alec, *Protestants: The Radicals Who Made the Modern World* (William Collins, 2017)
- Schwoerer, Lois, *Gun Culture in Early Modern England* (Virginia UP, 2016)
- Scott, Chris, and Turton, Alan, *Hey for Old Robin: The Campaigns And Armies Of The Earl Of Essex During The First Civil War, 1642–44* (Helion & Company, 2017)
- Southcombe, George, and Tapsell, Grant (eds.), *Revolutionary England, c.1630–c.1660: Essays for Clive Holmes* (Routledge, 2016)
- Spence, Craig, *Accidents and Violent Death in Early Modern London, 1650–1750* (Boydell, 2016)
- Spring, Laurence, *The First British Army, 1624–1628: The Army of the Duke of Buckingham* (Helion & Company, 2016)

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Stazicker, Elizabeth, and Willmoth, Frances, *Jonas Moore's Mapp of the Great Levell of the Fenns, 1658* (Cambridgeshire Records Society, 2016)

Stephens, Isaac, *The gentlewoman's remembrance: Patriarchy, piety, and singlehood in early Stuart England* (Manchester UP, 2016)

Turner, Henry, *Corporate Commonwealth: Pluralism and Political Fictions in England, 1516–1651* (University of Chicago Press, 2016)

Van Elk, Martine, *Early Modern Women's Writing: Domesticity, Privacy, and the Public Sphere in England and the Dutch Republic* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017)

Walter, John, *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford UP, 2016)

Williams, Kelsey, *The Antiquary: John Aubrey's Historical Scholarship* (Oxford UP, 2016)

Worton, Jonathan, *The Battle of Montgomery, 1644: The English Civil War in the Welsh Borderlands* (Helion & Company, 2016)

Wrightson, Keith (ed.), *A Social History of England, 1500–1750* (Cambridge UP, 2017)

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

by Prof Peter Gaunt

JOURNALS

Al-Akhras, S. and Green, M., 'Satanic whispers: Milton's Iblis and the "Great Sultan"', *The Seventeenth Century*, 32 (2017).

Anderson, R., 'Thomas Hooker at Chelmsford, Essex, 1625–31', *Essex Journal*, 51 (2016).

anon., 'Seal matrix's owner identified', *Current Archaeology*, 316 (July 2016).

anon., 'Cannonball finds shoot for Pontefract's past', *Current Archaeology*, 318 (September 2016).

anon., 'Civil war hoard found in Lincolnshire', *Current Archaeology*, 323 (February 2017).

anon., 'Knole's noteworthy finds', *Current Archaeology*, 325 (April 2017).

Arni, E. von and Hopper, A., 'Welfare for the wounded', *History Today*, 66 (July 2016).

Austin, P., 'The production of charcoal in south-east Hertfordshire, 1550–1850', *Local Historian*, 46 (2016).

Beale, S., 'John Leming and the High Court of Chivalry: urban ideas of social exclusivity in early Stuart Colchester', *Local Historian*, 46 (2016).

Bellany, A. and Cogswell, T., 'Murder most eminent', *History Today*, 66 (March 2016).

Betty, J., 'Sir John Young (1519–89), Dame Joan Young (1533–1603) and the Great House in Bristol', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 134 (2016).

Blakemore, R., 'The civil wars' troubled waters', *History Today*, 67 (February 2017).

Blakeway, A., "'Newes from Scotland" in England, 1559–1602', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 79 (2016).

Blakeway, A., 'Biography and James VI's Scotland', *Innes Review*, 67 (2016).

Bowen, L., 'News networks in early modern Wales', *History*, 102 (2017).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- Britland, K., 'Felix Kingston, Aurelian Townshend's ante-masques and the masque at Oatlands, 1635', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 79 (2016).
- Brooks, M., 'Performing curiosity: re-viewing women's domestic embroidery in seventeenth-century England', *The Seventeenth Century*, 32 (2017).
- Burrell, C., 'The bodies in the bailey: uncovering enigmatic graves at Halton Castle', *Current Archaeology*, 323 (February 2017).
- Busfield, L., 'Doubt, anxiety and Protestant epistolary counselling: the letter-books of Nehemiah Wallington', *Studies in Church History*, 52 (2016).
- Campbell, I., 'An "inventair of som of the Earill of Dunfermline his bulks in Pinkie June 1625": a fragment of the library of Alexander Seton (1555–1622)', *Innes Review*, 67 (2016).
- Campbell, I.W.S., 'John Punch, Scotist Holy War and the Irish Catholic revolutionary tradition in the seventeenth century', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 77 (2016).
- Catling, C., 'Because I'm worth it: Apethorpe preserved', *Current Archaeology*, 320 (November 2016).
- Chapman, A., 'Milton and legal reform', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 69 (2016).
- Chung, Y., 'Puritans, godly diversity and religious liberty in civil war England', *Parergon*, 33 (2016).
- Clement, J., 'Dearly beloved: love, rhetoric and the seventeenth-century English sermon', *English Studies*, 97 (2016).
- Cooper, T., 'The sack that never happened: Little Gidding, puritan soldiers and the making of a myth', *The Seventeenth Century*, 31 (2016).
- Cooper, T., 'Richard Baxter and the Savoy Conference (1661)', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68 (2017).
- Cornish-Dale, C., 'A history of the collegiate church of Wimborne Minster and the parish corporation, written in 1657', *Southern History*, 38 (2016).
- Cousins, D.R., 'The Poole clay trade, 1626–1700', *Southern History*, 38 (2016).
- Crawford, R., 'The life of Sir James MacDonald of Knockrinsay', *Innes Review*, 67 (2016).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Cruikshank, J.L., 'Courts Leet, constables and the township structure in the West Riding, 1540–1842', *Northern History*, 54 (2017).

Cruyningen, P. van, 'Dutch investors and the drainage of Hatfield Chase, 1626 to 1656', *Agricultural History Review*, 64 (2016).

Cunningham, J., 'Anatomising the Irish Rebellion: the Cromwellian delinquency commissions, the books of discrimination and the 1641 depositions', *Irish Historical Studies*, 40 (2016).

Cust, R., 'The defence of episcopacy on the eve of civil war: Jeremy Taylor and the Rutland petition of 1641', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68 (2017).

Darcy, E., 'Writing the past in early modern Ireland: Anglesey, Borlase and the craft of history', *Irish Historical Studies*, 40 (2016).

Daybell, J., 'The scribal circulation of early modern letters', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 79 (2016).

Dyson, T., 'The oaths at Woodchurch, 1643–4: tensions in civil war Wirral and its aftermath', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 164 (2015).

Feingold, M., 'Projectors and learned projects in early modern England', *The Seventeenth Century*, 32 (2017).

Fitzgibbons, J., 'Recording, reporting and printing the Cromwellian "kingship debates" of 1657', *Historical Research*, 89 (2016).

Fitzgibbons, J., 'Reconstructing the debates of the Protectorate parliaments: the pitfalls of J.T. Rutt's edition of Thomas Burton's Diary', *Parliamentary History*, 35 (2016).

Foster, M. and Simmons, I., 'Goates and draynes: dikereeves' accounts from the seventeenth century', *Lincolnshire Past & Present*, 106 (winter 2016–17).

Fox, A., 'Jockey and Jenny: English broadside ballads and the invention of Scottishness', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 79 (2016).

Fradkin, J., 'Protestant unity and anti-Catholicism: the irenicism and philo-semitism of John Dury in context', *Journal of British Studies*, 56 (2017).

Franklin, B., 'A seventeenth-century enclosure dispute in Thorpe Malsor', *Northamptonshire Past & Present*, 69 (2016).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- Gibson, W., 'Revising the siege of York: from royalist to Cromwellian in Payne Fisher's *Marston Moor*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 31 (2016).
- Gilbert, C.D., 'Prebendary Nathaniel Tomkins (1599–1681) as a historian', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 25 (2016).
- Goatman, P., 'Religious tolerance and intolerance in Jacobean Scotland: the case of Archibald Hegate revisited', *Innes Review*, 67 (2016).
- Gowing, L., 'Girls on forms: apprenticing young women in seventeenth-century London', *Journal of British Studies*, 55 (2016).
- Graham, D., 'Report on a trench across the ditch at Walldown monument, Whitehill, Hampshire', *Hampshire Studies*, 71 (2016).
- Greenspan, N., 'Charles II, Lucy Walter and the Stuart courts in exile', *English Historical Review*, 131 (2016).
- Groot, J. de, 'The Royal Oak', *History Today*, 66 (May 2016).
- Hailwood, M., 'Broadside ballads and occupational identity in early modern England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 79 (2016).
- Hailwood, M., 'Pubs and politics in Stuart England', *History Today*, 67 (January 2017).
- Hall, D., 'Moreton Pinkney fields and enclosures of 1601, 1624 and 1761', *Northamptonshire Past & Present*, 69 (2016).
- Hardy, M., 'The seventeenth-century English and Scottish reception of Francis de Sales' *An Introduction to a Devout Life*', *British Catholic History*, 33 (2017).
- Hargreaves, J.A., 'Religious minorities in Calderdale: Quakers, Moravians, Inghamites, Millenarians and Christian Brethren, c.1654–c.2014', *Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society*, new series 23 (2015).
- Hart, G., 'Government according to the Holie Scripture: Cambridgeshire's petition against episcopacy (1641)', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, 105 (2016).
- Hayns, D., 'Partakers of the afflictions of the gospel: the sufferings of Roman Catholics, Quakers and Presbyterians in post-Reformation Malpas, 1582–c.1720', *Cheshire History*, 56 (2016–17).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Healy, M., 'Medicine, metaphor and "crisis" in the early modern social body', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 46 (2016).

Heavens, D., 'The Ipswich town governors and the Privy Council', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History*, 43 (2016).

Hodgkin, K., 'Childhood and loss in early modern life writing', *Parergon*, 33 (2016).

Hughes, A., "'The accounts of the kingdom": memory, community and the English civil war', *Past & Present*, 230 supplement (November 2016).

Jeater, M. and Symonds, M., 'Fire! Fire! How London burned in 1666', *Current Archaeology*, 318 (September 2016).

Johnston, N., 'State formation in seventeenth-century Ireland: the Restoration financial settlement, 1660–62', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 36 (2016).

Kennedy, A., 'Representing the periphery: Highland commissioners in the seventeenth-century Scottish parliament, c.1612–1702', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 36 (2016).

Kerr-Peterson, M., 'Sir William Keith of Delny: courtier, ambassador and agent of noble power', *Innes Review*, 67 (2016).

Lane, C., 'John Milton's Elegy for Lancelot Andrewes (1626) and the dynamic nature of religious identity in early Stuart England', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 85 (2016).

Langley, C.R., 'Caring for soldiers, veterans and families in Scotland, 1638–51', *History*, 102 (2017).

Legon, E., 'Bound up with meaning: the politics and memory of ribbon wearing in Restoration England and Scotland', *Journal of British Studies*, 56 (2017).

Leng, T., 'Interlopers and disorderly brethren at the stademart: commercial regulations and practices amongst the Merchant Adventurers of England in the late Elizabethan period', *Economic History Review*, 69 (2016).

Little, P., 'The laughing roundhead', *History Today*, 66 (August 2016).

Macdonald, A., 'Consultation, counsel and the "early Stuart period" in Scotland', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 204 (2016).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- McDowell, N., 'Wit, conversation and literary transmission in mid seventeenth-century France and England', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 69 (2016).
- McGhee, P., 'Unbelief, the senses and the body in Nicholas Bownde's *The unbeleefe of S. Thomas* (1608)', *Studies in Church History*, 52 (2016).
- McIlvenna, U., 'The rich merchant man or what the punishment of greed sounded like in early modern English ballads', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 79 (2016).
- McOmish, D., 'Not just a lawyer: Thomas Craig and humanist Edinburgh', *Innes Review*, 67 (2016).
- McShane, B., 'Negotiating religious change and conflict: female religious communities in early modern Ireland, c.1530–c.1641', *British Catholic History*, 33 (2017).
- Marsh, C., 'A woodcut and its wanderings in seventeenth-century England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 79 (2016).
- Marsh, C., 'Best-selling ballads and their pictures in seventeenth-century England', *Past & Present*, 233 (November 2016).
- Mason, R.A., 'Counsel and Covenant: aristocratic conciliarism and the Scottish revolution', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 204 (2016).
- Mawdesley, J., 'Lancashire north of Morecambe Bay in the early modern period, c.1550–1750: a survey of research published since 1995', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 164 (2015).
- Mawdesley, J., 'Antrobus the cleric and Peter the cock: civil war, ministry and animal baptism in mid seventeenth-century Cumberland', *Local Historian*, 46 (2016).
- Metters, G.A., 'Office-holding and local politics in early seventeenth-century King's Lynn', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 47 (2015).
- Miller, M., 'Robert Bedell (1624–c.1700) of Fairstead, Essex, and New England', *Essex Journal*, 51 (2016).
- Mills, R.J.W., 'Alexander Ross's *Pansebeia* (1653), religious compendia and the seventeenth-century study of religious diversity', *The Seventeenth Century*, 31 (2016).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- Moody, D., 'Godshillwood and Woodgreen: a squatter settlement on the edge of the New Forest, 1600–1824', *Hampshire Studies*, 71 (2016).
- Nauman, J., 'Louise Imogen Guiney and Henry Vaughan', *Brycheiniog*, 48 (2017).
- Newton, C., 'Farnley Smithies, Leeds: an Elizabethan iron works and its sources of ironstone and charcoal', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 88 (2016).
- Nicosia, M., 'Reading Spenser in 1648: prophesy and history in Samuel Sheppard's *Faerie Leveller*', *Modern Philology*, 114 (2016).
- Paterson, M., 'Aspects of the parish of Broughton Astley in the late seventeenth century revealed in unpublished abstracts and notes', *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological Society*, 90 (2016).
- Peck, I., 'The great unknown: the negotiation and narration of death by English war widows, 1647–60', *Northern History*, 53 (2016).
- Pelling, M., 'John Graunt, the Hartlib circle and child mortality in mid seventeenth-century London', *Continuity & Change*, 31 (2016).
- Pelling, M., 'Far too many women? John Graunt, the sex ratio and the cultural determinism of number in seventeenth-century England', *Historical Journal*, 59 (2016).
- Pells, I., 'Philip Skippon: the Norfolk genesis of a parliamentarian general', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 47 (2015).
- Peters, K., 'The Quakers and the politics of the army in the crisis of 1659', *Past & Present*, 231 (May 2016).
- Phillips, H., 'Old, old, very old men: nostalgia in the early modern broadside ballad', *Parergon*, 33 (2016).
- Plank, G., 'Discipline and divinity: colonial Quakerism, Christianity and "heathenism"', *Church History*, 85 (2016).
- Postles, D., 'The structural transformation of landownership in an industrialising town: Loughborough, c.1650–1890', *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological Society*, 90 (2016).
- Pullin, N., 'Providence, punishment and identity formation in the late Stuart Quaker community, c.1650–1700', *The Seventeenth Century*, 31 (2016).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Redmond, J., 'Memories of violence and New English identities in early modern Ireland', *Historical Research*, 89 (2016).

Remien, P., "'Home to the slaughter": Noah's ark and the seventeenth-century country house poem', *Modern Philology*, 114 (2016).

Reynolds, M., 'Puritanism and a Sussex clerical scandal in the 1630s and 1640s', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 154 (2016).

Riden, P., 'The household accounts of the Cavendish family of Hardwick, c.1590–c.1700', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, 136 (2016).

Roberts, J., 'Surrendering Surinam: the Barbadian diaspora and the expansion of the English sugar frontier, 1650–75', *William & Mary Quarterly*, 73 (2016).

Roberts, S.K., 'The uses of scribal publication in the making of a royalist: Henry Townshend of Worcestershire, his "diary" and parliament, 1640–3', *Midland History*, 41 (2016).

Rose, J., 'Sir Edward Coke and the reformation of the laws: religion, politics and jurisprudence, 1578–1616', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 36 (2016).

Rose, J., 'Sir Edward Hyde and the problem of counsel in mid seventeenth-century royalist thought', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 204 (2016).

Rose, J., 'Councils, counsel and the seventeenth-century composite state', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 204 (2016).

Salazar, G., 'Polemicist as pastor: Daniel Featley's anti-Catholic polemic and countering lay doubt in England during the 1620s', *Studies in Church History*, 52 (2016).

Schnepper, R.N., 'Qualified toleration: Bermuda and the English Revolution', *Parliamentary History*, 35 (2016).

Schwyzler, P., "'Late" losses and the temporality of early modern nostalgia', *Parergon*, 33 (2016).

Sephar, W.E., 'The Militia Ordinance of 1642 and the fourteenth-century Great Statute of Praemunire', *Parliamentary History*, 35 (2016).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- Sharpe, J.A. and Dickinson, J.R., 'Revisiting the "violence we have lost": homicide in seventeenth-century Cheshire', *English Historical Review*, 131 (2016).
- Shuger, D., 'The mysteries of the Lambeth Articles', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68 (2017).
- Smith, R., 'Sir Edward Coke's collection of knowledge: the inception of the Holkham archive', *Archives*, 51 (2016).
- Spaeth, D., "'Orderly made": reappraising household inventories in seventeenth-century England', *Social History*, 41 (2016).
- Spence, V., 'Craven and the Elizabethan Settlement: diverging confessional identities, 1580–1603', *Northern History*, 54 (2017).
- Sugg, R., 'Flame into being: spirits, soul and the physiology of early modern devotion', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 46 (2016).
- Tabak, J., "'O Multiplied Misery!": the disordered medical narrative of John Donne's *Devotions*', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 46 (2016).
- Thick, M., 'Intensive rabbit production in London and nearby counties in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: an alternative to alternative agriculture', *Agricultural History Review*, 64 (2016).
- Till, R., "'A great fight in the church at Thaxted, 1647": social and religious tensions in the wake of the first civil war', *Local Historian*, 46 (2016).
- Tittler, R., 'Rural society and the painters' trade in post-Reformation England', *Rural History*, 28 (2017).
- Walsham, A., 'Domesticating the Reformation: material culture, memory and confessional identity in early modern England', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 69 (2016).
- Wilkie, V., 'Reading and writing between the lines: Lady Eleanor Douglas, a Midland visionary, and her annotated pamphlets', *Midland History*, 41 (2016).
- Williams, R., 'Theological doubt and institutional certainty: an Anglican paradox', *Studies in Church History*, 52 (2016).
- Wyatt, G., 'Not as by law established? Was there a separatist movement in early modern Thanet?', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 137 (2016).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Wyn Tomos, M., 'A memorandum book (1662–74) of Humphrey Hughes, Gwerclas', *Journal of the Merioneth Historical and Record Society*, 17 (2014).

Young, M.B., 'Charles I, Clement Coke and sedition', *Historical Journal*, 59 (2016).

The Cromwell Museum
Grammar School Walk
Huntingdon
PE29 3LF



01480 708008



www.cromwellmuseum.org

The Cromwell Museum is in the former Huntingdon Grammar School where Cromwell received his early education. The Cromwell Trust and Museum are dedicated to preserving and communicating the assets, legacy and times of Oliver Cromwell. In addition to the permanent collection the museum has a programme of changing temporary exhibitions and activities.

Opening times

1st April - 31st October
11.00am - 3.30pm, Tuesday - Sunday

1st November - 31st March
1.30pm - 3.30pm, Tuesday - Sunday (11.00am - 3.30pm Saturday)

Oliver Cromwell's House
29 St Mary's Street
Ely
Cambridgeshire
CB7 4HF



01353 662062



www.olivercromwellshouse.co.uk/



[@Cromwells_House](https://twitter.com/Cromwells_House)



www.facebook.com/cromwellshouse/

Opening times

1st April - 31st October
10.00am - 5.00pm daily, including Bank Holidays

1st November - 31st March
11.00am - 4.00pm daily, including Bank Holidays
Closed Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Eve

Last admission is one hour before closing

Admission charge
For discount please show the Cromwell Association membership card



‘promoting our understanding of the 17th century’