

# Cromwelliana 1994



The Cromwell Association

## The Cromwell Association

- President: Dr JOHN MORRILL, DPhil, FRHistS  
Vice Presidents: Baron FOOT of Buckland Monachorum  
Right Hon MICHAEL FOOT, PC  
Dr MAURICE ASHLEY, CBE, DPhil, DLitt  
Professor IVAN ROOTS, MA, FSA, FRHistS  
Professor AUSTIN WOOLRYCH, MA, DLitt, FBA  
Dr GERALD AYLNER, MA, DPhil, FBA, FRHistS  
Miss HILARY PLATT, BA  
Mr TREWIN COPPLESTONE, FRGS  
Chairman: Dr PETER GAUNT, PhD, FRHistS  
Honorary Secretary: Miss PAT BARNES  
Cosswell Cottage, Northedge, Tupton, Chesterfield, S42 6AY  
Honorary Treasurer: Mr JOHN WESTMACOTT  
1 Salisbury Close, Wokingham, Berkshire, RG11 4AJ

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

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

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

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

## CROMWELLIANA 1994

edited by Peter Gaunt

\*\*\*\*\*

### CONTENTS

Cromwell Day 1993. Oliver Cromwell and English Calvinism. By Professor William Lamont.	2
The Assembly's Annotations. By Dean G Lampros.	7
Oliver Cromwell and the English Experience of Manoeuvre Warfare 1645-1651. Part Two. By Jonathan R Moore.	24
Work in Progress I. The Wealth of Oliver Cromwell. By Dr Stephen Roberts.	37
Cromwell's Foreign Policy and the "Western Design". By Dr Timothy Venning.	41
Richard Cromwell. By Professor R C Richardson.	53
Historians of the English Civil War: A Chronological Bibliography. By J L Atkins.	56
Cromwellian Britain VII. Barthomley Church, Cheshire.	66
Cromwell, the English Revolution and the Civil War - A Few Notes on French and Swedish Literature. By Bertil Haggman.	70
Select Bibliography of Publications. By Dr Peter Gaunt.	72
Book Reviews. By Dr Peter Gaunt & Professor Ivan Roots.	81

ISBN 0-905729-05-6

OLIVER CROMWELL AND ENGLISH CALVINISM

by William Lamont

Calvinists were wary about funeral sermons. Scottish Presbyterians wouldn't preach them. They offered the temptation of immoderately praising the virtues of the departed, and thus of forgetting the vile origins of all of us! But there were Calvinists and there were Calvinists - the theme, if you like, of this address - and particularly there were English and Scottish Calvinists. English Calvinists were less inhibited than their Scottish colleagues about funeral sermons. They took to the genre as a vehicle of education and (as Professor Collinson has shown us) these, in their turn, fed into such remarkable collections as Samuel Clarke's Lives of Puritan Saints. [1]

Even so, a Calvinist awareness of what worms we are got in the way of fulsome. Cromwell's famed reputed desire to be painted, warts and all, strikes the right Calvinist note: a recognition of the unknowability of God and of the creatures He had created. What we are left with, at last, is images, not substance. A lively recent collection of essays is called just that: Images of Oliver Cromwell. [2] Images don't tell us what we most need to know, but they tell us something. In one case - 'Irish Images of Cromwell' - the essayist corrects a stereotype which most of us had accepted uncritically. Irish demonisation of Cromwell dates not from 1650 but from 1865, with an Irish barrister called J C Prendergast, if we are to believe a well-documented article. English demonisations of Cromwell in the nineteenth century were not unknown. In Flora Thompson's classic, Lark Rise to Candleford, she recalls at the end of the century in her Oxfordshire village that

some of the older mothers and grandmothers still threatened naughty children with the name of Cromwell. "If you aren't a good gal, Old Oliver Cromwell'll have 'ee", they would say, or "Here Comes Old Cromwell". [3]

Images tend to polarise. It would also be from the nineteenth century we would get a very different view of Cromwell, this time from the self-educated working man. At Watlington, Berkshire, in February 1852 in what an enthusiastic secretary reported as "the most important debate" that had ever come before them, and after listening to speakers on either side "of great research, power and eloquence" the young men of the Mutual Improvement Society, on a

ballot vote, decided that, notwithstanding certain errors and abuses, "a better Christian, a more noble-minded spirit, a greater warrior, a more constant man" than Oliver Cromwell had hardly ever appeared on God's earth. [4] Perhaps the Calvinist in Cromwell would have preferred Flora Thompson to the Watlington Mutual Improvement Society: better a demon than a prig?

Images can comfort, as well as polarise. The image of Cromwell was most evocative when it was most needed. In May 1940, when Tory backbencher L S Amery wants to express the nation's disgust with the Chamberlain Administration, whom does he turn to but to Oliver - "You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go". Less known, but no less remarkable, is the instruction from the Army Officers' Manual of 1941 of the importance of having men that "know what they fight for and love what they know". No direct reference to Cromwell, no mention of plain russet-coated captains, but the phrase comes wrapped in quotations, with the reference there for all clearly to pick up. This is even more noteworthy since, as Paul Fussell showed in his excellent account of World War Two morale and propaganda, Wartime, there was little sympathy with World War One-type high-flown rhetoric. His tenth chapter is actually called 'The Ideological Vacuum' [5], but clearly there were some around at the time who thought that the image of Oliver could fill it.

Can we go beyond images? The descendant of the funeral sermon, as the purveyor of images, is the newspaper obituary. Unsatisfactory as it is, it is often supplemented by verbal snapshots from people who knew the subject perhaps only fleetingly. And sometimes it is these snapshots which are more revealing than the official account.

I have three snapshots to offer: three Puritans, whom I have studied, grappled in various ways with Cromwell. What can we learn from their encounters? The first one, William Prynne, was an uncompromising enemy. To him, Cromwell was Richard the Third revived; not to be forgiven for the regicide, or Pride's Purge. And to these sins was compounded his readiness to readmit the Jews into England. Prynne's anti-semitic spleen knew no bounds. In repeated pamphlets he would quote Cromwell's old schoolmaster, Thomas Beard, and the martyrologist John Foxe - against Cromwell, and against Jews. He brought up that hoary old anti-semitic chestnut, The Blood Accusation - how the Jews rid themselves of their atrocious smell by drinking the blood of the Christian boy martyr: one to be revived with telling effect by Julius Streicher in the 1930s.

My second witness is Richard Baxter, only marginally less hostile to Cromwell than Prynne at first sight. Baxter, like Prynne,

blamed Cromwell for the regicide and declined the Engagement to the Commonwealth in 1650. In his memoirs (published posthumously in 1696) he was more restrained than Prynne but still notably lukewarm: "Never man was higher extolled and never man was baselier reported of and vilified than this man". But this is to give a false gloss on Baxter's views on Cromwell. His private papers and correspondence tell a different story. They tell how, through the intermediary of his personal friend and Cromwell's chaplain John Howe, he was won over to a positive view of the Protector, indeed describing him to Howe in one letter as "a man of a Catholike spirit, desirous of the unity and Peace of all the servants of Christ". This was the spirit which inspired his 1659 Cromwellian tract, A Holy Commonwealth, which he had publicly to repudiate after the Restoration to save his skin. In other words, the public distancing from Cromwell should not be taken at its face value.

My third Puritan, Lodowicke Muggleton, co-founded a sect which prided itself on having little to do with the civil magistracy. The sect began in 1652, was supposed to have become extinct some time in the nineteenth century, but in fact the last Muggletonian died as late as 1979. In 1661 Muggleton had published a tract, A Divine Looking Glass, which set out clearly the sect's non-involvement with lay powers. But the original text of 1656, written with his cousin John Reeve (who died two years later), was dramatically different. Here Cromwell was the subject of a series of fulsome tributes, such as: "Most Heroick Cromwell, who art exalted into Temporall Dignity before the foreknowledge of Man or Angels". They made as good reading in the time of a Stuart Restoration as A Holy Commonwealth did, and had similarly to be excised. Which, though, was the authentic text? This continued to worry the diminishing band of Muggletonians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; indeed it divided the few members left as late as 1933.

What then are we to make of these glancing encounters? Two things I would suggest. First, we should beware (as in the cases of Baxter and Muggleton) of taking what was said publicly about Cromwell after the Restoration as an index of what was privately felt. Second, we should note a sense of let-down in our three Calvinists (and here there is no private/public dichotomy) in what Cromwell accomplished as a Christian magistrate. Cromwell should have done more: this is the gist of what Baxter and Muggleton felt. In Prynne's case, the position is muddied by his consistent perception that Cromwell wasn't the right man in the job. But the job itself was another matter. More thoroughly than even Baxter or Muggleton envisaged it, Prynne saw the office of Christian magistrate as one of totalitarian vindictiveness: punishing adulterers to death, smiting the ungodly, keeping the Jews out of

England. It was a vision shared with Baxter and Muggleton. Baxter, for instance, beginning with his political reservations about Cromwell in 1650, ends the decade frustrated that Oliver and son are not doing more. And in the 1656 text of A Divine Looking Glass, Cromwell's providential role is seen as being that of cutting off his Cavalier enemies as "spiritual rebels".

Cromwell was enough of a Calvinist to share some of these aspirations throughout his career (particularly in 1653). But he resisted them by and large: he did not found a spiritual police force.[6] I concur with my predecessor, Professor Woolrych, in his 1991 Cromwell Day address, in seeing Cromwell's refusal to take on that mantle as the most distinctively praiseworthy quality in twentieth century eyes. Cromwell's claim at the end of his life to have been "the good constable, set to keep the peace of the parish" is not what Prynne, Baxter and Muggleton wanted to hear from a Christian magistrate, but is none the worse for that.

The fallacy would be to see this element in Cromwell as some deviancy from a Calvinist norm. We come back to the point: there are Calvinists and there are Calvinists. There are Calvinists like Prynne who lust for the magistrate who can stand in for God (the accident of his being persecuted by bishops in the 1630s gives him a spurious status as a freedom fighter). But there are other Calvinists - and Cromwell is one - who are held back from the instant judgment by awareness of the unknowability of God. This is what inspires the Calvinist Roger Williams, in his remarkable plea for liberty of conscience (The Bloody Tenent of Persecution of 1643), to insist that the civil magistrate must content himself with keeping the peace (like Cromwell's constable). It was the Calvinist John Cotton, who argued against fellow Calvinist Richard Mather, that it was better that hypocrites be admitted to the Sacraments than that one worthy person should be excluded. It was the Calvinist Increase Mather, Richard's son, who said that it was better that ten witches escape than that one innocent person went to the stake. It was the Calvinist Cromwell who said "I had rather that Mahometanism were permitted amongst us than that one of god's children should be persecuted". And it was to his fellow Scottish Calvinists that Cromwell delivered his most famous rebuke: "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken".

The "good constable" role was thus the fulfilment, not the negation, of one Calvinist ideal. When Baxter chafed that Oliver did not do more, Coleridge told him he was wrong: it was rather "one among a thousand proofs of Cromwell's attachment to the best interests of human nature".[7] We can side with Coleridge, not Baxter on this; there can be no better reason for us today to honour the life and achievements of Oliver Cromwell.

## THE ASSEMBLY'S ANNOTATIONS

by Dean G Lampros

- 1 Patrick Collinson, "A Magazine of Religious Patterns': An Erasmian Topic Transposed in English Protestantism", Godly People (London, 1983), pp. 499-525.
- 2 R C Richardson (ed), Images of Oliver Cromwell: Essays for and by Roger Howell, Jnr (Manchester, 1993): see especially Toby Barnard, 'Irish Images of Cromwell', pp. 180-206.
- 3 Flora Thompson, Lark Rise to Candleford (London, 1973), p. 215.
- 4 Raphael Samuel, "New Histories for Old", History, The Nation and the Schools (History Workshop Journal, Working Papers, Ruskin College, Oxford, June 1989), p. 5. I owe the subsequent Army Officers' Manual reference also to the kindness of Raphael Samuel.
- 5 Paul Fussell, Wartime (Oxford, 1989), pp. 129-143.
- 6 At least these once-favoured comparisons of Cromwell and Hitler no longer carry conviction. Perry Anderson in a recent article in London Review of Books (24 September 1992) called Ernest Barker "impeccably liberal". I suggested in a seven-line letter (22 October) that "peccably" would be better, in the light of his notorious 1936 Hamburg comparison of Cromwell with Hitler. "Touché", replied Anderson (5th November), though a forty-four-line answer tried to put Barker's lecture in context. What is of interest is our common ground - the fatuity of the comparison - even if we diverged about Barker's culpability in making it.
- 7 John Morrow, Coleridge's Political Thought (New York, 1990), p. 151.

"I profess I could never yet see a Bible well translated in English; but I think that, of all, that of Geneva is the worst".[1] So declared King James I of England at the famous Hampton Court Conference of 1604, when it was suggested by John Reynolds of the Puritan delegation that the Bishop's Bible (1568) be revised and a new translation of the Holy Scriptures be put forth. Indeed, these were arrogant words from a proud monarch whose head was filled with notions of divine kingship and whose heart was full of contempt for the Puritans, who, incidentally, looked upon the Geneva Bible with much affection. The Geneva Bible, in fact, had become "the favourite Bible for several generations of Puritans" [2], and it was without a doubt "the cherished volume in all covenanting and Puritan households".[3]

The inescapable irony was that in the end the Bible commissioned by the king to displace the Geneva Bible struggled for well over a quarter of a century to win popular acceptance. The Puritans as well as other Englishmen held it at arm's length. One historian has noted that it was received

at first by attitudes ranging from cool indifference to lukewarm acceptance to hot rejection. The Puritans...at first held aloof from it with suspicion. After all, it was "new" and they had their own beloved Geneva version. And besides, this King James translation smacked too much of the king, the bishops, and the Church of England to suit them.[4]

For some thirty years after the emergence of the Authorized Version in 1611, the old Geneva Bible continued to hold sway as the preferred household Bible. King James, in fact, had died long before the Bible which bore his name was able to win its way into the hearts of the English people. Undoubtedly, the harsh words he had spoken against the Geneva Bible came back to haunt him on his deathbed. "Pride goeth before destruction", it is said, "and a haughty spirit before a fall".[5]

Just as James made no secret of his intense dislike of the Geneva Bible, neither did he attempt to hide the rationale behind his feelings. The translators of the Geneva Bible had seen fit to affix to the text a brief, marginal commentary "upon all the hard places". The king, it seemed, objected to the marginal notes on the grounds that they were, he felt, radical and at times seditious. His orders for the Authorized Version, given at the Hampton Court Conference,

are quite telling:

Marry, withall, he gave this caveat...that no marginal notes should be added, having found in them which are annexed to the Geneva translation (which he saw in a Bible given him by an English lady) some notes very partial, untrue, seditious and savoring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits.[6]

James rightly perceived in the Geneva notes a challenge to the divine kingship he claimed to exercise and he feared the powerful influence they exerted over the masses. The Geneva Bible was, after all, produced during a period of bloodshed and exile by zealous English Protestants who bore little love for their queen. Moreover,

the margins of its Old Testament were studded with observations on the duties of kings and the fate of royal sinners. Similarly, the Genevans undermined the classic New Testament justification of obedience, Romans XIII (let every soul be subject unto the higher powers) by noting that it applied merely to the "private man", leaving the problematic case of the lesser magistrates discreetly veiled...Cromwell's scriptural citations show [the Geneva Bible] was a formative influence on him. Generations of readers were thus educated in a very limited form of monarchy.[7]

It is not difficult to see why James, with his emphasis on divine kingship, viewed the Geneva notes with suspicion and hostility and sought to counter their influence. The sixth of his fifteen rules "to be observed in the translation of the Bible" mandated the following: "No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew and Greek words". Consequently, the Authorized Version contained no commentary.

Ironically, the very thing hated by the king was loved by his people. John Eadie summarized popular opinion nicely when he wrote: "Though King James scornfully depreciated the Genevan notes at the Hampton Court Conference, the people relished them greatly".[8] The notes, according to Eadie, were "lucid, dogmatic and practical, presenting such aspects of truth and duty as were then all but universally prized".[9] We can, quite reasonably, attribute the enormous appeal of the Geneva Bible largely to its marginal commentary, with its brevity, clarity and Calvinistic tenor. The English historian Brooke Westcott wrote:

It was not therefore surprising that from the time of its first appearance, the Geneva Bible became the household Bible of the English-speaking nations, and it continued to be so for about three-quarters of a century; it was never sanctioned for public use in Churches; but the convenience of its form and the simple clearness of its notes gained it a wide popularity with the mass of the people.[10]

As one historian has said, "the single most important feature of the Geneva Bible, to both the laity and the clergy, consisted in the marginal notes".[11] Clearly, the importance of the Geneva Bible's marginal commentary is inestimable, and James, who was often referred to as "the wisest fool in Christendom", was foolish indeed to have believed that a Bible without notes could ever displace the beloved Genevan version.

Ultimately, the king's stubborn refusal to allow exegetical notes in the margin of his translation only prolonged the life of the Geneva Bible. His intransigence and shortsightedness, moreover, doomed the Authorized Version to play the role of second-best. It simply lacked what the people regarded as an essential study aid. As a result, it "did not immediately eclipse the popularity of the Geneva Bible" [12], nor would it do so during James's lifetime. More than sixty editions of the Geneva Bible appeared after 1611 alone.[13] In fact, that very year the Geneva Bible was issued in folio by the king's printer. Many preachers and authors certainly continued to use it after 1611.[14] In England successive editions were introduced almost yearly until 1616, when its printing was prohibited. From then on it was printed in Amsterdam, but under Laudian influence its importation was forbidden. One historian tells us, however, that of the numerous editions printed in Amsterdam up to 1644, all were imported and issued with a title page bearing the date 1599.[15]

What is clear and undeniable is that during the reign of King James and for most of his son's reign, the Geneva Bible held its own against what was a newer and, arguably, a better translation. "It did not", in the words of historian John Eadie, "die under episcopal frown".[16] Long after its printing was banned in 1616, it remained the Bible used in most English-speaking households. This, according to most historians, was the case for roughly another quarter-century. One historian has estimated that the Geneva Bible retained its status as the most popular text until well into the civil war.[17] Another historian has claimed that it was used privately for some forty years after the emergence of the Authorized Version.[18] Still another has said, "it had an immense vogue...The Authorized Version did not supersede it as a book for the home till the middle of

the seventeenth century".[19] The consensus is that the Geneva Bible, with a fierce tenacity amidst extreme adversity, hung on as the people's choice over the Authorized Version for some thirty years, with only a slight diminution of its pre-eminence.[20] As John Eadie has written, "the vitality of the Geneva Bible was wonderful".[21] Certainly, it is significant that Cromwell's Soldiers' Pocket Bible took its 122 Scripture passages almost exclusively from the Geneva Bible [22], showing that as late as 1643, the Geneva Bible continued to exert a powerful influence over English Protestantism.

What on the surface may appear to have been simply a struggle for dominance between two translations was, in fact, at a much deeper level a debate between the devoutly Protestant segment of English society and the established civil and ecclesiastical authorities over the role of Scriptural aids and exegetical tools. While they had virtually no say as to which Bible was used in the pew or pulpit, English Protestants time and again chose for themselves and their households a "Reformed" Bible equipped with a Calvinistic commentary to guide them through the Scriptures. The authorities, on the other hand, for reasons of their own, refused to permit this kind of exegetical aid in the translations they sanctioned.

In the midst of this debate, the political tide in England seemed suddenly to turn, and the forces of limited monarchy and personal liberty began gradually to take back the reins of power from the forces of tyranny and repression. The impeachment of William Laud early in 1641 brought about the collapse of press censorship.[23] For the first time in twenty-five years, English printers were free to issue new copies of the Geneva Bible. Oddly enough they did not. Presumably copies were still being imported from the Continent, but even in Amsterdam after 1644, the Geneva Bible was no longer printed. Furthermore, within ten years of Laud's demise, on the eve of the Commonwealth, the Geneva Bible had become virtually extinct.[24]

During the Laudian years when numerous obstacles were placed in the way of procuring a new copy of the Geneva Bible, its popularity quite naturally began to wane ever so slightly. Its disappearance and the subsequent rise of the Authorized Version by mid-century, however, present the historian with something of an enigma. The Geneva Bible was a translation that had for a quarter-century withstood the most unfavourable conditions, only to die when those conditions finally abated. Under the auspices of a free press, one would expect such a popular text to have experienced something of a revival. Moreover, it was far more in tune with the prevailing revolutionary zeitgeist than was the King James Bible, which smacked of divine kingship and episcopacy. The Authorized

Version, too, had been all but crammed down the throats of the English people by the king and his enforcers. More important still, the margins of the King James Bible, as we have seen, contained no annotations. How and why did the Authorized Version finally displace the Genevan translation as the common household Bible, when in fact conditions were ripe for the latter's resurgence?

The Geneva Bible was of course no stranger to revision. During the early 1640s it could easily have been revised and reissued. The fact that by mid-century worn-out Geneva Bibles had been replaced with King James Bibles could lead to the false conclusion that somehow English Protestants no longer cared about having a commentary to assist them. That they would adopt a translation lacking marginal notes seems to indicate such a trend in English Protestantism. No such trend occurred. Their demand for a commentary did not abate; rather, it was sated by the emergence of a completely new set of annotations designed to take the place of the old Geneva notes. In 1645 England witnessed the premier appearance of a commentary, too lengthy to fit the margins of the Authorized Version for which it was originally intended and so instead it was published separately as a companion volume to the King James Bible. The Annotations upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament...by the Joint Labor of Certain Learned Divines thereunto appointed, or the Assembly's Annotations as the binding stated, appeared first in 1645 as one volume. Successive editions were enlarged to make up two volumes, published in 1654 and again in 1657. In other words, what began in the 1640s simply as a project to revise the Geneva notes in order that they might match the text of the Authorized Version ended up as a commentary so large and detailed that it could no longer be confined to the margins of the text.

We have seen that despite the public's unfavourable reaction to the King James Bible, it had for more than thirty years resisted the imposition of a commentary upon its margins. Finally, when the country was in the midst of civil war, the presses had been freed from the pressure of Laudianism, and Charles I was in no position to regulate their output,

hence were diverse of the stationers and printers of London induced to petition the Committee of the Honourable House of Commons, for license to print the Geneva notes upon the Bible, or that some notes might be fitted to the new translation: which was accordingly granted, with an order for review and correction of those of the Geneva edition, by leaving out such of them as there was cause to dislike, by clearing those that were doubtful, and by [revising] those as

were defective...For which purpose letters were directed to some of us from the Chair of the Committee for Religion, and personal invitations to others, to undertake and divide the task.[25]

It is abundantly clear in the preface that the primary purpose behind the new annotations was to alter the King James Bible to suit popular demand. If in fact this was to be the Bible of the English-speaking people, it needed a parallel commentary, for no Bible would be truly effective without one. In a very astute assessment of popular opinion, the labouring divines explain in their preface what they perceived to have been the main objection to the Authorized Version. The people, they claimed, decried the absence of a parallel commentary:

The people complained that they could not see into the sense of Scripture, so well as formerly they did by the Geneva Bibles, because their spectacles of Annotations were not fitted to the understanding of the new text, nor any other supplied in their stead.[26]

Those responsible for initiating the work had thus identified within English Protestantism a strong potential market for some sort of commentary to accompany the King James Bible. After all, the main accusation that English Protestants had brought against the King James Bible was simply that there was no commentary to go with it. In most other respects it was regarded as the work of good, qualified scholars, some of whom, such as Lawrence Chaderton and John Reynolds, were good Puritans as well. It was in this potential market that both the London printers and the labouring divines saw the justification for their undertaking. There remained, however, for the divines the issue of how best to go about the task set before them.

Since the notes were originally intended as a mere revision of the Geneva notes to be contained within the margins of the Authorized Version, they were, as a result, to be quite brief. In the end this was deemed by the labouring divines to be a burdensome and unnecessary requirement, and it was decided that the annotations should be not only more substantial than the Geneva notes, but also large enough to make up an entire volume by themselves. As the divines explained in the preface:

Though we hold the Geneva annotations to be in the main points of religion, sound and orthodox in doctrine, and guilty of no error,...we conceive for ourselves, that we shall

better discharge the trust reposed in us, and do more answerably to the intention of those who set us on work, and better satisfy the expectation of such others as set observant eyes upon our assiduous and sociable pursuance of the service imposed on us, if (being as repairers of buildings to rip into an old house) we rather took it quite down, and built a new one, [rather] than patched it up, with here and there a new piece of our own putting in, which would not be decently suitable to the other parts, nor any way answerable, either in measure or manner of structure, to such a model...some apprehensive men have already prefigured to our performance.[27]

The preface to the third edition (1657) reveals more still:

These Annotations were at first intended, as those before in the Geneva Version, for marginal notes only affixed to the text. To which purpose, in the directions then delivered unto us, it was required that they should be much of the same size with them...Our endeavor was to be as brief and concise as we well might, and we were therefore constrained...to let pass many things not unworthy otherwise of due observation and large discussion, that our notes, having only a narrow by-place assigned them on the outside of the leaf, might not in undue and undecent manner so enlarge their quarter, as to encroach beyond just proportion upon the spaces that were to be reserved for the text. Hence came it to pass, when the work came abroad, that diverse notes seemed not so full nor so clear,...while "endeavor of brevity bred", as usual, "some obscurity"; and much was missed by many, ...which well might, and would have been the greatest part of it inserted, had the lists and limits prescribed us afforded room with any fitness to receive it...

Afterwards upon some second thoughts and further consideration, it seemed good unto those, who had put us upon this work, to alter their course at first propounded and to publish the Annotations apart by themselves.[28]

The resulting notes were far more comprehensive than even those attached to later editions of the Geneva Bible. Since it was not confined to the margin, the new commentary was naturally able to cover more of the Scriptures. More detailed, however, could also mean more cumbersome, and the authors hoped that the new notes would ultimately claim as wide a circulation as the more concise Geneva notes had in their day. They were, in other words, designed

to edify both the ordinary layperson and the more educated clergy alike, as the authors explained:

First, as we had no thoughts of such a service, until by Authority we were called unto it, so since we have accepted of it, we have thought of nothing so much, as how we might discharge it, with best advantage to the glory of God, and the instruction of his people, and therefore we have put ourselves to much more pains (for many months) in consulting with many more authors, in several languages, then at first we thought of, that...we might bring in such observations, as might not only serve to edify the ordinary reader, but might likewise gratify our brethren of the ministry, at least such among them, as have not the means to purchase, or leisure to peruse so many books as (by order of the Committee) we were furnished withall, for the finishing of the work committed to our hands.[29]

As they went about their task of shedding light upon the Scriptures, the divines considered both what the people wanted as well as what was good for the people at large. The task with which they had been entrusted, we must remember, was not simply to cater to public opinion, but to offer at the same time a truly edifying exegetical companion to the Scriptures. Ultimately their task was simplified because that is exactly what the people had demanded from the beginning. Thus, the only way to fulfil their commission and satisfy popular demand was to provide a commentary that was at its core faithful to the great truths of Continental Protestantism.

The Assembly's Annotations arose under the auspices of the Long Parliament (1640-1660), which later authorized the composition of such masterpieces as the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith, and Larger and Shorter Catechisms. In fact, of the learned divines who laboured to produce the notes, at least six - William Gouge, Thomas Gataker, John Ley, Francis Taylor, Daniel Featly and one Mr. Reading [30] - later served on the Westminster Assembly. The annotations, as a result, were the product of some of the best Reformed minds in England, as their content well attests. The following quotations offer but a brief survey of the notes and the Calvinistic spirit which permeates them. Each Scripture verse will be followed by the corresponding note.

"Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." (John III: iii) "v.3. born again] Regenerated by the Holy Spirit." [31]

"That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." (John III: vi) "v.6 born of the flesh] The corrupted nature of man; opposite to regeneration." [32]

"All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." (John VI: xxxvii) "v.37 All that the Father giveth me] All whom [God] elected shall believe in Christ and obey the Gospel." [33]

"No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." (John VI: xlii) "v.44 No man can come to me] That is, understand and believe these things, except God teach, enlighten, and give him faith." [34]

"For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." (Romans VIII: xxix) "v.29 he did foreknow] For his own, as the word is taken, John 10.14.27, Psalm 1.6, Jer 1.5, Matt 7.23. Those whom [God] marked out as it were out of all other men in the world, and set his affection upon." [35]

"Therefore hath [God] mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." (Romans IX: xviii) "v.18 he hardeneth] By God's withholding his grace and not mollifying their rebellious hearts. Moreover, it is to be noted that as the text saith that God hardened Pharaoh's heart, so it is said, Exod 8.15.32, that Pharaoh hardened his own heart, so that he could have no excuse." [36]

"Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." (Romans XI: v) "v.5 the election of grace] Not whereby men chose grace, but whereby God chooseth us of his grace and goodness." [37]

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (I Cor II: xiv) "v.4 spiritually discerned] That is, to be taken and understood in a spiritual and heavenly sense, to which his carnal reason cannot reach; or, they that are spiritually discerned, that is, by the virtue of the Holy Ghost, with an eye annointed with the eye-salve of the Spirit." [38]

"And you hath [God] quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (Ephesians II: i) "dead in trespasses and sins] Not dead to sins, but dead in sins: He is dead to sin, in whom sin hath little or no power (Romans 6.2.11). He is dead in sin, who hath no life of grace in him; all that are unregenerate are dead in this sense." [39]

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." (Ephesians II: viii) "Christ is the meritorious, grace the efficient and faith the instrumental cause of our justification and salvation: grace and faith stand one with another, to which two these are [both] contrary to [being] saved by ourselves or our works. And because it might be objected that faith is our work, and consequently that if we are justified by faith we are justified by works, the Apostle immediately addeth that though this faith be in us, yet it is not of us; that is, not from the power of nature, but that it is merely the gift of God." [40]

"For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." (Ephesians II: x) "v.10 his workmanship] We are God's workmanship, both in respect to our first creation and in respect of our regeneration, which is a second creation: of which these words are to be understood, for he speaketh not of us as we are by nature, but as new creatures in Christ by grace." [41]

"Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied." (I Peter I: ii) "v.2 elect] that is sequestered and separated from the world. See John 15.19, Rev 17.14, in which place, elect, called, and faithful, are put for the same; so that we are here to understand by elect those who were effectually called, or who had obeyed the Gospel. foreknowledge] or preordination, or foreappointment; that is, as God had before decreed. See verse 20." [42]

The notes are filled with Calvinistic jargon and such terms as regeneration, effectual calling and predestinate. Moreover, they set forth, as did the Geneva notes before them, the reformed doctrines of human depravity and free grace. In some instances, in fact, the authors chose to quote Lawrence Tomson's New Testament [43]

verbatim.

"For [God] saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." (Romans IX: xv) "God is most free, and cannot be taxed with injustice, though he cast brighter beams of his favor upon one than another; for although he chose and predestined to salvation them that are not yet born, without any respect of worthiness; yet he bringeth not the chosen to their appointed end, but by the means of his mercy, which is a cause next under predestination: Now mercy presupposeth misery, and misery, sin, and a voluntary corruption of mankind, and this corruption presupposeth a pure and perfect creation. Moreover, mercy is shown by degrees, to wit, by calling by faith to justification and sanctification, so that at the length we come to glorification. Now all these things ordinarily following the purpose of God, do clearly prove, that he can by no means seem unjust in loving and saving his." [44]

"God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew." (Romans XI: ii) "v.2 which he foreknew] Which he loved and chose from everlasting, and decreed to save before the foundations of the world were laid." [45]

"According as [God] hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." (Ephesians I: iv) "v.4 chosen] According as God by his election framed a new body out of mankind in opposition to the first, whose head was Adam, in whom they all did sin and die, and ordained Christ to be their head, that in him, all might be gathered and made partakers of him by his grace, life and glory; so also hath he accomplished this counsel of his in time, dispensing all his graces unto his chosen by Christ in his sacred communion. See chap.3.11, 2Tim.1.9. Election or choice here is taken for the eternal decree of election, which is of certain men in time drawn out of the common lump of corrupt mankind. See John 15.16, Rom.8.29, 1Thess.2.13, 1Peter 1.2.

God did not choose us because we were, for otherwise would have been holy; but to the end that we should be holy, being clothed with Christ's righteousness through faith." [46]

It is clear that the Assembly's Annotations were in many

ways reminiscent of the old Geneva notes in both their content and, at times, their wording. It is not surprising that they were received with enthusiasm as soon as they appeared. Neither is it surprising that shortly after the appearance of this brand new set of annotations, fitted to a translation regarded as both more recent and in many ways linguistically superior to the Geneva Bible, the latter, having done its job, slipped quietly into obscurity. Meanwhile the new and improved commentary began to take the field, carrying along the Authorized Version with it.

Actual references to the notes are sparse; there is, however, one contemporary account only a few decades removed from the notes themselves. It can be found in the preface to Matthew Poole's Annotations on the Holy Bible (1685). In it the writer offers a brief description of the notes and an assessment of their popularity:

About the year 1640 some deliberations were taken for the composing and printing other English notes (the old Geneva notes not so well fitting our new and more correct translation of the Bible). These were at first intended to be so short, that they might be printed together with our Bibles in folio or quarto. But those divines who were engaged in it found this would not answer their end; it being not possible by so short notes to give people any tolerable light into the whole text; yet they so contracted their work, that it was all despatched in one volume; which though it were at first greedily bought up, yet we cannot say it gave so general a satisfaction (by reason of the shortness of it) as was desired and expected. So as upon the second edition it came forth quite a new thing, making two just volumes. This was so acceptable to the world, that within sixteen [47] years it was ready for a third edition, with some further enlargements.[48]

Several things are revealed here. First of all, we are told that the masses readily accepted the new notes despite the fact that they were not attached to the margin of the text as had been the enormously popular Geneva notes. In fact, it would be safe to say that the notes were readily accepted because they were not confined to the margin. Apparently, the labouring divines had been correct in their assumption, for English Protestants, it seems, were looking for both a more detailed and a more comprehensive exegesis of the Scriptures. They were, it seems, not at all bothered by the prospect of having to purchase an extra volume, for we are told that the notes sold rather quickly. Within less than a decade, moreover, the English people were ready for an expanded version of the 1645 edition which was issued as two volumes in 1654. Three years later

it was once again updated and expanded. The expanded version, like the 1645 original, met with widespread acceptance.

The next reference comes just over one hundred and fifty-two years later in the preface to Adam Clarke's The Holy Bible, with a Commentary and Critical Notes (1837). Although brief, it affirms the popularity of the commentary, voluminous as it was.

The notes of the Assembly of Divines, in 2 volumes folio, 1654, have been long in considerable estimation. They contain many valuable elucidations of the sacred text.[49]

The Assembly's Annotations arose primarily because there existed an obvious market for them, and like the Geneva annotations before them, they quickly gained widespread circulation. Within twelve years of their first appearance, two more editions, both expanded, were issued for public consumption. For the first time there existed a commentary, both detailed and Reformed, to accompany the King James Bible. Its popularity enormous, the impact it made upon English society is unequivocal: by mid-century the venerable, old Geneva Bible had faded away, and the Authorized Version, once rejected and ignored, had become the common household Bible.

Throughout this discourse I have argued that it was ultimately the Assembly's Annotations that popularized the Authorized Version. The annotations, however, are significant for another reason as well. They represent the earliest attempt at a substantial revision of the King James Bible. While a few minor alterations had occurred prior to 1645, a commentary affixed to the margin would have constituted a major adaptation of the original text. The revision was officially commissioned by the House of Commons, and had it not been unanimously decided that the margins were too constricting, the work would have proceeded as intended, producing a very different Bible from the one which appeared in 1611. In the end, the annotations were issued as a separate volume; thus, in their final form they technically would not qualify as an official revision. This, however, is something for future historians to debate.

Irrespective of the manner in which they were issued, we can, with far greater certainty, attach considerable importance to the fact that the Assembly's Annotations became the King James translation's very first commentary. Never before had a commentary been issued for the Authorized Version, although many more would follow the path that the Assembly's Annotations had boldly forged.

More significant still is the third and last edition of the Assembly's Annotations (1657). Neither the Geneva notes nor the first two editions of the new notes were comprehensive enough to

be termed a complete commentary covering the whole of the Scriptures. The third edition, however, contained, according to the assembly who laboured to produce it, "an entire Commentary on the Sacred Scripture: The like never before published in English".[50] Discussing the differences between the third edition and the preceding editions, the divines wrote in their preface:

So that the work as now it is, (the premises well weighed) may not unduly be deemed An Entire Commentary upon the whole Body of the Bible; and that such (it may with good warrant be averred) as hath not at any time appeared in our Language before.[51]

The final edition of the annotations thus became the very first comprehensive Bible commentary to be compiled in the English language. While other commentaries had preceded it, they had been mostly translated from other languages or else, like the Geneva notes, were too short to be deemed truly comprehensive. Not until 1657 was there an indigenous work covering the entire Scriptures. It would, of course, be another twenty-eight years before Matthew Poole's annotations would appear on the market.

Paradoxically, the Assembly's Annotations, while rendering the old Geneva notes obsolete, simultaneously vindicated them. While the controversial notes had won the unanimous support of English-speaking Protestants, they had made the Geneva Bible face intolerance and scorn from the established authorities, who from the start of the seventeenth century tried to suppress it, first by refusing it the honour of becoming the official translation of the Church and later by banning outright its printing and importation. On one side were the authorities, who maintained that an annotated Bible was no Bible at all, and on the other side stood the people, who claimed that a parallel commentary was essential to a proper understanding of the Scriptures. As a result, the King James Bible, designed to displace the Geneva Bible once and for all, possessed no commentary, while the Geneva Bible, whose Calvinistic marginal commentary was arguably its most important and most beloved feature, remained the popular favourite.

When at long last the Geneva Bible sank into disuse, it gave way not to the King James Bible as James I had authorized it in 1611, but as the Puritans of the Long Parliament had "Reformed" it in 1645. While it is beyond the scope of this discourse to determine whether or not their work constitutes an actual revision of the King James text, it is safe to say that even though the text itself may have remained unchanged, the King James Bible that had by the middle of the seventeenth century replaced the Geneva Bible as the

household Bible was not the same as it had been forty years earlier in 1611. The new annotations made the Authorized Version of 1611 far more palatable than it had ever been. For the first time English-speaking Protestants felt that they could look into the text with the same understanding they had enjoyed with their Geneva Bibles, for they had finally been given a detailed and Reformed commentary as a companion to the King James Bible.

Thus, it was not the English-speaking Protestants who had changed by surrendering their hope for a commentary and accepting what was regarded as an inferior translation of an unresponsive and unenlightened monarch. Rather, the Bible adapted to suit them. It was only after their demand was satisfactorily met by the Assembly's Annotations that English Protestants finally put their Geneva Bibles to rest and adopted the Authorized Version. In this sense the Puritans too had been vindicated. They had remained steadfast in their demand for a commentary, and their resolve ultimately outlived the forces that had tried so hard to repress it.

- 1 Quoted in F F Bruce, History of the Bible in English, (3rd edn, New York, 1978), p. 96.
- 2 Leland Ryken, Worldly Saints (Grand Rapids, MI, 1990), p. 139.
- 3 John Eadie, The English Bible, (2 vols, London, 1876), p. 15.
- 4 Harold L Phillips, Translators and Translations (Anderson, IN, 1958), p. 62.
- 5 Proverbs XVI: xviii. All Scripture quotations are taken from the Authorized Version of 1611.
- 6 Quoted in Lloyd E Berry, "Introduction to the Facsimile Edition" of The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition (Madison, WI, 1969), p. 15.
- 7 Derek Hirst, Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658 (Cambridge, MA, 1986), p. 78.
- 8 Eadie, p. 52.
- 9 Ibid, p. 15.
- 10 Brooke Foss Westcott, A General View of the History of the English Bible (London & Cambridge, 1868), p. 96.
- 11 Berry, p. 15.
- 12 Ibid, p. 14.
- 13 See Charles Eason, The Geneva Bible: Notes on its Production and Distribution (London & Dublin, 1937), pp. 1-12.
- 14 Eadie, p. 37.
- 15 Eason, p. 5.
- 16 Eadie, p. 51.

- 17 Hirst, p. 78.
- 18 Julius D Payne, The English Bible: An Historical Survey (London, 1911), p. 84.
- 19 W K Lowther Clarke, Concise Bible Commentary (London, 1952).
- 20 See Eadie, pp. 15-52.
- 21 Eadie, p. 51.
- 22 Eason, p. 2.
- 23 Hirst, p. 203.
- 24 Payne, p. 84; Phillips, p. 63.
- 25 Annotations Upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament; Wherein The text is Explained, Doubts Resolved, Scriptures Paralleled, and Various Readings Observed. By the Joint-Labor of certain Learned Divines, thereunto appointed, and therein employed, as is expressed in the Preface. (London, 1645), Preface. Pages are not numbered.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Annotations, (3rd edn, London, 1657), Preface.
- 29 Annotations, 1645 edn, Preface.
- 30 Annotations, 3rd edn, Preface. Although no comprehensive list of authors is ever given, an abridged list appears at the end of the Preface to the 3rd edition.
- 31 Annotations, 1645 edn.
- 32-42 Ibid.
- 43 In 1576 Lawrence Tomson, a Puritan scholar and member of Parliament, brought out a revised translation of the New Testament along with a set of notes more comprehensive than those of the original Geneva text. From then on many editions of the Geneva Bible made use of Tomson's contribution.
- 44 Annotations, 1645 edn.
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Ibid. Second paragraph only is same as Tomson's New Testament.
- 47 Clearly, the writer is referring to the Assembly's Annotations, yet he errs in claiming that sixteen years elapsed between the first and third edition, when only twelve years had elapsed. Perhaps he refers to the time between the commencement of the deliberations to compose the notes, which he places around 1640, and the issuing of the third edition in 1657, which would make approximately sixteen years.
- 48 Matthew Poole, Annotations on The Holy Bible, (2 vols, London, 1685) reprinted as Commentary on The Holy Bible (London, 1962), p. vi.
- 49 Adam Clarke, The Holy Bible, with a Commentary and Critical Notes, (6 vols, New York, 1837), p. 7.
- 50 Annotations, 3rd edn, Title page.
- 51 Ibid. Preface.

## Bibliography

- Annotations Upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament; Wherein The text is Explained, Doubts Resolved, Scriptures Paralleled, and Various Readings Observed. By the Joint-Labor of certain Learned Divines, thereunto appointed, and therein employed, as is expressed in the Preface. (London, 1645).
- Annotations Upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament, (3rd edn, London, 1657).
- Bruce, F F, History of the Bible in English (New York, 1978).
- Clarke, Adam, The Holy Bible, with a Commentary and Critical Notes, (6 vols, New York, 1837).
- Clarke, W.K. Lowther, Concise Bible Commentary (London, 1952).
- Eadie, John, The English Bible, (2 vols, London, 1876).
- Eason, Charles, The Geneva Bible: Notes on its Production and Distribution (London & Dublin, 1937).
- The Geneva Bible, A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition (Madison, WI, 1969).
- The Geneva Bible, A Facsimile of the 1599 Edition, (2nd edn, Buena Park, CA, 1991).
- Hirst, Derek, Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658 (Cambridge, MA, 1986).
- Mitchell, Alexander F, The Westminster Assembly: Its History and Standards (London, 1883).
- Payne, Julius D, The English Bible: An Historical Survey (London, 1911).
- Phillips, Harold L, Translators and Translations (Anderson, IN, 1958).
- Poole, Matthew, Annotations on the Holy Bible, (2 vols, London, 1685).
- Ryken, Leland, Worldly Saints (Grand Rapids, MI, 1990).
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, A General View of the History of the English Bible (London & Cambridge, 1868).

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

## Part 2

by Jonathan R Moore

### The Preston Campaign 1648:

#### the Strategic Defensive and the Rise of Operational Art

In contrast to the first Civil War, the campaign of 1648 saw the close interaction of strategic aims, political objectives and military action. The price at stake was the political survival of the Independent group in parliament and the army in the face of a loose but powerful coalition of English Royalist rebels aided by strong merchant interests in the City of London. These were supported by a threat of military intervention from Scotland by a moderate Presbyterian faction, the "Engagers", led by the Duke of Hamilton, who sought to restore the King to his former powers in return for a limited period of Presbyterian church government in England. Politically and strategically, the army and the Independents were on the defensive; success lay with the ability to maintain cohesion in the face of two distinct threats.

The first threat was internal, to suppress the rebellions which broke out in Kent and South Wales in mid-1648. The insurrection in Kent was quickly crushed by Fairfax, but the campaign then became bogged down in a prolonged siege at Colchester, requiring some 8,700 invaluable troops. In Wales, the Royalists had retreated into Pembroke after being defeated by local forces at St Fagans. Cromwell, who had been ordered by the Commons to suppress the revolt, was involved in a difficult siege against a strong town, in a countryside poverty-stricken by war. By the middle of the year, the fate of the English Royalists in their beleaguered fortresses depended entirely on the ability of Hamilton's slowly forming army to defeat the New Model in the field. Unless the towns were relieved then the Royalist cause in England was doomed. This illustrates the dependence of fortresses on an adequate field force for their long term security. By July Hamilton felt ready to make his move into England, presenting the second, and by then the most significant threat.

The first phase of the Preston campaign occurred during July and August, when after slowly building up his army, Hamilton crossed the border, initially with some 10,500 men. He advanced to Carlisle to relieve Sir Marmaduke Langdale, who, with 3,000 English Royalists, was blockaded in the city by John Lambert, the commander of parliament's northern forces, with some 4,000 men. Uniting with Langdale, Hamilton tarried whilst waiting for further

reinforcement, in particular 2,700 veterans from Ireland under General Monro and his artillery train. Outnumbered by some 3:1 Lambert had no option but to fall back, and in a key decision for the course of the campaign decided not to block the direct route south through the defile into Lancashire (the obvious course), but to retire across the trans-Pennine passes and carry out a defence on interior lines, threatening the flank of any Scottish advance south, whilst covering the eastern route into England from Berwick (occupied by a small Royalist-Scottish force) and his base in Yorkshire.

The threat this movement posed to his flank forced Hamilton to react, committing his forces to a series of operations to secure the Pennine passes before moving south. This placed the tempo of operations in the hands of Lambert for a critical period; the time absorbed by these activities meant that when Hamilton renewed his advance, Pembroke had surrendered (11 July) and Cromwell, force-marching north, made a rendezvous with Lambert at Otley, bringing their combined forces to some 8,600, a mixture of local forces and New Model troops. Lambert, by carrying out an active defence on interior lines, had stopped the Scots from developing tempo. His force was intact and had won for Cromwell the time necessary to deal with the Welsh rebels and concentrate a field force capable of confronting Hamilton. The speed of Cromwell's advance, reaching Yorkshire from Pembroke in 26 days, by marching some 15-20 miles a day, ensured a decisive degree of surprise. Cromwell had simultaneously achieved an economy of force, by uniting all his troops under a single command. In contrast, reacting to Lambert's activity, and with some confusion in Hamilton's mind about the location of the English forces, the Scottish army moved in separate detachments with Langdale in the van. This presented Cromwell, who by 16 August had reached Hodder bridge, with several clear opportunities for action.

The operational situation was increasingly favourable for Cromwell, and would compensate for the fact that he was clearly outnumbered by Hamilton, whose total forces now amounted to some 22-24,000 men. The English army was directly placed on the flank of the Scottish advance. Langdale had been told to act as a flank guard against what were believed to be no more than Lancashire militia located at Whalley. Langdale stated that he had kept Hamilton appraised of the situation, but that for some reason, the Royalist commanders chose to ignore the threat. Much of the praise for this position must go to Lambert, for if he had chosen to block the direct route south and then been pushed into Lancashire by superior numbers, Cromwell would have had to move to join him, placing their combined forces in the path of the Scots and forcing a conventional pitched battle. Exploiting this opportunity,

Cromwell could now choose to cross the river and advance to engage the Scots south of Preston - the safest course, but this would give Hamilton time to react and place the English against the bulk of the Scottish force. He could also parallel Hamilton's march, seeking to block their advance south at Warrington or Manchester; again this would increase the chances of indecisive encounter. In typical fashion Cromwell seized the opportunity to engage Hamilton by successive fractions and separate the main body from his line of communication to the north and Monro's force around Lancaster. This enabled a favourable correlation of forces to be generated at the tactical level. By making use of these opportunities created by movement, Cromwell was maximising the fighting power of his units at the decisive point. The tempo of operations was clearly in favour of the English. What is surprising is Hamilton's lack of reaction to the clear indication that his army was in danger of being attacked and defeated in detail, once Langdale's force had been engaged. At this point, it would be best to look at the battle from day to day.

Day one saw a series of actions in which Cromwell broke Hamilton's by now isolated elements, first by defeating Langdale who had placed his 3,500 men in strong defensive position. Cromwell attacked his position in two columns of foot and horse, supported by a strong reserve of horse. He planned to "outwing" or envelop the Royalist to the north, using his numerical superiority to full effect, whilst fixing him by a powerful attack on the centre and left. Such a move would stop Langdale retreating north towards Monro and push him against the river Ribble where he would be destroyed. Cromwell had turned an in-theatre force ratio of some 2.5:1 in favour of Hamilton, to a tactical ratio of 2.5 in his favour. The enveloping move was slowed by weather and terrain, and Langdale's forces broke, after stubborn resistance, against the "fixing force" before it could take effect. Cromwell immediately unleashed his reserve horse who pursued Langdale's beaten troops to Preston and the bridges over the Ribble and Darwen. The only aid Hamilton gave Langdale was to keep two brigades of Scottish foot in Preston, around 4,000 men strong, and these were outnumbered 2:1 by the English; after a short fight they were in turn dispersed by Cromwell's now tired but victorious troops. By nightfall the New Model had established a bridgehead over the Darwen, whilst Hamilton merely sowed further confusion by attempting a night march to break off the fight, which only succeeded in splitting his horse from the foot and losing his ammunition train which fell into Cromwell's hands.

Day two saw the battle, which had up to then been one of successive fractions, develop into a vigorous pursuit action.

Cromwell was forced to leave behind a force of some 3,000 men to cover his rear against Monro and guard 4,000 prisoners, but he pushed on immediately with about 5,500 men. Although Hamilton still had some 7-8,000 foot and 4,000 horse, these were increasingly dispirited and disorganised. A series of running fights ensued. A strong body of Scottish foot some 3,000 strong, disordered by their own cavalry, was broken at Wigan Moor. By nightfall the remaining foot surrendered at Winwick north of Warrington, whilst their leaders escaped with 3,000 horse, which were in turn dispersed over the following week, Hamilton and his subordinates being captured.

The single campaign was decisive. Some 19,000 Scots prisoners were taken, and the threat to the Independents and their allies was removed. The English Royalists, with no chance of relief, surrendered Colchester on 28 August. Monro retreated to Scotland, and the Scottish Assembly sought a peace treaty with the Independents. The strategic objectives had been achieved and the political aims of the campaign secured. The defeat was catastrophic for Charles's cause. It was decided to bring him personally to trial and establish a new republican form of government. What then of the military lessons?

A successful mobile defence based on interior lines had provided suitable conditions for a completely successful counter-offensive. Lambert's manoeuvres had forestalled the Scots from seizing tempo and provided vital time in which reinforcements could be gathered. He had maintained the cohesion of the English defence at the strategic, operational and tactical levels, and provided an opportunity for a decisive counter-stroke.

Cromwell's counter-moves sought to restore the strategic position not by blocking the Scottish advance; as long as they remained intact the threat of resurgent Royalism would remain. His purpose was, quite simply, to break Hamilton's strengths - that is, his main force - and this could only be achieved by decisive battle. The essential factor was to fight that battle in the most favourable conditions which could be obtained. The movement to join Lambert, the location of forces and the actions of Hamilton's formations all enabled Cromwell to manipulate those conditions to achieve that end.

Unlike Naseby, operational success is not to be found at the tactical level, in the action of units on the battlefield, but in the movement and positioning of the army. Tactical success was a product not just of superior fighting power, but more significantly of the change in correlation of forces and achievement of surprise due to the manoeuvring of the army as a whole in relation to Hamilton's. This provided Cromwell with the opportunities which

could then be exploited at the battlefield level. In this sense operational art becomes distinct from the tactical and strategic levels, and takes up a clearly defined position as a transmission belt for altering tactical conditions and strategic circumstances. The tactical conditions the army faced were the direct result of the activities of the whole army in a specific theatre; they belong nowhere else.

The keys to success in manoeuvre operations rest on the ability to generate and exploit options for action; that is, the seizure of tempo. At the same time, this increases chances of success as the enemy CNS is placed under stress by being forced into a reactive position where the chances of making a mistake increase. From this it is possible to readily generate and develop surprise which magnifies the impact of one's own fighting power and create real economy of force. Consequently, it is easier to create a superiority in fighting power at the decisive point. In the case of Preston, Cromwell saw the opportunity to defeat the enemy by successive fractions, changing the correlation of forces from an inferiority at the operational level into tactical superiority.

Preston secured the Independent group within Parliament from the Royalist threat, by the adoption within a strategic defensive of tactical and operational offensive action to seize the tempo. Our final example, the Dunbar campaign, shows the new Commonwealth of England on the strategic offensive to protect the new political order.

#### Dunbar 1650: The Strategic Offensive and Manoeuvre War

The strategic offensive is the complete expression of the manoeuvre form of warfare; and is the only means by which armed force can effect a profound change in the political, economic, international and military circumstances. In other words, the transformation of military success into political objectives, the achievement of national aims, ambitions and policy.

It should be noted that these political objectives can in some cases be perceived as "defensive", in that they seek, for example, to protect a state from the military power of a neighbour. The adoption of the strategic offensive does not necessarily have to be preceded by the initiation of hostilities. The offensive can consist of pre-emptive action or the wish to strike before an opponent, who has made his aggressive intentions clear, has an opportunity to fully develop his strength. It is this strategic problem with which the fledgling Commonwealth of England was confronted in 1650.

Without allies in Europe and facing a host of foreign enemies, the constant possibility of Royalist subversion at home and a war-weary population, the new Republic was presented with an increasingly antagonistic and bellicose Kirk-led Scotland, eager

to challenge the regicide "sectaries" to the south. In June 1650 Prince Charles arrived in Scotland and the Scots began mobilising forces under David Leslie, the commander who provided such vital succour for the Parliamentary cause during the First Civil War. The clear threat to restore the Stuarts by force and impose a Presbyterian church on England could not be ignored. The Council of State, the executive authority of the republic, recalled Cromwell from Ireland, and after Fairfax had declined to take command of an offensive into Scotland, he was appointed Lord General or Commander-in-Chief.

English policy was quite simply to preserve the security of the new political order by a pre-emptive strike. A rapid victory was essential to reduce the expense of the conflict and remove the Stuart threat as expeditiously as possible. That required a military decision which could only be obtained by an offensive operation, to seize and retain a favourable tempo. In effect, both political and military objectives were in concordance, allowing close integration of military means with political ends.

Offensive operations would make it possible for Cromwell to manipulate time and space to his advantage, and this could only be achieved by choosing when and where to establish a point of decision. By advancing north, directly against the enemy capital, and "by seizing that which your opponent holds dear" [1], it was calculated that Leslie would be forced to fight, in which case the superior flexibility and fighting power of the English army would enable a tactical manoeuvre to be used to defeat the Scots in a single action. The English would rely on the fleet to supply the logistical means to sustain the campaign; the "rear area" of England was secured by a reorganised militia and a capable military/political executive body.

Cromwell advanced as soon as his forces, comprising some 4,200 horse, 10,800 foot and 1,000 dragoons, were ready. On 22 July 1650 they crossed the border and marched directly to Edinburgh, only briefly halting to secure the port of Dunbar as an advanced supply base. However, as they moved north, the English found no opposition in a deserted countryside. A strong reconnaissance, led by Major-General Lambert, found no enemy until Musselburgh had been seized, and Leslie's army of around 22,000 men were discovered manning an entrenched line between Edinburgh and its port of Leith, both of which had been heavily fortified.

Leslie, a capable, if somewhat cautious professional soldier, was determined not to fight Cromwell in the open, where he recognised the superior fighting power and manoeuvre capability of the English could be brought to bear against his raw, if numerous army. He was to rely for victory on a methodical positional

approach. By occupying a series of strong positions with his communications to Stirling secure, he could cause steady attrition of the English strength, forcing them either to attack him on his own terms or withdraw. Logistical "stretch", bad weather and reliance on a "scorched earth" policy would achieve his purpose at minimum risk. This demonstrates that manoeuvre war is not necessarily a panacea, and can be inappropriate or impossible to apply if conditions are unsuitable. Positional concepts of war clearly have their strengths if they can be used correctly, which Leslie showed all evidence of doing.

Cromwell's answer to this problem was to alter those conditions, attempting to manoeuvre Leslie out of his defences by threatening his lines of communication with Stirling. The English marched south after garrisoning Musselburgh, then west through the Pentland hills. Leslie, recognising the threat, paralleled Cromwell's march; and was able to meet the English in a strong position with his flanks secured by bogs outside the village of Gogar. Clearly for Cromwell, to attack would be foolish; his forces had no room to deploy effectively let alone manoeuvre. As a consequence Cromwell and his tired army, shadowed by the Scots, fell back to Musselburgh.

Leslie had made good use of an interior position to match Cromwell. However, it should be noted that this was not what could be termed a manoeuvre defence on interior lines. Leslie was not seeking to fight Cromwell and maximise his fighting power by movement, but by moving from position to position to block Cromwell, whilst maintaining the cohesion of his own forces. In each successive position he hoped Cromwell would be forced to retreat or attack on unfavourable terms. Operationally he did not have to fight to win: attrition through sickness, the weather and hard marching was achieving success. Victory, we have indicated, depends on being able to seize tempo, and Cromwell was unable in the first stage of the Scottish campaign to achieve this. Conversely, Leslie was able to maintain favourable conditions for the prosecution of the form of warfare which suited the character, nature and limitations of his army.

When Cromwell fell back on Dunbar to rest his exhausted army, now reduced to some 12,000+ men, Leslie's policy seemed to be paying handsome dividends. Yet, at this point Leslie committed what was to prove to be a fatal error. He left the security of his trenches and followed in the English footsteps. If, as Napoleon suggests, luck is the exploitation of "accidents" (in fact this and their creation through superior tempo), then Leslie was to present Cromwell with an accident which he was to exploit ruthlessly.

The Scottish army moved south-east, engaging in several clashes with English rearguards; then through the Lammermuir hills (to cut the road south to England at Cockburnspath), and occupied Doon hill overlooking the English fortified camp outside Dunbar. This was a sound position in which to observe the English, but from which Leslie could not hope to fight them, so he compounded his initial error by moving down from the hill to line the Bronxburn, a shallow but deep gullied stream at the foot of the hill. Leslie, it seems, believed the English were evacuating the port, although they had no intention of doing so. The removal of the sick to the fleet may have fostered this belief. The Scots were clearly hoping to preempt any such a move and also to shelter their troops, exposed on the hill slopes, from inclement weather.

Tactically, this provided Cromwell with the opportunity to manoeuvre against the Scottish army, which although deployed behind the stream was constricted by the steep slopes upon which they had to form. This made re-deployment of forces along the Scottish line difficult in the extreme, both to the rear and the front across the burn. The only exception to this was east towards the coast, where the road south crossed the stream just above the sea and where the gradient was favourable. Here Leslie seems to have deployed the bulk of his horse. Such conditions could be readily exploited by an aggressive enemy attempting to envelop the Scottish army by its right wing. It was these conditions Cromwell seized.

The English adopted an "oblique" order, an assault/enveloping force concentrated in echelon at the decisive point on the English left as follows:

Manoeuvre force:

First echelon—(Lambert, Harrison)

6 regiments of horse

3 + regiments of foot

Second echelon—(Cromwell)

Col Pride's Brigade (3 regiments of foot)

Col Bright's Brigade (3 regiments of foot)

1 regiment of horse

Fixing force (Monck):

1 Brigade of foot (possibly 3 regiments)

Dragoons

Artillery

The fixing force covered the stream against the centre and left of the Scottish forces. It was tasked with pinning the bulk of Leslie's

forces, so making reinforcement of the Scottish right even more difficult. These preparations were carried out at night so as to enable a dawn attack to be made, Lambert supervising the deployment. This is evidence of high quality staff work and training of the New Model. All told, Cromwell could muster some 12,000 men against around 22,000 Scots, a ratio of 1:1.8. At the decisive point, by adopting an oblique order of attack, the English could amass some 2,800 horse and 6,750 foot [2] against some 3,500-4,000 Scottish horse, a ratio of 2.4:1 in Cromwell's favour.

Although taken by surprise by the New Model's dawn attack on their right wing, the Scottish horse initially put up stubborn resistance against the initial shock of the English first echelon. Cromwell, personally commanding the second echelon, reinforced Lambert and Fleetwood, his control of this echelon being essential for the commitment of those forces which would ensure retention of the tempo and ultimate success. The English renewed the assault and simultaneously began to envelop the Scottish horse. After brief resistance the Scottish cavalry broke, allowing the English, who were kept firmly under hand by their commanders, to envelop and roll up the Scottish line from right to left, as at Naseby. Unable to redeploy effectively and falling into increased disorder, Leslie's army disintegrated. After barely half an hour's fighting the Host of the Covenant was in flight. Immediately reorganising his forces, Cromwell carried out a controlled pursuit to Edinburgh. Some 3,500+ Scots were killed and over 10,000 prisoners taken for the loss of a few dozen English.

In the next few days the English were able to overrun the whole of the lowlands south of Stirling, where Leslie was able to block the route north using the castle and field entrenchments covering the bridge, with a scratch force. The English were only able to prise the Scots out of this formidable position the following year after a bold seaborne descent into Fife severing Leslie's troops from their supplies. This finally led to the forlorn advance into England and to the battle of Worcester, the denouement for that curious hybrid creature, the Scottish Presbyterian and English Royalist alliance.

The Dunbar campaign is instructive. Despite a determined strategic offensive at the operational level, when faced by conditions which favoured his opponent, Cromwell was unable to seize the advantage. And despite his manoeuvres, he was unable to develop sufficient superiority in relative mobility to wrest the tempo from his opponent, who had skilfully retained attritional tempo (that is a favourable rate of exchange of forces). Cromwell's ability to see and exploit an opportunity when it appeared ultimately confirms his personal reputation as a great captain and the strength of character of

English troops. By exploiting a tactical opportunity for the application of envelopment, Cromwell was able to transform an unfavourable force ratio to a superiority in fighting power at the decisive point.

We can see that Cromwell, by combining surprise and economy of force at the tactical level of decision, was able to change the operational character of the war and with it the strategic situation. Thus, as at Naseby, the operational situation was transformed at the tactical level. At last the Commonwealth was secure from external threats, the Scots being placed on the defensive, not by choice as at the start of the campaign, but by the stark imperatives of defeat. By 3 September 1651, Cromwell and the New Model army had achieved in fourteen months what no English government or army had accomplished in 500 years of endemic warfare, the complete subjugation of Scotland, now broken militarily, politically and morally. It was during those dawn hours on 3 September 1650, with the clash of two opposing military cultures, forms and concepts of war, the triumph of manoeuvre to exploit "an opportunity and advantage to attempt upon the enemy" [3], transformed the future relationship between England and Scotland and the history of the British Isles.

#### Conclusion

In conclusion, we are seeing a dynamic in which a very conventional military organism underwent a profound change in its approach to war. This was based on the perception of a number of key commanders that the existing methods of using fighting power on the battlefield and on campaign were unable to provide rapid and decisive victory in a conflict which was becoming interminable. By recognising that movement in relation to an enemy's combat cohesion multiplies one's own fighting power and ability to inflict overwhelming levels of stress on the opponent, these commanders were able to break out from the straitjacket which the traditional attritional/positional means of waging war imposed. The implementation of manoeuvre concepts in turn required more from the organism in terms of manpower quality, leadership and training. These in turn increased the combat cohesion and fighting power of tactical units and the whole army. It was not some vain boast when Cromwell could say of his troops that "Truly they were never beaten at all".[4]

The dynamics of a mobile war demanded a new approach to command and control on the battlefield. We see the rediscovery of generalship, the means of influencing the course of battle, not as in the past by supervising the formation of the line of battle and then acting as some knightly cheerleader, but in transforming the use of

fighting power throughout the whole of the engagement. This "revolution" manifested itself in two ways:

(a) The creation of more effective means of command - by devolving the level of decision-making forward to those elements in contact with the enemy. For example, at Naseby where Fairfax allowed the key decisions to be made by subordinates such as Skippon and Cromwell, that is, by those officers most capable of seeing what was necessary for victory and acting accordingly.

(b) Creation of reserves and echelons on the battlefield which enabled the Commander-in-Chief to decisively influence the course of the battle as a whole. Thus he no longer remained, as had occurred previously, after the initial commands had been issued, merely the most well-accounted individual on the battlefield. Effort could now be concentrated, by use of reserves at the decisive point, to achieve advantage and exploit any success obtained.

For a mobile form or concept of war to be successfully applied, a careful balance must be obtained between command (devolved to the lowest level in contact with the enemy) to exploit the achievement of tempo and control (the capability to influence the whole battle once the command to initiate an action has been taken, and thus exploit opportunities which only the Commanding General would perceive). The success of the New Model army essentially lay in the achievement of this balance. The CNS of that army enabled mobile warfare to be realised, and in turn become a decisive force multiplier, when encountering positional military forms.

Perhaps at this point it should be stressed that the difference which exists between any form of war rests on a differing approach to thought, in turn a product of the mobile military culture. That is how the commander and his subordinates perceive the opportunities and options which are available in the solution of battlefield problems. As so often in human affairs, it is not so much a question of knowing what to do, but seeing what can be achieved. This said, manoeuvre war is not a panacea. Its successful application rests on what is possible, and a clear insight into the availability of the necessary resources. Are conditions favourable and can they be manipulated to anyone's advantage? At its simplest, is the requisite force-space relationship available and can it be created? Likewise, the action and concepts of war employed by the enemy are central. War is a clash of independent wills, as Cromwell discovered in 1650. Leslie was not prepared to fight in conditions of the New Model Army's choosing; a manoeuvre concept could only be applied when an opportunity was created, perceived and exploited. It is this ability to see what potential exists, develop the correct response and act with the utmost energy in the pursuit of that objective, that is the key to success. As military thinkers from Sun Tzu to Clausewitz

have stressed, energy is paramount in military activity, yet activity without direction is not enough and will be dangerous in the extreme, leading to the dissipation of fighting power. It is energy directed by insight, the ability to direct the energy and consequent activity at the decisive point, against those conditions in time and space, which will undermine the enemy concept of operations and fighting power, cause a collapse in enemy cohesion and the ability and will to fight.

As with all human activities, this capability for insight and understanding is not uniform in its creation or application, and is contingent on vagaries of character, intellect and organisation. Therefore this approach to problem solving can rarely be applied continuously, nor with a consistent degree of success. What is true, is that once this approach to thought is applied, then the possibilities for success are increased, by multiplying the opportunities available for the effective application of fighting power. What is also true, is that if this approach is emphasised and becomes part of the character of the organism, then the likelihood of achieving success increases dramatically. The strength of the mobile forms of war lies not so much in the application (the examples given above show that mobile concepts are not a panacea) but in that they widen vision and encourage the perception that each event, each action or potential action is peculiar, the product of particular conditions which cannot be recreated; and that the means to successfully overcome this is not to force events to conform to an artificially structured "plan" or prejudged appreciation, but to widen the options which can be exploited and applied. The mobile approach to war does not eschew the "plan", but sees it as a means of creating options: it points to the end, but the route will vary according to the opportunities created and encountered. Such an approach creates for the enemy the problem of countering a wide number of possibilities many of which he will not recognise before it is too late. The success of mobile war lies in maximising one's own potential for decision-making whilst minimising that of the opposition. The application of this may not always demand the use of a mobile concept of war; positional action may be the most valid at that particular instant. However, the key to success lies in recognising that the road to victory, although rocky, lies in creating for oneself as many changes and opportunities as possible, and that warfare is a demanding, and often painful choice, between "an option of difficulties".

- 1 Sun Tzu, The Art of War, translated by L Giles (Singapore, 1988), p.121.
- 2 Calculations of force numbers in the seventeenth century are notoriously difficult to make with any degree of reliability. We have accurate information on the number of English regiments and brigades present at Dunbar, but these formations after several months campaigning in often appalling weather were undermanned. As a result we make the assumption that average strengths were as follows (establishment in brackets):

Regiment of Horse:	400	(600)
Regiment of Foot:	750	(1,200)
Dragoons:	700+	(1,000)

- 3 Thomas Carlyle (ed), Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (revised edn, London, 1907), III, 43.
- 4 Ibid, I, 147.

This is the second part of a two part article, originally published in the journal British Army Review nos. 99 (December 1991) and 102 (December 1992). It is being republished in Cromwelliana in similar form, save only that the illustrations - and textual references to them - in the original are here omitted. The editor of Cromwelliana is grateful to the Ministry of Defence for permitting the reproduction of this article.

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

## WORK IN PROGRESS I. THE WEALTH OF OLIVER CROMWELL

by Stephen Roberts

The aim of this new feature in Cromwelliana is to offer a forum in which contributors can share findings and ideas about topics of common interest. Historical research is usually a solitary and individualistic activity, but there is no reason why items of information, informed speculation and opinion on avenues of research should not be presented in these pages. Readers are invited to contribute shorter or longer pieces to develop the role of this journal as a clearing-house of historical knowledge.

To set the ball rolling, I offer below some preliminary comments on the topic of Cromwell's wealth. Given the number of biographies and essays on the Lord Protector, it is interesting that little work seems to have been done on his personal finances. It could be that in the scale of issues arising in any study of Oliver Cromwell, the mundane, not to say grubby, topic of how much money Cromwell made during the 1640s and 1650s has not seemed to weigh very much with biographers. It is nevertheless a matter of legitimate enquiry. Historians have been successful in recovering a sense of the scale of Cromwell's personal resources during his obscure first forty years in East Anglia. This has mattered because we need a sense of how meteoric Oliver's rise really was. Our judgment on whether the Interregnum was a social revolution depends significantly on how we assess the status of its principal public figure. During the later years of Cromwell's pre-eminence, his critics consistently accused him of "ambition", and some implied that financial acquisitiveness formed part of this. There is the issue, too, of what happened to Cromwell's wealth after his death, and the extent to which the restored Charles II was able to profit from any resources the Lord Protector had built up.

Even for contemporaries critical of the Protectorate, it was Oliver's associates and clients who seem to have attracted the opprobrium rather than the head of state. The two best-known polemical sources for the alleged salaries and perquisites of those dependent on the regime of the Protectorate are probably the tracts A Narrative of the Late Parliament (1657) and A Second Narrative of the Late Parliament (1658). These are catalogues of place-men, army officers, MPs and household officials of the Protector who allegedly supported attempts to proffer Cromwell the crown during the second Protectorate Parliament. They were written from a committed republican standpoint, and represent partly a revived culture of anti-"court" or "country" feeling against a regime centring

on a single person. They also represent the fullest and best-documented statements of the distinction between public interest and private gain made during the 1650s. From our perspective what is interesting is that Cromwell is not numbered among the profiteers. We might have expected to find him named as the role-model for this litany of self-interest, but the anonymous author or authors are content rather to list his clients and to desist from an attack on Oliver's personal corruption. It seems unlikely that this was a charge they could not have made stick. Perhaps, like the critics of the early Stuart monarchy, they found it easier to develop a language of hostility towards the dependents of the head of state than to risk the retribution of the government against a more direct assault. Donald Wing attributes one of these pamphlets to Lord Wharton, a critic of the Protectorate but a man sympathetic to Cromwell personally, and so perhaps the tone may be accounted for by the personal position of the author, but the heavy overtones of republicanism for me make Wharton an unlikely candidate for authorship.

The emphasis in these attacks on the entourage and not the man may also arise from the difficulty in distinguishing personal wealth from the resources of the state. The expenses of the household of the monarch or of the Protector may be identified, but it is not so easy to make any distinction on the revenue side. Where the lands and rents belonging to Oliver the individual, and those which should properly be regarded as belonging to the state, began and ended may be the most intractable problem of all in our investigation.

What, as we have said, is clear is that Cromwell's income before he launched comparatively late into his career in national politics was unspectacular. The latest research on this topic, by John Morrill, shows Oliver to have inherited an estate worth only around £90 per annum in 1617. The family fortunes deteriorated subsequently before they recovered in the mid-1630s, when they became dependent upon an income from Ely cathedral dean and chapter leases of around £300 a year. Cromwell's wealth was heavily dependent on lay impropriations of church property, principally tithes.

Did Cromwell's family continue to enjoy these leases after the abolition of bishops and the sales of dean and chapter lands? Perhaps a reader may know the answer to this question. In his edition of the Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, W C Abbott surmises that Cromwell would have hung on to these leases to 1657, and that a survey was made of Ely dean and chapter lands in 1649. Has this survived?

We should probably assume some continuity between Cromwell's income in the Fens and his subsequent sources of

wealth once he appears in national public life, but it is his status as a parliamentary hero after Naseby that secured him a sudden and spectacular increase in wealth. As lieutenant-general from 1644 he received £4 per day as a salary, but in 1646 he was awarded an additional £2,500 a year by a grateful Parliament, and in May 1647 lands which had belonged to the royalist Marquis of Worcester were ordered to be valued and then bestowed upon him. These estates were in Monmouthshire, Glamorgan, Hampshire and Gloucestershire, and included the seigniorship of Gower, much land in and around Chepstow and four Hampshire manors. The advowsons (the rights to present ministers to the church livings) of Tidenham and Woolaston in Gloucestershire were included. The source for these points is in the first instance Abbott once more.

These grants made Cromwell a very important landowner. He himself estimated his lands to be worth around £1,600 a year, and may have been justified in this, since there were delays in getting in income from the grants; only from 1651 was he able to collect rents from Chepstow, for example. A hostile commentator, Clement Walker, whose History of Independency detailed the building up of what he thought were sinister networks of power and wealth by sectaries, put Cromwell's income from these lands at between five and six thousand pounds. In the marriage negotiations between the Cromwell family and the Maijor family of Merdon manor, near Winchester (Oliver's eldest surviving son Richard married Dorothy Maijor), Oliver was able to settle £3,000 in lands both in Hampshire and East Anglia. He seems at that time to have distinguished between his own estates and those granted him by Parliament.

In 1647 and 1648 Cromwell seems to have been able to command the admiration of wide strands of opinion within Parliament. In October 1648 he was nearly awarded a jewel worth £800, although the order was laid aside. And yet there were delays and problems in his receiving those salaries and rents he had already been granted. His experience was in this sense that of all officeholders and soldiers in the employ of the state at that time. Cromwell had to make sure his money kept rolling in. In April 1648, perhaps because Parliament wanted to make sure of its most reliable soldier, it gave him £84 as 28 days' pay as lieutenant-general. The Irish campaign was another milestone in Cromwell's advancement. While he remained in England his salary rose to £10 per day as lord lieutenant of Ireland, and once in the field he enjoyed £2,000 a quarter. The most diligent compiler of evidence about Cromwell's sources of wealth, W C Abbott, reckons that by 1649 Oliver's annual income was about £13,000 a year.

Readers will I hope want to fill in the gaps in the information

presented here. I have said nothing about further grants by the Rump Parliament to Cromwell after the Scottish and Worcester campaigns. Before concluding with a brief discussion of what happened after Oliver's death and the collapse of the Protectorate, I would wish to make two brief comments on the patterns these accumulations of wealth reveal. One is that Cromwell was able to build up a network of patronage through alienations of these lands, by granting leases of them and by appointing stewards to husband these resources. This was one of the ways in which the "household" of the Protector developed during the 1650s. Secondly, it is once Cromwell becomes Protector that the distinction between his own wealth and that of the state seems to get very blurred. The later administration of the lands recorded in Commons' and Lords' Journals (Abbott's main source for this topic) as awarded to Oliver in the 1640s is in any case not easy to trace.

As a postscript to this article, it should be noted that this blurring may account for the rather obscure history of the dismemberment of Cromwell's property after 1660. Each of the regicides and their assignees forfeited their estates to the Crown under the terms of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. In the Public Record Office Class E178 (Special Commissions of the Exchequer) there are surveys which were made of the property of the regicides, but none survives for the estate of Oliver Cromwell. The nearest thing I have so far found to a survey is in another class, LR2, in which there is a list of all regicides' estates, the counties where they were to be found and their value. Many of these properties went to James, Duke of York. Some of the values recorded in this summary list are very high. Sir John Danvers, for example, had £6,000 of lands in Wiltshire; Sir Arthur Haselrige had £1,500 in Leicestershire. John Jones of Maesygarneidd, Merionethshire, had estate in Wales of over £4,000. But for Oliver Cromwell, only lands worth £135 12s. 5d. in Cambridgeshire and Ely are noted. Some other lands in "Emneth and Outwell", Norfolk, were surveyed as having been owned either by Oliver or by a syndicate of himself, Valentine Walton, Edward Whalley and William Goffe: all his relatives and all fellow army officers (all in Cromwell's regiment?). These lands were petitioned for by the King's coachman. What I have yet to discover is any full survey of the landed wealth of Oliver Cromwell's heirs at the Restoration. It may be that none was made, since lands once deemed crown and church lands automatically reverted to their pre-Interregnum owners, and much of Cromwell's wealth would have derived from special grants by Parliament which became void in 1660. Nevertheless, the apparent absence of any formal documentation about Cromwell's attainder is another tantalising problem in this research in progress.

## CROMWELL'S FOREIGN POLICY AND THE "WESTERN DESIGN"

by Timothy Venning

The "Western Design", Cromwell's expedition to the Caribbean to attack Spanish colonies in 1655, is central to any assessment of his policies towards France and Spain. These two great Catholic monarchies, the "Two Crowns", were the most powerful states in Western Europe at the time, its nearest threatening neighbours, and the states most likely to aid Charles II in attempts to regain his throne after 1651. Luckily they had been embroiled in a costly and exhausting war since 1635, an extension of the European Thirty Years' War which had not been included in the general peace of 1648 and was further exacerbated by Spain's involvement with French rebels against the regency government of Anne of Austria and Cardinal Mazarin. Thus it was a great advantage to English governments after 1651 to keep the Franco-Spanish war alive if possible, and Cromwell's Secretary of State John Thurloe chose to claim that this was the cornerstone of his foreign policy in the summary of foreign affairs which he wrote for his new masters in 1661-2 (albeit with the benefit of hindsight). He wrote that France was the more dangerous to the Commonwealth as it was stronger than Spain, had close family links with the Stuarts, and was not as unpopular with Charles II's potential allies in England as Spain. Thus Cromwell had an active policy to encourage Charles II to rely on Spain by tying France to England with a close alliance, with the result that in 1656-8 Spain proved singularly unable to finance or equip an invasion of England on Charles's behalf.[1]

The situation in which Cromwell found himself when he assumed full power in 1653 required the maintenance of large armed forces, both soldiers and shipping. Besides the security problem posed by Royalists and disaffected Scots and Irish, the Government did not rely upon the usual sanction of tradition. The expulsion of the Rump on 20 April 1653 removed the last part of the traditional regime of King, Lords, and Commons, an act of open force for which many committed Parliamentarians never forgave Cromwell. An experiment of a Nominated Parliament of "godly" MPs was followed in December 1653 by Great Britain's first written constitution, the Instrument of Government, and the civilianization of the regime under the Lord Protector was further enhanced by semi-monarchical reforms in 1657.[2] However, the military establishment remained a large drain on finances throughout the Protectorate, besides alienating local opinion and political opponents through such action as the experimental rule by Major-Generals in

1655-6.[3] The cost of some 15 cavalry regiments, 18 regiments of foot, 35 ships, and 5000 seamen was estimated in December 1654 at some £2,626,537 per annum out of a total Government expenditure of £2,877,079; the annual revenue was approximately £1,586,175, leaving a deficit equivalent to one year's taxes.[4] The armed forces could not be substantially reduced after peace was signed with the Dutch, and more men had to be raised to deal with Penruddock's Rebellion.[5] Parliament proposed an overall annual grant of £1,210,000 in autumn 1654 for the military establishment and £200,000 for the civil one [6], and Cromwell's poor relations with his MPs prevented much improvement. In summer 1658 his regime, at the height of its reputation abroad, was in serious financial trouble.[7]

The result of these problems was a constraint on foreign policy, to which was added the memory of the political trouble when soldiers or sailors had been idle in garrisons or port in 1647-9. Most "Leveller" malcontents had been weeded out, but there was to be more trouble in the Navy (ironically, centred on criticism of Cromwell's war against supposedly unpopular Spain) in 1656. There was also a substantial feeling of bitterness against France within the armed forces, that country being regarded as primarily responsible for Charles's invasion in 1651. The extent of Protestant fervour against the European Catholic monarchies as the enemies of the "new Israel" is more debatable.[8] The rebellions within France in the early 1650s provided an opportunity to act, particularly as Protestants (Huguenots), who had been deserted by Charles I and Buckingham during their previous revolt, and republicans (the "Ormeé" faction at Bordeaux) were among Cardinal Mazarin's enemies. Their appeals for help were carefully studied by Cromwell and his predecessors in the Rump in 1651-3.[9] Thus in April 1653 Cromwell continued to consider aid to the rebels in south-west France to weaken the French government, receiving envoys, studying maps, and sending out his own agents - Joachim Hane and Jean-Baptiste Stoupe - to assess his chances of success if he listened to the appeals of the rebel Prince of Conde and his Spanish backers.[10] The view was long held by historians that Cromwell, obsessed with the "Black Legend" of Spain's Popish cruelties and the glories of 1588, was determined on war with Spain. In fact, he maintained the good relations with that country which his predecessors had established with them throughout 1654, listening with every appearance of sincerity to the attempts to win his friendship by their resident ambassador Don Alonso de Cardenas. Cardenas, resident in London since 1640, had long kept up good relations with the Parliamentary enemies of Charles I, that ruler's marriage to a French Bourbon princess being of more importance to

him than the anti-monarchical ideology of a few Parliamentarians.[11] Thus Cromwell, as commander-in-chief, had taken part in the Commonwealth's double negotiations with the French and Spanish rivals since 1651 and continued to do so in 1654. Spain offered England the return of Calais if it would assist a Spanish offensive in Flanders; France, at a disadvantage from its Royalist links and slowness to recognise the new regime, offered Dunkirk (taken by Spain in 1652).[12]

A further reason for an even-handed English approach to the rival offers of France and Spain in 1654 was that the Council of State was divided its attitudes. Under the Instrument of Government Cromwell was required to seek their "advice and consent" on foreign policy, though there were no sanctions to force this. They were mostly friends and relations or close military/political allies, but they were far from being the band of "yes-men" which they were accused of being by disenchanted contemporaries.[13] Until recently their importance in decision-making has been underestimated.[14] A report by Ellis Leighton unearthed by S G Gardiner suggests a specific division of opinion on the subject of alliance with France or Spain in the spring of 1654. One faction, led by Cromwell's talented young protégé General John Lambert (who was currently regarded as the second most important man in England), urged alliance with Spain against Charles II's French allies; one, led by Sir Gilbert Pickering, urged the reverse; and a third, led by Secretary Thurloe, held that peace with all potential enemies was essential for the new, fragile Government but that the Franco-Spanish war had to be kept alive. They also believed that Cromwell should be "caput et ducem foederis Protestantis", a militant role entailing hostility towards any Catholic state believed to be oppressing Protestants. This role seemingly fitted France in 1654-5, given first the Huguenot revolt and in April 1655 French involvement in the much condemned Vaudois Massacre in Savoy. Contemporary observers believed that Cromwell desired "peace with all the world" until he had consolidated his position.[15]

The result was a continuation of negotiations with both powers in 1654, more or less on the basis of an auction of military assistance to the highest bidder. Cardenas acted for Spain, assisted by Conde's emissary Barriere, while the new French ambassador Antoine de Bordeaux was assisted by the hot-headed young Philippe de Castelmoré, Baron de Baas. Baas, the brother of the original of Dumas's D'Artagnan, was Mazarin's nephew's fencing-tutor, a hot-headed young officer who started asking awkward questions about the strength of opposition in England in retaliation for Cromwell's open meetings with French rebels. Cromwell confronted him after his meetings coincided with the Royalist Gerard Plot in June 1654

and expelled him, being highly indignant that Mazarin promoted him instead of punishing him.[16] Spain, assisted by the bitterness of some high-ranking officers against France and by Baas's mistakes, was hampered - perhaps fatally - by her inability to raise the money which Cromwell demanded she provide for any English expedition to Flanders, her hard-pressed finances being severely damaged by the war in Flanders.[17] Complaints from English mercenaries already in Spanish service to the Protector reinforced his caution.[18] In any case, no money could be raised in England until Parliament met.

In these circumstances, the end of rebellion in France coincided with increasing evidence of Spain's inability to fund an alliance. Agreement with France was no more likely, given the prolonged nature of discussions with Bordeaux over commercial disputes, compensation for seized shipping, and other matters - talks which frequently drove him to despair and Mazarin to put pressure on Cromwell (and satisfy domestic critics) by nearly recalling him. Accordingly an expedition to Flanders or to assist the Huguenots became unlikely, and a target outside Europe came under consideration. Financial difficulties required that a lucrative target be chosen as no ally could fund the expedition, which seemed to point to the Spanish empire in America. (Other reasons for this will be considered later.) Some time in mid-April 1654 the Council held a debate on the matter, considering whether it was wise to "render itself agreeable to all the world". The choice of policy lay between attacking France, attacking Spain, and peace with both "supposing we might have good sums of money from both so to do". Attacking France was reckoned "difficult and unprofitable" after the failure of the rebellions, and "latterly France was not so bitter against the Protestants". On the contrary, Spanish attacks on English positions in the West Indies seemed to invite retaliation, though in reality the control exercised by Madrid over the sprawling Viceroyalties in Central and South America made the incidents of the past decades hardly a direct outcome of planned aggression. Past seizures of treasure-loaded galleons of the Spanish Plate Fleet, bringing gold and silver from Spain's American mines to Europe to finance the Spanish government and army, made an attack on them seem "the most profitable in all the world".[19] Cromwell himself, according to Thurloe's later recollections, was "for war, at least in the West Indies, unless assurances were given and things well settled for the future".[20] The ability of the Spanish government to control the actions of its local authorities, customs-officials, and captains was ignored; to that extent latent prejudice against the "Black Legend" of Spanish cruelty and sinister Popish aggression played its part. It is significant that the Inquisition, centrepiece of anti-Spanish

propaganda, was mentioned during the discussions. The strategy of the attack concerned whether to "make a partial work of it this year", which would be cheaper and less risky in committing resources needed at home, and experts on the state of Spanish defences in the Caribbean (such as Captains Hatsell and Limbery) were called in. It was decided that a large-scale expedition would be too expensive, and that a colony should be set up on a Spanish-held island in the Caribbean to which 8-10,000 troublesome Royalists a year could be transplanted from Scotland.

The use of the Caribbean as a dumping-ground for potential rebels from within the British Isles had previously been seen at Barbados, to which Scots prisoners were removed after 1651, and a new, larger colony would prove very useful. It would also cut the costs of maintaining a military presence in Scotland. According to the somewhat stylised account we have of the debate, which probably summarises points made during a rather less neat discussion, Pickering's faction pressed Cromwell for an open war with Spain and alliance with France, arguing that this would keep the Franco-Spanish war in being, "discountenance our rebels and fugitives", and assist an alliance with France's North German Protestant allies. In reply, Lambert's faction argued that Spain would cut off her trade with England (Lambert's home county of Yorkshire was the centre of the wool trade which would be affected), close the Straits of Gibraltar, and ruin English shipping. Cromwell would not accept the arguments of either for an open declaration of war, showing a mixture of pragmatism and genuine indecision (the latter to be ended only when the events of 1655 seemingly pointed to a Spanish war as God's will). He desired to restrict military action to "beyond the Line" in the Americas where Spanish breaches of terms of the treaties of 1604 and 1630 could excuse some local retaliation. His reply to Lambert shows that he was not convinced by the threat to trade - Spain would not dare to close the Flemish ports, which relied on such trade (they did defy orders to close in 1655), and other countries would make up the loss of Spanish ports. He singled out France's Marseilles and the ports of Portugal, currently in revolt against Spain.[21] A peace-treaty was currently being agreed with Portugal, despite the fact that its ambassador's brother had been arrested for killing an Englishman and would shortly be executed in a public affront to all claims of diplomatic immunity.

Preparations for the Caribbean expedition accordingly began, and the orders for new dispositions for the fleet in June designated fourteen ships for it.[22] It is a comment on the state of English security that within weeks the Royalists knew about the destination [23], and that in July Thurloe's spy in Madrid with

reporting that "it is not unknown to the Spanish ambassador who is mad at it and has acquainted his master with it".[24] The Spanish Council of State duly discussed it, decided that "the English have some hankering after the island of Santo Domingo", and resolved to send orders there to prepare defence.[25] The Spanish thus knew what was afoot, but due to their war with France they could not afford to withdraw Cardenas before a rumoured attack became a fact as Cromwell would then ally openly with France. This was the crucial factor which enabled Cromwell to proceed with his colonial expedition and continue talks with France and Spain without fear that his plans would cause Cardenas to leave London.

There was a further debate on policy on 20/30 July, of which we possess a stylised but still useful summary drawn up by one of the Council, Colonel Edward Montague (later the admiral who played a crucial role in the Restoration and created Earl of Sandwich). The Protector quoted Spain's obstinacy over refusing toleration for English merchants' Protestant services - something which the more hard-pressed Portugal had conceded. The other important demand was for official acceptance that English ships could trade with Spanish America, an illegal practice which had led to sporadic seizures of offenders by Spanish officials. In fact the decline of the Spanish mercantile marine meant that the illegal visits of English and (mainly) Dutch ships had to be tacitly accepted by the local authorities in order to obtain enough imports.[26] The official acceptance of this would only occur when Spain was desperate, in 1713, and would be seen as humiliating; it was not strictly necessary to obtain this to benefit merchants. Cardenas referred to the demands for trade and toleration as "his master's two eyes", showing their importance and prestige. However, some face-saving clause allowing services in private had been granted in the treaties of 1604 and 1630. The former was more contentious, and showed Cromwell's lack of appreciations of practical realities in the area; it reflected his desire to prevent any further harassment.

The Protector gave the following reasons for war:

- (i) "Providence seemed to lead us hither, having 160 ships swimming,...we think it our best consideration to keep up this reputation" to impress enemies.
- (ii) "While considering the two Crowns, and the particular arguments' weight, we found opportunities point this way".
- (iii) "It was told us that the Design would cost little more than laying by the ships, and that with great profit...Six nimble frigates shall range up and down the Bay of Mexico to get prey". This fleet proved too small.
- (iv) "To stay from attempting it of superfluity is to put it off for ever, our expenses being such as will in all probability admit

that".

- (v) "The good of the Design both to the Protestants' cause and to the undertakers".

In reply, the arguments against it (attributed to Lambert) centred on the practical difficulties. It was "too far off, having greater concerns at home"; it was not likely to gain riches or "vent for troublesome people in England, Scotland, and Ireland" (by transplantation, as recently to Barbados). It would be subject to the hazards of tropical diseases, and local colonists would not join in "unless you be well settled" (as in fact happened, to Cromwell's surprise). "The case at first wrong stated. The charge not well considered. The regulation of law...not well taken care of...What account shall we give to Parliament for it?" if it failed.[27]

Other evidence shows Cromwell's attitude to this. The local Spanish authorities had breached past treaties, as a merchants' petition shows.[28] Legal justification was explained to the co-commander, Robert Venables, in a "heads I win, tails you lose" manner:

Either there was peace with the Spaniard in the West Indies or there was not. If peace they had violated it, and to seek reparation was just. If we had not peace, there was nothing acted against articles.[29]

Cromwell's own accounts to Parliament in 1656 and 1658 show that he preferred to indulge in a long account of his spiritual odyssey and the inevitability of a Divinely-inspired war with the Papists to a careful summary of policy.[30]

It should be emphasised that the Design, preparations for which went ahead through the autumn of 1654, did not imply war in Europe. Negotiations with French ambassador Bordeaux for peace did not conclude until November 1655, and there was no offensive alliance until Spain was feared to be likely to sign peace with France. Thurloe's later summary states that:

Cromwell intended not to meddle with anything in Europe until the Spaniards should begin, unless the Plate Fleet should be met with, which was looked on as a lawful prize.[31]

Cromwell sent Admiral Blake orders to intercept Spanish shipping in European waters in May-June 1655 [32], but even at this point observers in Madrid did not believe that weakened Spain would declare war unless the "Design" attacked ports and fortresses in America.[33] Don Luis de Haro, Philip IV's chief minister, found it

convenient to send a second envoy (the Marquis de Leda) to London in May 1655, albeit with no new offers. Concurrently, French troops' involvement in the massacres of Protestant villagers in the Vaudois valleys of Savoy, their close ally, in April led to a new outburst of Francophobia in England. This was particularly marked among radical preachers and the armed forces, while Cromwell held up the French negotiations until a settlement was reached in Savoy and sent indignant letters and envoys (one of them the infamous George Downing) to France and Savoy. Ironically, Cardenas even formed an alliance with preachers - the supposed enemies of Spain and its Inquisition - to press for war with France.[34]

It should be remembered that the sending of a State expedition to the Americas was a new departure in English foreign policy, Cromwell's predecessors having been conspicuous for their lack of involvement in colonial matters. The haphazard nature of English colonies, set up and largely controlled by wealthy individuals or trading-companies, reflected the lack of a conscious colonial policy until 1654, and indeed State interference in the Caribbean was not welcomed by the local settlers who it was designed to help. The Design seized Dutch ships which had been trading there in defiance of the Navigation Acts, unaware that such trade was essential due to the lack of English shipping, as well as ships trading with Spanish America. (It is noticeable that Cromwell had ordered his expedition to destroy all ships trading with the "enemy" although England and Spain were technically at peace and the action would infuriate both Dutch and French, two allies who he would need in a year or two). Government ships had only been sent to the Americas during the Elizabethan war with Spain, and then largely through privately-funded expeditions; the State did not have resources or interest. The civil war had caused greater State interest for security reasons, and in 1651 an expedition had been sent to drive Prince Rupert's Royalist fleet from the Caribbean and regain Barbados. Now, however, a force was being sent to escalate minor incidents with a "friendly" Power.

The change in English policy partly reflects Cromwell's sense of duty to his citizens, whose appeals he was morally bound to answer. As he wrote in regard to the Hays case in Hamburg in 1656, he "conceived it a chief part of our duty not to suffer any countryman of ours in vain to desire our patronage and succour in distress".[35] This has been linked by some historians to the way in which enthusiastic Parliamentarian preachers and pamphleteers had compared the victories of the New Model Army, God's chosen instrument, with those of ancient Israel and looked on war with any Catholic power as being a crusade. (One, the Fenland drainer Sir Cornelius Vermuyden, wanted England and the Dutch to divide the

Spanish empire between them.) "Godly" concern for one's fellow-citizens apart, a Catholic target for the armed forces was popular as well as hopefully remunerative. In 1653-4 this could have been directed against France or Spain, and Cromwell seems to have preferred to keep his options open (not least to avoid faction in the Council) while being inclined to acts of reprisal in the Americas. An important factor in his assumptions about the situation was undoubtedly the basic prejudice against Spain and its aggressive, cruel, imperialistic Counter-Reformationary Catholicism which existed in contemporary England. This phenomenon has been best dealt with in William Maltby's work The Black Legend in England: the development of anti-Spanish sentiment, 1558-1660. [36] There was plenty of contemporary "evidence", such as Las Casas's Tears of the Indians, which was to be reprinted in 1656. It should be remembered that there had been a notable outbreak of anti-Spanish fear as a result of the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War and the expulsion of Frederick and Elizabeth of Bohemia in 1620, as reflected in the many calls in Parliament (the voice of the educated classes) for intervention. This had been in the formative years of Cromwell and many of his advisers, and some of the Council had travelled in Europe during the wars; Colonel Skippon had fought against Spain. Interestingly, many MPs had preferred a cheap colonial war to an expensive expedition to the Continent.[37]

Cromwell's plans may have harked back to the debates of the 1620s, but they also acted as an extension of more recent private initiatives. Some form of State action to assert English power in the Caribbean (e.g. a West Indies Company) had been considered by prominent figures in the 1620s and 1630s, without Royal support; the career of Sir Thomas Roe is instructive. Cromwell had links with a number of important figures who set up the Providence Island Company in the 1630s to found a private colony in the Caribbean as a base for attacks on Spanish shipping. They included his cousin Oliver St. John, his friend Lord Saye and Sele (to whose colony, Sayebrook, he is supposed to have considered moving) and the father of Councillor Nathaniel Fiennes, Pym, and the future Parliamentary admiral Warwick. The Company Secretary was William Jessop, later Thurloe's deputy. Their ideas provided a blueprint for him to follow on a larger scale with Hispaniola (as it turned out, Jamaica), though the "Instructions" for the Design make it clear that Cromwell kept his choice of target vague enough to enable his commanders to set up a colony on the South American mainland if they so desired.[38] The Company's captains, most notably William Jackson, provided evidence of the lack of Spanish defences in the region by the ease with which they raided it in the early 1640s - evidence which persuaded Cromwell that a small

expedition could be successful.[39] He appears to have taken particular notice of a renegade Dominican priest, Thomas Gage, who had long travelled in the poorest-defended areas of central America and who lobbied the Council early in 1654. The author of the vitriolic polemic The English-American His Travails by Land and Sea which expatiated on Spanish cruelty and military weakness, Gage presented Some Brief and True Observations concerning the West Indies to the Council, proposing a pre-emptive strike before Spain attacked other English colonies and arguing for use of disaffected Negroes, Indians, and Creoles. Interestingly for future anti-colonialist writing, Gage argued that the Spaniard had no more right to lands because he had discovered them than would an Indian who landed in Spain. The just title belonged to the natives, who could legally confer it on their liberators.

Cromwell took too much notice of the over-confident Gage, most of whose information was of limited value and twenty years out of date. He took less notice of an alternative proposal by the Royalist Barbadian planter Colonel Modyford, who believed that a landing on a weakly-held part of Venezuela would be easier as there would be towns and fields ready to be used. He predicted that a small, unsettled island would not attract colonists and would be difficult to plant, causing the English troops to desert, which is what happened on Jamaica.[40] In the event, the expedition was made up of a mixture of troops from different regiments - men who could be spared from the more essential tasks at home - under two indifferent commanders, Admiral William Penn (father of the founder of Pennsylvania) and Robert Venables. Thanks to underestimation of the tasks facing them, they were repulsed at their landing on Hispaniola and had to make do with Jamaica. Modyford wrote that he "heartily wished that it might have been their first attempt, that it might have seemed choice rather than necessity".[41] It is arguable that it was this unprecedented reverse for the New Model Army which emboldened Spain to expel the English merchants in that autumn of 1655 and precipitate war with the enraged Cromwell, leading to the Spanish alliance with Charles II in April 1656. However, Thurloe's estimation of Spanish weakness held true, making the Spanish aid to the Royalists small, reluctant, and insufficient seriously to threaten Cromwell's rule.

- 1 Thomas Birch (ed), Thurloe State Papers (7 vols, London, 1742), I, 759-63.
- 2 A H Woolrych, Commonwealth to Protectorate (Oxford U.P., 1982) is the best study of this. For the Protector's failure to take the kingship in 1657, see Woolrych, "The Cromwellian Protectorate: a military dictatorship?" in

History 75 (1990), pp.207-31, especially pp.225-6.

- 3 See Ivan Roots, "Swordsmen and Decimators", in R H Parry (ed), The English Civil War and After (Macmillan, 1970), pp.78-92.
- 4 B[ritish] L[ibrary] Additional Manuscripts 2884 and 4156.
5. Woolrych, "The Cromwellian Protectorate", History 75 (1990), p.216.
- 6 Bodleian Library, Carte Mss 7 ff.63-5.
- 7 M E Green (ed), Calendar of State Papers Domestic 1658-9 (HMSO, 1885), p.80.
- 8 For instances of English popular and military antagonism to France, see Grignon's letter to Mazarin, 5/15 February 1649, in P[ublic] R[ecord] O[ffice] State Papers 31/3/89, and Croulle to Mazarin, 16/26 September and 28 October/7 November 1650, P.R.O. State Papers 31/3/90. For military feeling in April 1654, see an account of a dinner at Henry Cromwell's house in De Patt to Mazarin, 17/ 27 April quoted in Guizot, History of Oliver Cromwell (trans. Scobie, 1854) Appendix viii, no.3.
- 9 See Philip Knatchel, England and the Fronde (Cornell U.P., 1967), pp.298-300. The rebels at Bordeaux offered to transfer their city's sovereignty to Cromwell, but thought better of it; Calendar of State Papers Domestic 1652-3, p.340.
- 10 See Bordeaux's letters to Mazarin of 4/14 November and 1/11 December 1653 in P.R.O. State Papers 31/3/91; and Barriere to Conde, 5/15 December, B.L. Additional Mss. 35252.
- 11 See A J Loomie, "Alonso de Cardenas and the Long Parliament, 1640-8", in English Historical Review 97 (1982), pp.289-307.
- 12 For France's offer of Dunkirk, see Governor D'Estrades to Mazarin, 15/25 February 1652, quoted in English Historical Review 11 (1896), pp.481. For Cardenas' offer of Calais, see his despatch to Madrid of 13/23 April, in P.R.O. State Papers 94/43.
- 13 See Cromwell's own contemporary John Hobart's comment that they were appointed to "Assentari not to Assentiri" (to flatter not to approve), in Bodleian Library, Tanner Ms. 52, f.19v.
- 14 See Peter Gaunt, "The Single Person's Confidants and Dependants: Oliver Cromwell and his Protectoral Councillors", in Historical Journal 32 (1989) pp.537-60.
- 15 Bordeaux to Count Brienne, 28 February/10 March 1653, P.R.O. State Papers 31/3/90.
- 16 See Baas's account of his final meeting with Cromwell in his despatch of 15/ 25 June 1654 in P.R.O. State Papers 31/3/95. We do not have an English account.
- 17 Barriere to Conde, 7/17 April 1654, and Mazerolles (who believed "the Spanish ambassador has not got a sou") to Conde, 4/14 and 14/24 July 1654; B.L. Additional Mss. 35252.
- 18 For Cromwell's protests to Philip IV on behalf of the mercenaries, see Bodleian Library, Rawlinson Mss. A261, ff. 7-8, 12-13. Baas wrote about Cromwell's concern and surprise at the poor pay in his despatch of 15/25

- June quoted above.
- 19 C H Firth (ed), The Clarke Papers (4 vols, Camden Society, 1891-1901), III, 203-6.
- 20 Venables's account in T Park (ed), The Harleian Miscellany (12 vols, London, 1807-11), III, 513.
- 21 As n.19.
- 22 Calendar of State Papers Domestic 1654, p.201.
- 23 W Macray et al (eds), Calendar of the Clarendon Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library (5 vols, Oxford, 1872-1970), III, 379.
- 24 Thurloe State Papers, II, 414.
- 25 Venetian ambassador Pauluzzi to Senate, 20/30 May and 26 May/5 June 1655, in Calendar of State Papers Venetian 1655-6 (ed. Allen Hines), pp.60 and 62-4.
- 26 See Pierre Chaunu, Seville et l'Atlantique, for an account of the decline of the Spanish marine which required the American ports to rely on "illegal" English and (mainly) Dutch shipping for their imports. Incidentally, this factor - which Cromwell's merchant associates must have mentioned on the Council's allied committees - also foiled his attempts to blockade Cadiz and other ports during the war by seizing Spanish merchant ships.
- 27 Clarke Papers, III, 207-8. Cromwell remarked of his mission that "God has not called us hither...but to consider the work that we may do in the world".
- 28 Ibid. The petition is in Thurloe State Papers, IV, 44-5.
- 29 As n.20.
- 30 B.L. Additional Mss. Ayscough, 6125, ff.34-60b.
- 31 Thurloe State Papers, I, 759-63.
- 32 Ibid., III, 611.
- 33 Calendar of State Papers Venetian 1655-6, p.65.
- 34 Bordeaux's letters in Thurloe State Papers, III, 680.
- 35 Ibid., VI, 518-19.
- 36 Published by Duke University Press in 1978.
- 37 Robert Ruigh, The Parliament of 1624 Politics and Foreign Policy (Harvard U.P., 1971), pp.177-9, 220.
- 38 Penn, Memorials of Admiral William Penn (James Duncan, 1833), pp.203-9. The instructions stated that the objective was "to gain an interest in that part of the West Indies in the possession of the Spaniard. For affecting whereof we shall not tie you up to a method by any particular instructions".
- 39 C M Andrewes, British Committees, Commissions, and Councils of Trade and Navigation (Baltimore, 1908), I, 50.
- 40 Thurloe State Papers, III, 59-61.
- 41 Ibid., III, 62, 565.

## RICHARD CROMWELL

by R C Richardson

[An address given in Hursley Parish Church on 9 October 1993 at a service held to dedicate a commemorative tablet to the second Protector.]

Richard Cromwell is usually presented as little more than an anti-climax - the central but ineffectual figure in the brief epilogue to the republican regime of his much more famous and feared father. Richard succeeded Oliver Cromwell in September 1658 and by the middle of 1659 his political career was over. He had a very long life - from 1626 to 1712 - but an exceedingly short period of power. (It is a sobering thought that Richard's death occurred only two years before that of Queen Anne.) His career is reasonably well documented in contemporary sources like the Clarke Papers but relatively few historians have judged it worthwhile to write about him at length. Gilbert Burnet dismissed him in a paragraph. The bibliography specifically devoted to Richard is not extensive. Mark Noble had much to say about him in a publication of 1787. Francois Guizot gave him the two-volume treatment in 1856. C H Firth supplied an account of Richard Cromwell for the Dictionary of National Biography. R W Ramsey and E M Hause produced studies of his life and times in 1935 and 1972 respectively. Neither of these publications, however, offered a full-scale biography of Richard. Ramsey's book is a straightforward, undemanding account of Richard's period. Hause's study, though considerably longer and more scholarly, is again chiefly a study of an age, focussing on what he sees as a "vital year" in the seventeenth century.

The purpose behind today's gathering is not to inflate Richard's significance but to commemorate him. What can be said about him? How should his career be approached and judged? Clearly the public and private dimensions of his life need to be separated.

His public career concerns us first. Although nominated only at the last possible moment Richard succeeded his father peaceably in 1658 and received many warm expressions of loyalty. He was positively welcomed by some supporters who approved of his being untainted by any close identification with a particular faction. And he was welcomed by many MPs as someone who might change the character of the Protectorate by making it less military. Richard Cromwell, by virtue of his background, could not perpetuate his father's link with the army and he was less likely to be reliant on it. Richard was his own man not simply his father's son, and as a

politician he had a number of impressive qualities. He had courage, he was fair-minded, and was a good speaker.

But the odds were heavily stacked against him. His inheritance was truly an unenviable one in three principal respects. First, he was encumbered with a massive debt of £2m. Arrears of pay for the Army stood at £890,000. Second, the long-running tensions between Army and Parliament continued and Richard Cromwell found it impossible to maintain the balancing act performed by his father. He could neither control the ambitions and radical interests of the Army which generals like Lambert represented nor could he manage the fillibustering of Haselrig and others in Parliament. It was the rivalries and collisions between Army and Parliament which brought him down. Third, Richard was dreadfully inexperienced. Though he had joined the Privy Council in his father's second Protectorate and had acquired some experience of committees, this ill equipped him for political leadership. He may not have been quite so lazy and disorganised as the legend of "Tumbledown Dick" would suggest but he was quite clearly out of his depth in the world of seventeenth-century high politics. None mourned his fall from power in 1659 and, for that matter, there is relatively little evidence either that he himself regretted its passing. His exit from Whitehall was an undignified non-event and was complicated by his debts and the need to dodge his creditors. He was never deposed or arrested.

Richard's private life as a country gentleman was, of course, clearly linked with Hursley. After complex marriage negotiations conducted by the two fathers and an intermediary (Colonel Richard Norton) in which godliness and hard-headed business instincts struggled for precedence, Richard was married to Dorothy, the daughter of Richard Maijor, in Hursley church on 1 May 1649. The Maijor family had no long standing link with the area, having only acquired the Hursley property in 1638. But Hursley became Richard's home in the 1650s and it was here that he indulged an undemanding lifestyle as a country squire, hunting, riding, and getting into debt. There was also grief. Five children of the couple died in their infancy in Hursley. Richard returned to Hursley for a brief period after the fall of his Protectorate. Dorothy, his wife, re-settled here and died in Hursley in 1676.

Richard's wanderings after 1660 were more complex. He judged it prudent to stay away from politics and from his creditors and to keep the lowest possible profile. He assumed a number of different names - the most lasting of which was that of John Clarke. Richard lived for a time in Paris and then in Geneva. His wife died in his absence. Not until 1680 did he return to England and went to live at Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, the home of a friend. He returned

to Hursley only for short visits to the old family home on a number of occasions, as in 1684, 1701 and 1707. He died at Cheshunt on 12 July 1712 and his body was then brought back to Hursley for burial.

Nineteenth-century church re-building at Hursley under John Keble's direction between 1846 and 1848 - much of it at his own expense - removed the gravestone in the chancel which marked Richard's tomb. (Curiously one of the most recent biographies of Milton - by A N Wilson - has Richard Cromwell buried in London at Bunhill Fields, alongside Goodwin, Owen, Bunyan and other Nonconformists). The last of Richard's daughters died and was buried in Hursley in 1731. His direct line died out.

Richard Cromwell's epitaph is best provided in the words of a contemporary and also by himself. Lucy Hutchinson was certainly no friend of Oliver Cromwell and his family, but on Richard her verdict was more generous. He was, she said, "gentle and virtuous but became not greatness". Richard himself at the time of his ousting from power in 1659 said "I will not have one drop of blood spilt for the preservation of my greatness which is burden to me". And in 1690 under the alias of John Clarke he confessed "I have been alone thirty years banished and under silence and my strength and safety is to be retired, quiet and silent". Richard Cromwell long outlived his brother, his wife, and even his own son, and in death as in his later life, he found a decent obscurity. This was in fact the kind of niche he probably preferred. The English political scene in the 1650s had not offered him a role that he was qualified to fill.

#### Bibliographical Note

The chief eighteenth and nineteenth century studies of Richard Cromwell were Mark Noble, Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell (1787) and Francois Guizot, Histoire du Protectorat de Richard Cromwell et du Retablissement des Stuart (1658-1660) (Paris, 1856). The chief twentieth-century studies are R W Ramsey, Richard Cromwell (1935) and E M Hause, Tumbledown Dick (1972). See also I Roots, "The short and troublesome reign of Richard IV", History Today, 30 (March 1980), pp.11-15, and R Hutton, The British Republic 1649-1660 (1990) and The Restoration (1985).

## HISTORIANS OF THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR: A CHRONOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

by J L Atkins

### Introduction

It is always interesting to meet people with the same hobby as yourself, but how much more interesting to meet such a person from a different time! Who were the historians of days gone by who had the same interests as us? Who were the Cavalier or Roundhead supporters in the days of Nelson, Byron, Wordsworth, Kipling or Kitchener? In this article, I have attempted to list such enthusiasts and to give some brief details of their lives. One noticeable fact that has emerged about these writers is that so many of them were either lawyers or divines.

Their names are listed in approximate chronological order and showing the title of the most noteworthy book which they wrote dealing with the English civil war period. All the entries are based on information from the 20 volume Dictionary of National Biography.

Joshua Sprigge (1618-84). Anglia Rediviva.

A preacher from Banbury, Oxon. Prior to the civil wars he was a preacher in London and then became Chaplain to Fairfax. In religious views he was an extreme Independent. After the Restoration he was moderately wealthy and retired to Grayford, married, then moved to Highgate where he died in 1684.

J Ricraft. The Civil Warres of England.

Born in London the son of a sailor, he became a London merchant and religious writer. A supporter of Parliament in the civil wars, he discreetly corresponded with Royalists. He wrote several books on civil war affairs and was in 1679 a magistrate in Middlesex.

V Gookin (1616-59). The Great Case of Transplantation in Ireland.

Surveyor-General for Ireland, the family was from Gloucester but after the death of his father emigrated to Ireland where he took a genuine interest in its people and affairs. A strong supporter of Cromwell and his policies, he became Surveyor-General in 1655 under Henry Cromwell.

J Harrington (1611-77). The Commonwealth of Oceana.

Political theorist from Upton, Northants. He imbibed republican principles while travelling on the Continent and at the outbreak of the civil wars sided with Parliament, though he personally liked the King. After the Restoration he was confined to the Tower and then Plymouth.

Sir W Sanderson (1586-1676). A Complete History of the Life and Reign of King Charles from Cradle to Grave.

Probably born in Ireland, he became secretary to the Earl of Holland. Said to "have suffered in the cause of King Charles". After the Restoration he was given property in Windsor. Died aged 90 and buried in Westminster Abbey.

R Flecknoe. The Idea of his late Highness the Lord Protector.

Born at Oxford, he became a poet and playwright but was noted for his bad verse and was known as "Macflecknoe". Died about 1678.

C Walker. The Complete History of Independency.

Author of numerous civil war publications, he was from Dorset. At the outbreak of the wars he sided with Parliament but despised the Puritans and became a bitter enemy of Nathaniel Fiennes. Later arrested and fined £600; from then onwards he was viewed with suspicion. Rearrested in 1649, he remained in prison until his death two years later.

J Davies (1627-93). The Civil Wars of Great Britain and Ireland.

Translator from Kidwelly, Carmarthenshire. During the civil wars he was in France, but later settled in London and earned a good living as a translator. He was described as a "genial, harmless, Quiet man".

T Fuller (1608-61). England's Worthies.

Divine and antiquary from Northants, he eventually became chaplain to Charles II. His book is about the counties of England and their notable men. Coleridge described him as "incomparable".

G Thomason. "The Thomason Tracts".

Collector of the remarkable "Thomason Tracts", he was a bookseller at the "Rose & Crown", St Pauls Churchyard, London. A staunch Royalist, he was implicated in a plot in 1651 but allowed free on £1,000 bail. His tracts took twenty years to collect and by 1662 he had amassed 23,000 of them, eventually arranged in 1,983 volumes. Fearful of discovery, he moved his collection to several venues, thereby escaping the Great Fire. Eventually it was purchased by George III and presented to the British Museum. He died in Holborn, "a poore man", about 1666.

Sir W Clarke (1623-66). "The Clarke Manuscripts".

Born in London, he studied law and when qualified became General Monck's secretary. After the Restoration he was knighted and was with Monck during his Dutch campaigns of 1666. He died, aged 43, after being hit in the leg by a cannon-ball during a sea battle with the Dutch. Buried in Harwich church, he left a valuable collection of papers on the civil wars.

J Thurloe (1616-68). "State Papers".

Born in Essex, he trained for the law but during the civil wars became Secretary of the Council and a totally reliable Cromwellian, controlling his intelligence department with great skill. He became moderately wealthy but at the Restoration was arrested then released on condition that he put his expertise at the disposal of the new Secretary of State. He then retired. His state papers are a major source for the history of the period. Many of them were published in the mid eighteenth century in a seven volume collection. See T Birch (q.v.).

Sir J Turner (1615-86). History of his own Life and Times, 1632-70.

A soldier and author from Scotland. Always determined to be a soldier, he joined Gustav Adolphus's army on the Continent and soon became distinguished by his many exploits. When the civil wars started he offered his services to the King and then served in Ireland and England. Captured in 1648, he was imprisoned in Hull but released by Fairfax. He then went abroad but was at Charles II's side at the battle of Worcester, after which he fled to France. At the Restoration he was knighted and resumed his military career. Retired in 1668.

Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon (1608-74). History of the Great Rebellion and Civil War in England.

Statesman and historian from Dinton, Wilts, he became an influential advisor to Charles I and Lord Chancellor under Charles II, but was falsely accused of treason and banished in 1667. In France he wrote his History which is best known for its perceptive and tolerant character sketches of the leading people of the times. He was the grandfather of two Queens of England. Buried in Westminster Abbey.

L Hutchinson (1620-76). Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson.

Biographer from Nottingham, her life of her husband reveals a delightful picture of a distinguished Roundhead family during the civil wars.

Sir T Herbert. Memoirs of the Last Two Years of the Reign of King Charles the First.

Travel writer and historian from Yorkshire. Originally a Roundhead supporter, he changed sides and became very close to the King and latterly his only attendant and was with him on the scaffold.

T Hobbes (1588-1679). History of the Civil War in England.

Philosopher from Malmesbury, Wilts, he spent most of his life as tutor to the Cavendish family and a number of years on the Continent. He was an ardent Royalist and defended secular monarchy, but his anticlericalism made his position difficult in post-Restoration England.

G Bate (1608-69). History and Progress of the Late Troubles in England.

Physician from Buckinghamshire. When the civil wars forced the King to

Oxford, he accompanied him as his physician but during the Interregnum was employed by Cromwell. After the Restoration he was again serving the royal family, working for Charles II. Died at Kingston-upon-Thames.

S Bethel (1617-97). The World's Mistake in Oliver Cromwell.

Born in Knaresborough, Yorks, he became a fierce Republican but did not sympathise with Cromwell and went to live in Germany. Following the Restoration he returned to live in London but became involved in controversial local politics. He was regarded as an austere but determined man.

E Ludlow (1617-92). Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow.

Politician and soldier from Wilts. During the civil wars he was a fearless Roundhead leader. Captured in 1644, he was exchanged only to lead an ill-fated regiment of horse. Played a leading role in "Pride's Purge". Was second in command to Cromwell in Ireland but fell out with him and was closely watched for the rest of his career. Was again in Ireland after Richard Cromwell's fall. Involved in plots, he escaped to France and then lived at Vevey where he died in 1692. For unconquerable will, he had few rivals.

D Holles (1599-1680). Memoirs of Denzil Holles.

Soldier and politician, he was the son of an Earl. Became an M.P. but was banished for eight years after assaulting the Speaker. During the civil wars he was an active Roundhead officer but disliked Cromwell and the New Model Army. During the Commonwealth he was briefly imprisoned. Pardoned at the Restoration, he then served Charles II as ambassador in France but later again lost favour.

Sir P Warwick (1609-83). Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles I.

Politician and historian from London. Travelled on the Continent then became secretary to the Lord Treasurer. Was with Charles I at Oxford during the wars, having fought at Edgehill. Attended the King as his secretary when prisoner of the New Model Army. After the Restoration he was again secretary to the Lord Treasurer. His memoirs are remarkable for their moderate and unbiased tone.

B Whitelocke (1605-75). Memorials of the English Affairs from the Beginning of the Reign of Charles I to the Happy Restoration.

Lawyer and politician from London, son of a judge. He became a successful lawyer and sided with the Parliament at the outbreak of the civil wars, championing their cause with his pen; he eventually became Cromwell's ambassador to Sweden. After the Restoration he was allowed to retire to Wiltshire. His best known work concerning the wars is, however, regarded as unreliable.

Sir E Walker (1612-77). Historical Discourses upon Several Occasions.

Soldier and writer from Somerset. Entered the King's service in 1633 and

accompanied him throughout the civil wars, acting as his secretary-at-war. After the fall of Oxford he fled to France, where he assisted the future Charles II. At the Restoration he obtained high executive office. Died at Stratford-on-Avon and buried in the church.

J Rushworth (1612-90). Historical Collections 1618-48.

Historian from Northumberland. Trained as a lawyer, he became secretary to Lord Fairfax during which time he amassed considerable material on the civil wars and as Fairfax's most able assistant became a person of political importance. After Fairfax's resignation he was temporarily Cromwell's secretary. At the Restoration he presented his collection to Charles II and continued to flourish but spent the last six years of his life in Southwark where he died, apparently of alcoholism. Buried in St. George the Martyr Church, Southwark.

M Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle (1624-74). Life of William Cavendish.

English noblewoman and one of the outstanding female writers of the seventeenth century, she was known for her eccentricity of dress and behaviour. She wrote prolifically, producing thirteen books.

Sir W Petty (1623-87). History of the Cromwellian Survey of Ireland, 1655-56.

Political economist, he studied at Caen, Utrecht, Amsterdam, Leyden, Paris and Oxford. During the civil wars he supported Cromwell and was responsible for the "Down Survey" of forfeited land in Ireland. Invented the first copying-machine and double-keeled seaboat.

Sir R Bulstrode (1610-1711). Memoirs and Reflections upon the Reign and Government of Charles I and II.

Soldier, diplomat and author, during the civil wars he served in Lord Wilmot's regiment. After the Restoration, to avoid creditors, he fled to Bruges but later became an envoy under James II. Died at St. Germain, aged 101.

I Kimber (1692-1755). Life of Oliver Cromwell.

Minister, biographer and journalist from Wantage, Berks. He was a rather dull preacher and unsuccessful, but started a periodical which ran from 1728-32. He then took up schoolteaching and then writing for booksellers. Died of apoplexy.

T Skinner (1629-79). Life of General Monck.

Historian, he was educated at Cambridge and studied medicine which he then practised at Colchester. Became physician to Monck when he was Duke of Albemarle. Died at Colchester. Scholars regard his work as of little value.

T Rawlinson. "The Rawlinson Manuscripts".

Bibliophile from London. Studied law and then travelled on the Continent collecting numerous manuscripts. On the death of his father, he inherited some wealth which he spent on collecting more manuscripts. He lived in Grays Inn

but his rooms were so packed with books that he had to sleep in the passage. He married his maidservant. His enormous collection is now in the Bodleian Library. Buried at St. Botolph's Church, Aldersgate.

T Carte (1686-1754). Life of the Duke of Ormonde. A Collection of Letters and Papers concerning the Affairs of England. A History of England to 1654.

Historian from Warwickshire, he was educated at Oxford and at Cambridge. Took orders but resigned his benefice in true republican tradition when he was required to take the oath of allegiance to George I. Partially involved in a conspiracy, he escaped to France where he lived in exile until 1728.

J Banks (1709-51). A Short Review of the Life of Oliver Cromwell.

Writer from Sonning, Berks. He started as a bookseller but then tried poetry at which he was moderately successful. His book on Cromwell was one of the first ever to show Cromwell in a favourable light. He was known as a cheerful and good-natured man.

G Wishart (1599-1671). Memoirs of Montrose.

Scottish preacher from East Lothian. Ordained in 1625 at St. Andrews University, he became friendly with Montrose. In 1642 he was dismissed from his preferment for "being a frequenter of taverns". In 1644 while in Newcastle he was captured by the Roundheads and imprisoned. Montrose released him following his victory in 1645 and Wishart became his chaplain and comrade from then on. Following the Restoration, he again worked at Newcastle and in 1662 became Bishop of Edinburgh. Died in 1671 and is buried in Holyrood House.

Sir E Peyton (1588-1657). Divine Catastrophe: The Fall of the House of Stuart.

Roundhead officer from Cambridgeshire. Early in his career as an M.P., he was dismissed for his violent temper and extreme Puritanism and from that time onwards was an avowed enemy of the Royalists. During the civil wars he fought at Edgehill, Newbury, and Naseby but his son, Thomas, fought for the King.

H L'strange (1616-1704). The Reign of King Charles.

Journalist and Royalist pamphleteer. He was employed by Hyde in the service of the future Charles II but on his return to England in 1653 was pardoned by Cromwell. After the Restoration he became Surveyor of Printing Presses.

Sir J Temple (1600-77). The Irish Rebellion and Bloody Massacres.

Born in Ireland, he entered the service of the King but when the civil wars started sympathised with the Roundhead cause. Consequently he was imprisoned and then exchanged. He gained high office with the Roundheads, specialising in Irish affairs. Pardoned at the Restoration, he became Master of the Rolls. Died in 1677 and buried beside his father in Trinity College, Dublin.

T Birch (1705-66). A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe (7 vols). Historian and biographer from London. Brought up as a Quaker, he worked in several religious preferments in England and Wales. Many of his numerous works concern the seventeenth century, but he was regarded as having a dullness of style.

J Nickolls (1710-45). Letters and Papers Addressed to Oliver Cromwell. Antiquarian from Ware, Herts. Became a partner in his Quaker father's firm and formed an excellent library specialising in collecting letters of officers of the civil wars. Died at a young age of fever and is buried in Bunhill Fields cemetery.

W Harris (1720-70). Life of Oliver Cromwell. Biographer from Salisbury, he was educated for the ministry at Taunton and lived most of his life at nearby Luppitt. Wrote biographies of the Stuarts, Cromwell, and Hugh Peter and had an informative but unattractive style.

M Noble (1754-1827). Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell. Biographer from Birmingham. On the death of his father he inherited a modest fortune (from slave-trading) and became a lawyer but abandoned that career to devote his time to history and literature. Was ordained in 1781 and lived and worked at Knowle, Warwicks, on a farm. Became rector of Barming, Kent, in 1786 and lived there for 42 years. Died at Barming and buried in the church, where there is a monument to him. His numerous writings, however, are regarded by scholars as rather amateurish, with bad grammar.

Sir J Prestwich (d1795). Respublica. Antiquary from Lancashire. He claimed the title of baronet but officially it was not recognised. Most of his work concerned heraldry and his Respublica deals with the banners, flags, mottoes, coats-of-arms, etc. of the Cromwellians. Died in Dublin in 1795.

J Caulfield (1764-1826). Cromwelliana. Author and printer from London, at an early age he opened a bookshop in the Strand, where Dr Johnson was a regular customer. He became very successful and opened up several other premises in London. His success, however, seems to have declined after 1820 and with advancing old age he took to drink but still worked hard. After an accident to his leg he died in St. Barts hospital.

R Vaughan (1795-1868). The Protectorship of Oliver Cromwell. Historian and theologian in the west of England. He became a minister in Worcester and then London, where he was also Professor of History at University College. Died in Torquay.

F von Raumer (1781-1873). Political History of England from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century. German scholar and traveller. He became Professor of History at Breslau in 1811 and published many works on historical and legal themes. In 1848 he was German ambassador in Paris.

T Croker (1798-1854). Narrative of the Contests in Ireland, 1641-60. Irish antiquary from Cork, he was the son of an army major. From 1812-15 he rambled about Ireland collecting songs and stories. From 1820-50 he was a clerk at the Admiralty in London. He became a well-known author and helped to found several historical/antiquary societies in London. Lived in Fulham and entertained many literary celebrities. He was described as "small, keen-eyed and with an easy manner".

T Cromwell (1792-1870). Oliver Cromwell and his Times. Dissenting minister (who presumably claimed ancestry), he originally worked in the publishing business. Became minister at Stoke Newington, where he remained for 20 years and after worked at Canterbury until his death. He was regarded as a respected antiquary and a man of much literary information.

N Napier (1798-1879). Life and Times of Montrose. Edinburgh historian, he became a lawyer and then Sheriff of Dumfries and Galloway. Published various "memoirs", some of which were very controversial. Wrote from a strong Cavalier bias. Despite his aggressive style he was said to be "a genial, polished gentleman".

T Carlyle (1795-1881). Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell. Scottish-born historian and writer best known for his explosive attacks on hypocrisy, materialism, democracy and the mob. He had highly romantic beliefs in the power of the individual and especially strong heroic leaders such as Cromwell. His Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell was highly successful and entirely altered the public estimate of Cromwell's character.

R Bell (1800-67). The Fairfax Correspondence. Translator and writer from Cork, Ireland. In 1828 he settled in London and became the successful editor of a weekly journal and numerous other publications. His death in 1867 was much regretted and he was buried near his friend Thackeray in Kensal Green Cemetery.

E Warburton (1810-52). Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers. Historian from Tullamore, King County, Ireland. He led a roving life, travelled in the East and then wrote of his experiences. When exploring the isthmus of Darien (off South America) he was killed when his ship caught fire.

F Guizot (1787-1874). History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth.

French historian and statesman from Nimes. Was Professor of History at the Sorbonne and later French ambassador in London. He became French Prime Minister but fled to England after the 1848 revolution (for which he was partly responsible) and then went to live, presumably incognito, in Normandy. Clearly he tried to apply Cromwellian ideas to France - but they did not work.

R Cattermole (1795-1858). The Great Civil War at the Times of Charles I and Cromwell.

Miscellaneous writer, he was secretary of the Royal Society of Literature for nearly thirty years, then became a vicar in Buckinghamshire.

J L Sanford (1824-77). Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion.

Historian from London, he studied law but never practised. His main interest was the study and writing of history for which he gained a great reputation. His eyesight failed in 1875 and he moved to Evesham, where he died two years later.

Sir C Markham (1830-1916). A Life of the Great Lord Fairfax.

Traveller and historian from Yorkshire. Joined the Royal Navy in 1844 and served mostly in South America. In 1853 he was working in the Civil Service in England (at the India Office) and then South America, India and Greenland. Chose the ill-fated Capt. Scott to head his expedition to the South Pole. His many biographies, though hasty, are eminently readable.

L von Ranke (1795-1886). History of England in the Seventeenth Century.

German scholar from Wiehe, he studied at Leipzig University, his speciality being sixteenth and seventeenth century history and became the outstanding German historian of the day. His eyesight failed in the 1870s but he continued to dictate his work. Died in Berlin.

J R Phillips (1844-87). Memoirs of the Civil War in Wales and the Marches.

Lawyer from Cilgerran, Pembrokeshire. Trained for the law and worked in London but spent most of his spare-time researching Welsh history in the British Museum and elsewhere. Became a magistrate in West Ham just prior to the "Jack the Ripper" period. Died, aged only 43, in South Hampstead. Buried in Brompton Cemetery.

S R Gardiner (1829-1902). History of the Great Civil War.

Historian from Ropley, Hampshire, he was a descendent of both the Cromwell and Ireton families and determined to write the classic account of the civil wars. From 1871-85 he was Professor of History at Kings College, London. Indefatigable in research, he was accurate and unbiased. Also wrote a history of the Commonwealth and early years of the Protectorate, plus a biography of Cromwell.

J H Jesse (1815-74). Memoirs of the Court of England during the Reign of the Stuarts.

Historical writer from Yorkshire. After a misspent youth, he then worked for most of his life as a clerk at the Admiralty and must have known T Croker (q.v.) but his passion was history and he published several memoirs. Tall, amiable, he could also be very persuasive.

D Murphy (1833-96). Cromwell in Ireland.

Born near Newmarket, Co. Cork, during his religious training he resided in France, Spain and Germany. He worked as a priest and professor in the Limerick and Dublin areas. He was known as an entertaining companion with wit and a tender heart.

C H Firth (1857-1936). Cromwell's Army.

Probably the most prolific writer ever on the civil war period, he wrote and edited numerous books on the subject, including an account of the later years of the Protectorate and a biography of Cromwell. Born in Sheffield, he was a Professor of History at various Oxford Colleges from 1883 onwards.

T Baldock (1854-1937). Cromwell as a Soldier.

Soldier/historian from Hampshire. Served in the Royal Artillery in Malta and South Africa and in World War One, in which he was wounded. Retired (as a Major-General) in 1916 and went to live in St. Tudy, Cornwall.

Sir R Tangye (1833-1906). The Two Protectors.

Businessman from Birmingham. Founded an international engineering company and became very wealthy, though a Quaker. It may have been his Quaker beliefs that led to his great interest in Cromwell and he amassed one of the largest libraries ever on him. Founded the Birmingham Art Gallery and financed it. Buried in Putney Vale Cemetery.

C S Terry (1864-1936). Life and Campaigns of Alexander Leslie.

Historian from Newport Pagnell, Bucks. Was a Professor of History at various universities and produced many historical books from 1899-1933. Lived most of his life in Aberdeenshire.

Sir R D Palgrave (1829-1904). The Lord Protector.

Born in Westminster, he became a solicitor but spent most of his time writing, painting and sculpting. Became Assistant Clerk to the House of Commons in 1853 and Clerk in 1886. He was exact and thorough in his work and assisted S R Gardiner in a lot of his research. After retiring, he lived in Salisbury and returned to his hobbies. He was popular and a great talker but his book on Cromwell shows the Lord Protector in an unfavourable light.

## BARTHOMLEY CHURCH, CHESHIRE

The village of Barthomley lies near the south-eastern boundary of Cheshire, close to the border with Staffordshire. Although it is less than a mile from junction 16 of the M6 and is bypassed by the busy A500, it remains a small, peaceful, rural village. Agriculture has long dominated the life of the village and Barthomley is encircled by farms which work the now enclosed heath and mossland of the area. The Wulvarn Brook, running through the settlement, is named in memory of the last wolf in England, supposedly killed in Barthomley Wood. The village itself, with its seventeenth century black and white half timbered cottages as well as more modern houses, clusters around the junction of two country lanes. At this junction stands The White Lion Inn, dating from 1614 and formerly the home of the parish clerk. But by far the largest building in Barthomley, overshadowing and dominating the village, is St Bertoline's Church.

The church, with its very rare dedication to an eighth century saint who performed a miracle here, stands on an ancient barrow mound. There may well have been a church here in the Saxon period, but the present church apparently contains nothing older than the late eleventh century. A Norman doorway, with its distinctively patterned round arch, survives from the rebuilding of c1090; now blocked, it is set into the north wall. Most of the present church dates from the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Built of local red sandstone, it comprises a heavy western tower, nave, southern and northern aisles and a chancel. Slight variations in the design of windows and pier capitals suggest that, although everything is essentially Perpendicular in style, the church was not of one build, but was extended and added to over several decades or generations. St Bertoline's was restored, sympathetically and without the drastic alterations to the existing fabric, in the mid nineteenth century. In the 1920s the chancel and chancel arch were largely rebuilt, but otherwise the main structure remains in essence as it would have been in the Tudor and Stuart period, complete with the carved oak ceiling above the nave. However, with the exception of the carved Elizabethan altar, most of the fittings - font, pews, pulpit and coloured glass - are fairly modern.

The church retains several important links with the early and mid seventeenth century, many of them connected with the Crewes. In the seventeenth century the parish was dominated by a branch of the powerful Crewe family, whose seat of Crewe Hall lies less than three miles to the north-west. Sir Ranulphe Crewe (b1558), who

built the present Hall in the opening decades of the seventeenth century, was a serjeant-at-law under James I, served as Speaker of the House of Commons in the brief parliament of 1614 and was knighted in the same year, and was created Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench in 1625, just before James I's death. However, he was one of a number of senior judges who questioned the legality of forced loans during the opening year of Charles I's reign and was dismissed by the King in November 1626. The aged Crewe took no active part in the civil war. He died in London in January 1646 but chose to be buried at Barthomley church, in the new chapel which he had built for his family on the south side of the chancel, abutting the east end of the south aisle. Although Sir Ranulphe himself has no visible funereal monument, the Crewe chapel contains mural monuments to several of his descendents, as well as fine recumbent effigies of earlier and later figures. At the north end of the north aisle is a second Crewe enclosure, a late Elizabethan oak screen, carrying carved inscriptions, which formerly surrounded the family pew. It now encloses the nineteenth century organ.

Affixed to the wall by the door of the Crewe chapel are four brass plaques, dating from the seventeenth century and commemorating members of the Malbon family of Bradley Hall, Haslington; the Hall, which no longer exists, stood about four miles to the north-west. A stone tablet now affixed to the south wall of the south aisle records another Malbon, Thomas, sometime attorney at Chester, who died in 1658. Born in 1578, Thomas Malbon practised law in both Nantwich and Chester, and rebuilt Bradley in the opening decades of the seventeenth century. Like Sir Ranulphe Crewe, he was too old to fight in the civil war, but Malbon clearly supported the parliamentary cause, playing a minor role in the war-time administration of the area. In 1651, after the war was over, he wrote "A breefe & true Relacon of all suche passages & things as happened & weire donne in and aboute Namptwich in the Countie of Chester & in other plac[es] of the same Countie". A lively and colourful history of the civil war 1642-48, focussing on the area around Nantwich, but encompassing most of Cheshire, Malbon's account is one of the principal sources for the history of the civil war in Cheshire. It was almost immediately paraphrased and plagiarised by Edward Burghall, vicar of Acton in the 1650s, who cobbled together his own manuscript account of the war in Cheshire, "Providence Improved". In 1889, both accounts were edited by James Hall and published by the Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society.

We know a little about Barthomly's incumbents at this time. For part of the war years, the living was held by George Mainwaring, member of another old Cheshire family with tentacles

in many parts of the county; the Crewes had married into a branch of this family in the sixteenth century. From 1649 until 1684 the incumbent was Zachary Cawdrey. In 1647, while a fellow of St John's College, Oxford, he had been in trouble with parliament for "using the Prayerbook against Protestant orders and praying to the King". But Cawdrey retained the parish throughout the 1650s and the Restoration period. A silver chalice and paten which he gave to the church are still in use. The author of a number of minor religious works published during the 1670s and early 1680s, Cawdrey died in 1684. A brass plaque, now affixed to south chancel wall, records not only his own death but also that of his wife, three years earlier.

Barthomley church has a much stronger and darker claim to fame and has an infamous niche in the history of the civil war, for it was here that one of the most notorious massacres of the war took place. The basic facts are clear enough. Bolstered by newly arrived reinforcements from Ireland, in the closing days of 1643 the Chester royalists sent out parties to harry the parliamentarians, who controlled much of the county. On 23 December royalist troops entered Barthomley. Malbon gives a graphic account of what followed:

The Kinges p[ar]tie comynge to Barthomley Churche, did sett upon the same; wherein about xxtie Neighbours where gonne for theire saufegarde. But maior Connaught, maior to Colonell Sneyde,...w[i]th his forces by wyelcome entred the Churche. The people w[i]thin gatt up into the Steeple; But the Enmy burnynge formes, pewes, Rushes & the lyke, did smother them in the Steeple that they weire Enforced to call for quarter, & yelde them selves; w[hi]ch was graunted them by the said Connaught; But when hee had them in his power, hee caused them all to be stripped starke Naked; And moste barbarouslie & contr[ar]y to the Lawes of Armes, murdered, stabbed and cutt the Throates of xii of them;...& wounded all the reste, leavinge many of them for Dead. And on Christmas daye, and Ste Stevens Daye, the[y] Contynued plu[n]dringe & destroyinge all Barthomley, Crewe, Haslington, & the places adiacent...

Of the twenty "neighbours" who had been smoked out of the steeple, twelve (all males, named in Malbon's account) were killed on the spot and many of the remaining eight badly wounded. They seem to have been cut down at the base of the tower, and thus within the church itself. By 26 December Lord Byron, royalist commander in Chester, was crowing to the Marquis of Newcastle:

the Rebels had possessed themselves of a Church at Bartumley, but wee presently beat them forth of it, and put them all to the sword; which I finde to be the best way to proceed with these kind of people, for mercy to them is cruelty.

Malbon's account, largely followed by Burghall, portrays the event as a completely unprovoked and unlawful attack upon villagers who had surrendered at Connaught's promise of quarter. Other accounts, however, suggest that the sequence of events may have been rather different. In a letter of 9 January, John Byron claimed that the royalists had initially issued a summons to the men inside the church but that it had been refused. Only then did the royalists attack and capture the church, possibly having to fight their way in. Although in the civil war quarter was usually then given at that point, there was no legal obligation to spare defenders who had spurned a formal summons and had pushed the issue to violence and bloodshed. Although very unusual, the capture of Barthomley church was not the only occasion during the civil wars when, in such circumstances, the attacking force proceeded to put the defending force to the sword. Some historians have suggested an alternative sequence of events to explain the bloodletting - that having initially agreed to surrender on offer of quarter, one of the villagers wounded or killed a royalist soldier, thus negating the agreement and provoking what followed.

Whatever the exact sequence of events at Barthomley church on 23 December 1643, the killings became notorious. Eleven years later, at the Chester assizes of October 1654, vengeance was exacted. John Connaught, formerly a royalist major, was tried for his life. Although he was charged with murdering "several persons" in the church, the trial focussed on the death of just one of them, John Fowler. The jury heard that Connaught, with a battleaxe (valued at 6d) in his right hand, had caught hold of Fowler and struck him on the left side of his head, inflicting a wound which, though only one inch long and one inch deep, was instantly fatal. The jurors found the case proved, Connaught offered nothing in mitigation and John Bradshaw, who five years before had presided over the King's trial, passed sentence of death. Connaught was hanged at Boughton, on the outskirts of Chester, on the afternoon of Tuesday 17 October 1654. According to the diarist, Henry Newcome, he went to the scaffold protesting his innocence:

The matters he died for were clearly proved, and yet he seemed to take a great glory in his innocency, and would freely tell of his other sins, as gaming, drinking, nay

conjuring, which were some of them not known, and yet would stand in the denial of a thing that was proved.

It is now hard to believe that this attractive church in its quiet rural setting once witnessed such horrors as those of Christmas-time 1643. St Bertoline's is still in regular use for services. It is in good condition and is well kept. It stands amidst an equally interesting churchyard, and an unusual number of well preserved early eighteenth century gravestones - a handful date from the latter half of the seventeenth century - are now laid to form a path around the outside walls of the church. St Bertoline's itself is generally unlocked and open to visitors during the day. Sadly, because of the threat of vandalism, the Crewe chapel is normally locked, though a notice directs visitors to the adjoining modern rectory, where the key may be sought.

## CROMWELL, THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION AND THE CIVIL WAR - A FEW NOTES ON FRENCH AND SWEDISH LITERATURE

by Bertil Haggman

### 1. French Literature.

In January 1993 Presses Universitaire de France (PUF) in the excellent paperback series que sais-je? published a short introduction to the history of the English Civil War (Cromwell, la révolution d'Angleterre et la guerre civile, 124 p.) by the French historian Jean-Pierre Pousson.

But a Cromwell biography had been published in 1992 by Fayard (B Cottrel, Cromwell). Two other French biographies of Cromwell exist. In 1970 Hachette was responsible for the publication of Jean Matrat's Oliver Cromwell. In 1989 Y Kerlan's Cromwell: la morale des seigneurs was made available to the public by Perrin.

On the English revolution the French can consult R Marx's L'Angleterre des Révolutions (con "U 2", A Colin, 1971).

The Civil War has been treated in an essay by V Barrie and Cuvien "La guerre civile anglaise: interprétations et revisions", p.9-34) in the collection Guerre et pouvoir en Europe au XVIIe siècle

(Henri Veyrier, Paris, 1991).

Of older literature on the subject there is Francois Guizot, Histoire de la Révolution d'Angleterre (several volumes between 1860-63).

On the Levellers can be mentioned the book of O Lutand, Cromwell, les Niveleurs et la République (Aubier-Montaigne, 1978) and his Les deux révolutions d'Angleterre (published the same year by Aubier-Montaigne).

Cromwell's foreign policy is treated in Les îles Britanniques, les Provinces-Unies, la guerre et la paix au XVIIe siècle (Economica 1991).

For texts of the Cromwellian era there is G Walter, La révolution anglaise 1641-1660 (coll "Memorial des Siècles", A Michel, 1963).

### 2. Swedish Literature.

Swedish literature on the Cromwellian era is unfortunately meagre when it should be rich because of the close relationship between the Commonwealth, the Protectorate and the Swedish kingdom in the 1650s. There is however one shining exception: historian Ludwig Stavenow's Den stora engelska revolutionen i det sjuttonde århundradets midt (The great English revolution in the middle of the seventeenth century), 1895.

One has to go all the way back to the eighteenth century for the first Cromwell biography, Oliver Cromwell, protector i England (ed. G Christiernsson, 4 vols, 1769-70). Two more biographies exist: C Kastman, Oliver Cromwell, hans lefnad berättad för svenska folket, 1908 (Oliver Cromwell, his life told for the Swedish people) and S Wikberg, Oliver Cromwell (1943).

The latest book on the Cromwell era is Lars Åke Augustsson's De heligas uppror, 1983 (The revolt of the holy). It is a collection of essays, one of which, "Bitter segrare - Oliver Cromwell, försynen och puritanismens politik" (Bitter victor - Oliver Cromwell, providence and the politics of puritanism) is on Cromwell. Augustsson, a leftist, travelled to England in preparing the book and visited a number of historic places with puritan connections: Huntingdon, Sidney Sussex College in Cambridge and Burford. But being a Marxist he also went to George's Hill in Surrey to ponder Gerard Winstanley and his fate.

Around the turn of the century a number of academic dissertations and books appeared on Swedish-English relations during the Protectorate. One of them is Sverige och England 1655-augusti 1657 (Sweden and England 1655-August 1657) by J Levin Carlbom (1900).

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PUBLICATIONS

compiled by Peter Gaunt

### I. BOOKS.

- Anderson, M S, The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450-1919 (Longman, 1993).
- Arnold, L J, The Restoration Land Settlement in County Dublin 1660-1688 (Irish Academic P, 1993).
- Aylmer, G E, The Personal Rule of Charles I, 1629-40 (Historical Association, new edition 1993).
- Ben-Amos, I K, Adolescence and Youth in Early and Modern England (Yale UP, 1994).
- Bener, D T, Literary Milton: Text, Pretext, Context (Duquesne UP, 1993).
- Brackenbury, R, Brothers at War: The Story of the Pierrepont Family in the Civil War (Ashbraken, 1992).
- Bradshaw, B, Hadfield, A & Maley, W (eds), Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict 1534-1660 (Cambridge UP, 1993).
- Brenner, R, Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict and London's Overseas Traders 1550-1653 (Cambridge UP, 1993).
- Bruijn, J R, The Dutch Navy of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (South Carolina UP, 1993).
- Calhoun, T O (ed), Abraham Cowley's Collected Works: Volume 2: Poems (1656) (Delaware UP, 1993).
- Carlin, N (ed), Certain Queries: Propounded to the Consideration of Such as were Intended for the Service of Ireland (Aporia P, 1992).
- Carrington, P, The English Heritage Book of Chester (Batsford, 1994).
- Clark, J C D, The Language of Liberty 1660-1832 (Cambridge UP, 1993).
- Cliffe, J T, The Puritan Gentry Besieged 1650-1700 (Routledge, 1993).
- Collins, J B, Classes, Estates and Order in Early Modern Britain (Cambridge UP, 1994).
- Corman, B, Genre and Generic Change in English Comedy 1660-1710 (Toronto UP, 1993).
- Corns, T N, Cambridge Companion to English Poetry, Donne to Marvell (Cambridge UP, 1993).
- Coward, B, The Stuart Age (Longman, revised edition 1994).
- Davies, J D, "Lover of the Sea and Skillful in Shipping": King Charles II and the Navy (Royal Stuart Society, 1992).
- Demaray, J G, Cosmos and Epic Representation: Dante, Spenser, Milton and the Transformation of Renaissance Heroic Poetry (Duquesne UP, 1993).
- Diefendorf, B B & Hesse, C (eds), Culture and Identity in Early Modern Europe (Michigan UP, 1993).

- Durston, C, James I (Routledge, 1993).
- Erickson, A L, Women and Property in Early Modern England (Routledge, 1993).
- Fallon, R T, Milton in Government (Pennsylvania State UP, 1993).
- Farr, M (ed), The Great Fire of Warwick, 1694 (Dugdale Soc Pubs 36, 1992).
- Flesch, W, Generosity and the Limits of Authority: Shakespeare, Herbert and Milton (Cornell UP, 1993).
- Flynn, T S, The Irish Dominicans (Four Coats P, 1993).
- Frampton, D & Garnham, D, The Battle of Winceby (Partizan P, 1993).
- Fraser, A, Charles II: His Life and Times (Weidenfeld & N, reissued 1993).
- Friedman, J, Miracles and the Pulp Press during the English Revolution (London UP, 1993).
- Garner, A A, Boston and the Great Civil War, 1642-51 (R Kay P, 1992).
- Groves, J, The Impact of the Civil War on a Community: Northenden and Etchells in Cheshire, 1624-60 (Northern Writers Advisory Service, 1992).
- Harth, P, Pen for a Party (Princetown UP, 1993).
- Hatcher, J, The History of the British Coal Industry I: Before 1700 (Clarendon P, 1993).
- Hebb, D D, Piracy and the English Government 1616-42 (Scolar P, 1994).
- Hendricks, M & Parker, P (eds), Women, "Race" and Writing in the Early Modern Period (Routledge, 1994).
- Hibbert, C, Cavaliers and Roundheads: The English at War 1642-49 (Harper Collins, 1993).
- Holcroft, F, English Civil War Around Wigan and Leigh (Wigan Heritage Service, 1993).
- Holland, P, St Margaret's, Westminster (Ellis, 1993).
- Holmes, G, The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian England 1660-1722 (Longman, 1993).
- Honeygosky, S R, Milton's House of God: The Invisible and Visible Church (Missouri UP, 1993).
- Hopton, A (ed), Declaration of John Robins and Other Writings (Aporia P, 1992).
- Hugget, R, Early Seventeenth Century Prices and Wages (Stuart P, 1993).
- Hughes, A, Godly Reformation and its Opponents in Warwickshire 1640-62 (Dugdale Soc Pubs, 1993).
- Hutner, H, Rereading Aphra Benn (Virginia UP, 1993).
- Janes, A, West Country Voices from the Civil War (Macwest, 1992).
- Jutte, R, Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe (Cambridge UP, 1994).

Kermode, J & Walker, G (eds), Women, Crime and the Courts in Early Modern England (London UP, 1994).

Knott, J R, Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature 1563-1694 (Cambridge UP, 1993).

Kramer, D B, The Imperial Dryden: The Poetics of Appropriation in Seventeenth Century England (Georgia UP, 1994).

Lewalski, B K, Writing Women in Jacobean England (Harvard UP, 1993).

Loewenstein, D, Milton: Paradise Lost (Cambridge UP, 1993).

Loftis, J (ed), Colonel Joseph Bampfield's Apology: "Written by Himself and Printed at His Desire", 1685 (Bucknell UP, 1993).

Lossky, N, Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626) (Clarendon P, 1993).

Low, A, Reinvention of Love: Poetry, Politics and Culture from Sidney to Milton (Cambridge UP, 1993).

Lynch, M, The Interregnum 1649-60 (Hodder & Stoughton, 1994).

MacCuarta, B (ed), Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising (Queens UP, 1993).

McCabe, R M, Incest, Drama and Nature's Law 1550-1700 (Cambridge UP, 1993).

Manning, R B, Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640 (Clarendon P, 1993).

Marcombe, D, English Small Town Life: Retford 1520-1642 (Nottingham UP, 1994).

Markley, R, Fallen Languages: Crises of Representation in Newtonian England 1660-1740 (Cornell UP, 1994).

Marsh, C W, The Family of Love in English Society 1550-1630 (Cambridge UP, 1993).

Miller, F H, Religion and the Civil War (Abcado P, 1993).

Miller, L, John Milton's Writings in the Anglo-Dutch Negotiations 1651-54 (Duchesne UP, 1993).

Mitchell, J, Not By Reason Alone: Religion, History and Identity in Early Modern Political Thought (Chicago UP, 1993).

Morris, R, The Battles of Lansdown and Roundway, 1643 (Stuart P, 1993).

Morris, R, The Siege of Gloucester, 1643 (Stuart P, 1993).

Morris, R, The First Battle of Newbury, 1643 (Stuart P, 1993).

Morris, R, The Storming of Alton and Arundel (Stuart P, 1993).

Mullet, M, James II and English Politics 1678-88 (Routledge, 1994).

Mulryne, J R & Shewring M (ed), Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts (Cambridge UP, 1993).

Newman, P R, The Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War 1642-46 (Manchester UP, 1993).

Ohlmeyer, J H, Civil War and Restoration in Three Stuart Kingdoms: The Career of Randall MacDonnell, Marquis of Antrim, 1609-83 (Cambridge

UP, 1993).

Quintrell, B (ed), The Maynard Lieutenancy Book, 1608-39 (2 vols, Essex Record Office, 1993).

Palmer, W, The Political Career of Oliver St John, 1637-49 (Clarendon UP, 1993).

Parker, M St John, The Civil War 1642-51 (Pitkin P, 1993).

Patterson, A M, Andrew Marvell (Northcote House P, 1994).

Peachey, S, The Storming of Bristol, 1643 (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S, The Battle of Stratton, 1643 (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S, The Battles of Launceston and Sowton Down, 1643 (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S, The Battle of Modbury, 1643 (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S, The Battle of Coleford, 1643 (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S, Early Seventeenth Century Imported Foods (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S, Murrel's Two Books of Cookerie and Carving 1638: A Period Recipe Book (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S, The Book of Salads, 1580-1660 (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S, Farmhouse Christmas Fare 1580-1640 (Stuart P, 1993).

Peachey, S & Turton, A, Armies of the First English Civil War, 1642-46 (Stuart P, 1993).

Phythian-Adams, C (ed), Societies, Cultures and Kinship, 1550-1850 (Leicester UP, 1993).

Pocock, J G A, Schochet, G J & Schwoerer, L G (eds), The Varieties of English Political Thought 1500-1800 (Cambridge UP, 1994).

Randall, D, Search for Old Wirral: A Historical Guide to Wirral's Buildings and Sites from Roman Times to the Civil War (Countywise, 1993).

Ratcliffe, E, Winstanley's Walton 1649: Events in the Civil War at Walton on Thames (Astrapost, 1993).

Rawson, C, Satire and Sentiment 1660-1830 (Cambridge UP, 1994).

Raymond, J, Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641-60 (Windrush P, 1993).

Rees, C, Judgment on Marvell (Pinter P, 1993).

Reid, D, The Humanism of Milton's Paradise Lost (Edinburgh UP, 1993).

Roberts, J R (ed), New Perspectives on the Seventeenth Century English Religious Lyric (Missouri UP, 1994).

Rushdy, A H A, Empty Garden: Subject of Late Milton (Pittsburgh UP, 1993).

Schwartz, R M, Remembering and Repeating: On Milton's Theology and Poetics (Chicago UP, 1993).

Sharpe, K & Lake, P (eds), Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England (Macmillan, 1994).

Shawcross, J T, John Milton: The Self and the World (Kentucky UP, 1993).

- Singh, B, Five Seventeenth-Century Poets: Donne, Herbert, Crashaw, Marvell, Vaughan (Oxford UP, 1993).
- Snowden, K, Civil War in Yorkshire: An Account of the Battles and Sieges and Yorkshire's Involvement (Castleden P, 1993).
- Spellman, W M, The Latitudinarians and the Church of England 1660-1700 (Georgia UP, 1993).
- Stewart, R & Beer, J, The Stewart Dynasty (Thomas & Lochar, 1993).
- Stone, L, Broken Lives: Separation and Divorce in England 1660-1857 (Oxford UP, 1993).
- Sullivan, E W, The Influence of John Donne (Missouri UP, 1993).
- Thomson, J E, Mercenaries, Pirates and Sovereigns: State Building and Extra-Territorial Violence in Early Modern Europe (Princeton UP, 1994).
- Thulesius, O, Nicholas Culpeper (Macmillan, 1993).
- Tilly, C, European Revolutions 1492-1992 (Blackwell, 1993).
- Tollver, H, George Herbert's Christian Narrative (Pennsylvania State UP, 1994).
- Tribble, E B, Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England (Virginia UP, 1993).
- Turner, J, One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton (Oxford UP, new edition 1993).
- Wedgwood, C V, The Trial of Charles I (Penguin, reissued 1993).
- Westfall, R S, The Life of Sir Isaac Newton (Cambridge UP, 1993).
- Wiesner, M E, Women and Gender in Early Modern England (Cambridge UP, 1993).
- Willmoth, F, Sir Jonas Moore: Practical Mathematics and Restoration Science (Boydell, 1993).
- Wilson, A (ed), Rethinking Social History: English Society 1570-1920 and its Interpretation (Manchester UP, 1993).
- Zagorin, P, Milton: Aristocrat and Rebel - The Poet and His Politics (D S Brewer, 1993).
- Zwicker, S N, Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture 1649-89 (Cornell UP, 1993).

## II. ARTICLES.

- Allen, D, "The Order of St John and Cromwell's Navy 1649-60", The Mariner's Mirror 79 (1993).
- Amelang, J S, "Vox Populi: Popular Autobiographies in Early Modern Urban History", Urban History 20 (1993).
- Appleby, J C, "Thomas Mun's West Indies Venture 1602-5", Historical Research 67 (1994).
- Ball, R M, "After Edghill Fight", Historical Research 67 (1994).
- Barnard, T C, "Lawyers and the Law in Late Seventeenth Century Ireland", Irish Historical Studies 28 (1993).
- Baskerville, S, "Blood Guilt in the English Revolution", The Seventeenth Century 8 (1993).

- Beckett, J V, "Aristocrats and Electoral Control in the East Midlands 1660-1914", Midland History 18 (1993).
- Blackwood, B G, "Parties and Issues in the Civil War in Lancashire and East Anglia", Northern History 29 (1993).
- Blackwood, B G, "Parties and Issues in the Civil War in Suffolk", Suffolk Review new series 18 (1992).
- Bosher, J F, "The Franco-Catholic Danger 1660-1715", History 79 (1994).
- Boulton, J, "Clandestine Marriages in London: An Examination of a Neglected Urban Variable", Urban History 20 (1993).
- Brown, K M, "The Scottish Aristocracy, Anglicization and the Court, 1603-38", Historical Journal 36 (1993).
- Brown, M H, "'That Old Serpent and Ancient of Evil Days': Walter, Earl of Atholl and the Death of James I", Scottish Historical Review 71 (1992).
- Carroll, C, "Representations of Women in Some Early Modern English Tracts on the Colonization of Ireland", Albion 25 (1993).
- Champion, J A, "Religion After the Restoration", Historical Journal 36 (1993).
- Cope, E S, "Groups in the House of Lords, May 1626", Parliamentary History 12 (1993).
- Cressey, D, "Purification, Thanksgiving and the Churching of Women in Post-Reformation England", Past & Present 141 (1993).
- Croft, P, "Patronage and Corruption, Parliament and Liberty in Seventeenth Century England", Historical Journal 36 (1993).
- Croft, P, "The Reputation of Robert Cecil", History Today 43 (November 1993).
- Davis, J C, "Against Formality: One Aspect of the English Revolution", Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 6th series 3 (1993).
- Dodaro, R & Questier, M, "Strategies in Jacobean Polemic: The Use and Abuse of St Augustine in English Theological Controversy", Journal of Ecclesiastical History 44 (1993).
- Dore, R N, "The Civil War in Cheshire", Cheshire History 31 (1993).
- Dore, R N, "1642: The Coming of the Civil War to Cheshire: Conflicting Actions and Impressions", Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society 87 (1991).
- Dunster, S, "An Independent Life? Nottingham Widows 1594-1650", Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire 95 (1991).
- Fletcher, A, "Power, Myths and Realities", Historical Journal 36 (1993).
- Ford, A, "The Church of Ireland: A Critical Bibliography: Part II 1603-41", Irish Historical Studies 28 (1993).
- Ford, J D, "The Lawful Bonds of Scottish Society: The Five Articles of Perth, the Negative Confession and the National Covenant", Historical Journal 37 (1994).
- Foyster, E, "A Laughing Matter? Marital Discord and Gender Control

in Seventeenth Century England", Rural History, Economy, Society, Culture 4 (1993).

Gaunt, P, "The Parliamentary War Effort in Cheshire", Cheshire History 32 (1993).

Goodare, J, "The Nobility and the Absolutist State in Scotland 1584-1638", History 78 (1993).

Gordon, P, "William Castell of Courteenhall: A Seventeenth Century Pioneer of Missionary Work", Northamptonshire Past & Present 8 (1993-4).

Gowing, L, "Gender and the Language of Insult in Early Modern London", History Workshop Journal 35 (1993).

Greengrass, M, "Interfacing Samuel Hartlib", History Today 43 (December 1993).

Harley, D, "Pious Physic for the Poor: The Lost Durham County Medical Scheme of 1655", Medical History 37 (1993).

Harris, T, "The Tories and the Rule of Law in the Reign of Charles II", The Seventeenth Century 8 (1993).

Hirst, D, "The Fracturing of the Cromwellian Alliance: Leeds and Adam Baynes", English Historical Review 108 (1993).

Hirst, D & Zwicker, S, "High Summer at Nun Appleton 1651: Andrew Marvell and Lord Fairfax's Occasions", Historical Journal 36 (1993).

Holland, S, "Archbishop Abbot and the Problem of 'Puritanism'", Historical Journal 37 (1994).

Holmes, C, "Women: Witnesses and Witches", Past & Present 140 (1993).

Holt, P M, "Edward Pococke (1604-91), the First Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford", Oxoniensia 56 (1991).

Howkins, A & Merricks, L, "'Wee Be Black as Hell': Ritual, Disguise and Rebellion", Rural History, Economy, Society, Culture 4 (1993).

Hoyle, R W, "Further Comments on Dr Ward and the 'Rental Policy of the English Peerage 1649-60'", Agricultural History Review 41 (1993).

Hudson, E K, "The 'Plaine Mans' Pastor: Arthur Dent and the Cultivation of Popular Piety in Early Seventeenth Century England", Albion 25 (1993).

Hull, F, "Kentish Map Makers of the Seventeenth Century", Archaeologia Cantiana 109 (1991).

Hull, F, "Sidney of Penshurst - Robert, 2nd Earl of Leicester", Archaeologia Cantiana 111 (1993).

Johns, F D, "The Royalist Rising and Parliamentary Mutinies of 1645 in West Kent", Archaeologia Cantiana 110 (1992).

Jones, J G, "Sir John Wynn, jnr, of Gwydir and Llanfrothen and the 'Grand Tour' 1613-14", Journal of the Merioneth Historical and Record Society 11 (1993).

Kennedy, T, "Roman Catholic Recusancy in Denbighshire", Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society 42 (1993).

Lee, M, "The Buccleuch Marriage Contract: An Unknown Episode in

Scottish Politics", Albion 25 (1993).

MacInnes, A I, "Crown, Clans and Fine: The 'Civilizing' of Scottish Gaeldom 1587-1638", Northern Scotland 13 (1993).

Matar, N I, "The Comenian Legacy in England: The Case for the Conversion of the Muslims", The Seventeenth Century 8 (1993).

McGregor, J F, Capp, B, Smith, N, Gibbons, B J & Davis, J C, "Debate - Fear, Myth and Furore: Reappraising the Ranters", Past & Present 140 (1993).

McGuire, J I, "The Church of Ireland: A Critical Bibliography: Part III 1641-90", Irish Historical Studies 28 (1993).

McKenny, K, "Charles II's Irish Cavaliers: The 1649 Officers and the Restoration Land Settlement", Irish Historical Studies 28 (1993).

Meikle, M M, "The Invisible Divide: The Great Lairds and the Nobility of Jacobean Scotland", Scottish Historical Review 71 (1992).

Morgan, G, "Women's Wills in West Wales 1600-1750", Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (1992).

Munden, R C, "'All the Privy Council Being Members of this House': A Note on the Constitutional Significance of Procedure in the House of Commons 1589-1614", Parliamentary History 12 (1993).

Neave, S, "Rural Settlement Contraction in the East Riding of Yorkshire between the Mid Seventeenth and the Mid Eighteenth Centuries", Agricultural History Review 41 (1993).

O'Brien, P K & Hunt, P A, "The Rise of the Fiscal State in England 1485-1815", Historical Research 66 (1993).

O'Riordan, C, "Popular Exploitation of Enemy Estates in the English Revolution", History 78 (1993).

Ormrod, D, "The Atlantic Economy and the 'Protestant Capitalist International' 1651-1775", Historical Research 66 (1993).

Owen, S J, "Interpreting the Politics of Restoration Drama", The Seventeenth Century 8 (1993).

Perkins, J, "Deaths in Stuart Lancashire: Some New Interpretations", Lancashire Local Historian 8 (1993).

Pflederer, R, "Dutch Maps and English Ships in the Eastern Seas", History Today 44 (January 1994).

Porter, S, "Death and Burial in Seventeenth Century England", The Local Historian 23 (1993).

Pugh, T B, "A Portrait of Queen Anne of Denmark at Parham Park, Sussex", The Seventeenth Century 8 (1993).

Questier, M C, "Sir Henry Spiller, Recusancy and the Efficiency of the Jacobean Exchequer", Historical Research 66 (1993).

Riden, P, "Early Ironworks in the Lower Taff Valley", Morgannwg 36 (1992).

Roberts, R O, "Financial Developments in Early Modern Wales and the Emergence of the First Banks", Welsh History Review 16 (1993).

Roots, I A, "A Context for the Civil War", Cheshire History 31

(1993).

Rowlands, M, "Government and Governors in Four Manorial Boroughs in the West Midlands 1600-1700", Journal of Regional and Local Studies 13 (1993).

Sanderson, J, "Conrad Russell's Ideas", History of Political Thought 14 (1993).

Shoemaker, R B, "Using Quarter Sessions Records as Evidence for the Study of Crime and Criminal Justice", Archives 90 (1993).

Smith, N, "Oliver Cromwell's Angler", The Seventeenth Century 8 (1993).

Sommerville, J P, "Further Light on Hobbes", Historical Journal 36 (1993).

Spence, R T, "Mining and Smelting in Yorkshire by the Cliffords, Earls of Cumberland, in the Tudor and Early Stuart Period", Yorkshire Archaeological Journal 64 (1992).

Spurr, J, "Perjury, Profanity and Politics", The Seventeenth Century 8 (1993).

Stapleton, B, "Inherited Poverty and Life-Cycle Poverty: Odiham, Hampshire, 1650-1850", Social History 18 (1993).

Stoyle, M, "The Honour of General Monck", History Today 43 (August 1993).

Suggett, R, "Slander in Early Modern Wales", Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 39 (1992).

Tangye, M, "A Seventeenth Century Fish Cellar at Porth Godrevy, Gwithian", Cornish Archaeology 30 (1991).

Thomas, J E, "Elgin Notaries in Burgh Society and Government 1540-1660", Northern Scotland 13 (1993).

Underwood, A, "The Case Against Hugh Reeve, a Seventeenth Century Recusant", Bedfordshire Historical Record Society 72 (1993).

Wanklyn, M, "Urban Revival in Early Modern England: Bridgnorth and the River Trade 1660-1800", Midland History 18 (1993).

Ward, I, "The Humble Response of the Hired Lackey - A Reply to Hoyle", Agricultural History Review 41 (1993).

White, I D, "Scottish Population and Social Structure in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries", Archives 89 (1993).

Williamson, A H, "A Patriot Nobility? Calvinism, Kin Ties and Civic Humanism", Scottish Historical Review 72 (1993).

Wilson, J, "Icons of Unity", History Today 43 (June 1993).

Woodward, D, "The Determination of Wage Rates in the Early Modern North of England", Economic History Review 47 (1994).

Yeo, G, "A Case Without Parallel: The Bishops of London and the Anglican Church Overseas 1660-1748", Journal of Ecclesiastical History 44 (1993).

Zaller, R, "The Figure of the Tyrant in English Revolutionary Thought", Journal of the History of Ideas, 54 (1993).

## BOOK REVIEWS

### "We Three Kings":

James I, Charles I and Oliver Cromwell.

Within the past twelve months, there have appeared new studies of the three rulers who dominated not only England but also the whole of Britain for over half a century, from 1603 until 1658. Two are designed primarily for students - good sixth formers as well as undergraduates - though with appeal to a wider readership, while the contents and price of the third indicate that it is aimed at a more advanced market. Two are primarily syntheses of existing works, though with a good deal of fresh research by the authors, the third a collection of already-published and newly-written articles, some the result of substantial fresh work on primary source material. Like their subjects, these three studies constitute a rather mixed bag.

The well-established series of 'Lancaster Pamphlets', which aims to "provide a concise and up-to-date analysis of major historical topics", has got round to the first Stuart to sit on the English throne. Time and again, Christopher Durston's James I (Routledge, 1993, £4.99) shows how James's stock has been rising in recent years. Generations of bleak historical assessments based upon the sour writings of a disappointed courtier - Weldon's "poisonous piece of literary revenge" - as well as upon prudish morality and a long-term view of constitutional crisis leading to civil war in which James's reign was often portrayed as the beginning of a messy decline, have been stripped away over the past thirty years by so-called "revisionist" historians. Instead, some have gone as far as to paint James's reign as a sort of golden age, a period of wise moderation when dogs were left to sleep peacefully, until prodded needlessly and foolishly awake by James's incompetent son.

In a series of thematic chapters, looking at the man, his court, favourites and patronage, finance, parliaments, foreign policy and the church, Durston summarises recent research and publications, as well as throwing in fresh assessments of his own. He goes a long way down the revisionist path, but at times he expresses his own reservations and scepticism, as well as noting the very recent work of "post-revisionists", especially in the area of James's relations with parliaments. On the whole, Durston's James escapes, if not with a clean bill of health, at least without major or terminal ailments. He made mistakes, there were shortcomings in his personality and his policies - much is made of his financial extravagance - but in many key areas, especially religion but also, despite its unpopularity at the time, his pacific foreign policy, he got it more or less right. For Durston, he proved "a shrewd, capable, and moderately successful ruler". The pamphlet begins with a useful three-side chronology of the reign and ends with a two-side select bibliography. There is no index.

Throughout his work, Durston draws a sharp contrast between James and his son, and stresses that 1625 was a turning point. As he puts

it colourfully on the last page, Charles, the "real culprit" responsible for the civil war, "has avoided full censure...for so long because the sins of the son were visited upon the father by historians who found a drunken, homosexual spendthrift a more appropriate scapegoat than a refined and dignified paragon of traditional family life". Brian Quintrell's assessment in Charles I 1625-1640 (Longman, 1993, £5.25) does little to contradict this interpretation. Produced as part of another well-established series, 'Seminar Studies in History', at 131 pages it is almost twice the length of Durston's 'Lancaster Pamphlet', and it includes a glossary, detailed bibliography and index, as well as partial or full transcripts of a selection of thirty contemporary documents.

The main text is divided into four sections. Firstly, Quintrell sketches in the Jacobean background - his assessments are perfectly consistent with those of Durston - and Charles's early life. The second section, which is chronologically based, looks at the years 1625-29, focussing very much upon parliament, foreign policy, state finance and the influence of Buckingham; there is surprisingly little here on Charles's religious policies. Right from the start of the reign, Quintrell finds abundant evidence of Charles's defects, his surreptitious and semi-fraudulent behaviour, his elevation of authority and order above all else, his assumption that what he wanted should be done, regardless of convention and the feelings of those affected, his unwillingness to engage in public speaking or to make himself visible, his intense privacy and his refusal to explain or to compromise. Section three, surveying the Personal Rule of 1629-40, is thematic in structure, with chapters exploring government and order, finance, foreign policy and the navy, and religion. Many of the defects already identified in the opening years of the reign emerged again during the 1630s - his desire for authority, not affection, his privacy and remoteness from even his elite subjects and so forth. Quintrell is sceptical of interpretations which see a revitalised Privy Council as a key element of government during the 1630s, though he does concur in the traditional view that, even though the cash raised by Ship Money was largely used to build up the navy and did not form part of the ordinary revenue, this levy proved extremely divisive and fuelled trouble for the future. On religion, Quintrell concedes that far more work needs to be done on opinion at the local level, but he suspects that inconsistency, fudge and compromise were common. The tone of the fourth and final section, which serves as a brief conclusion, is revealed by its title - "The Trouble With Charles I". Despite a not altogether happy inheritance in 1625, Charles contrived to make things much worse, his own personality, policies and defects causing a growing and unnecessary crisis. Quintrell breaks off in 1640 - indeed he mentions the trouble with Scotland in 1637-40 only briefly. This tends to be very much an English view of the man and the reign; there is little on Scotland and Ireland, perhaps justifiable bearing in mind that between 1625 and 1640 Charles visited Scotland only once and Ireland never. This is a valuable and elegant contribution to our understanding of the man and his reign pre-1640 and serves as an

important corrective to Kevin Sharpe's exhaustive but suspiciously favourable interpretations of the Personal Rule.

The third work, on Cromwell, is rather different, a substantial hardback tome containing articles by a variety of different historians. It is published in honour of the late Roger Howell, Jr, an American-based historian who was for many years a member of The Cromwell Association. Although never, perhaps, quite in the "premier league" of Cromwellian and civil war historians, Howell produced a steady stream of books and articles on the period, including a biography of Cromwell and a study of Newcastle upon Tyne in the mid seventeenth century as well as several contributions to Cromwelliana - his penultimate paper appeared in the 1987-88 edition of our journal. Howell had long been working upon a full-length study of the historiography of Cromwell, showing how from his death to the present day interpretations of Cromwell have shifted and flowed. Alas, Howell's untimely death terminated the project a long way short of completion. However, under the editorship of Professor R C Richardson, something of this project has been salvaged in Images of Oliver Cromwell (Manchester UP, 1993, £35). Richardson has collected together several papers on this theme which Howell originally published in the late 1970s and 1980s, as well as from such unpublished writings as he had completed by his death. Seven of the twelve chapters are by Howell. The remaining "gaps" have been filled with newly-written articles by other historians.

The end product is, inevitably perhaps in the circumstances, something of a patchwork, but it does give a reasonable coverage of the various interpretations of Cromwell. Howell's own contributions - providing an overview, looking at views of Cromwell in the late seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and exploring Cromwell's personality, his relationship with his parliaments and Cromwell and liberty - are always very elegant and, although rarely particularly deep or original, they provide pleasant and readable accounts. Professors Speck, Roots and Richardson have respectively contributed studies of Cromwell's image during and after the Glorious Revolution, of Carlyle's Cromwell and of Cromwell portrayed in the mould of the twentieth century inter-war dictators. Professor Karsten reviews Cromwell's image in America.

But by some way the most interesting contribution is Dr Toby Barnard's mould-breaking study of 'Irish images of Cromwell'. Barnard reassesses Cromwell's campaign in Ireland, stressing its limited geographical and temporal span and, despite opinions at the time, its rather mixed military fortunes. More importantly, he argues that Cromwell's image was invoked and employed remarkably little in the two centuries following that campaign. Late seventeenth and eighteenth century Irish Protestants rarely looked to Cromwell as their saviour, and Irish Catholics just as rarely condemned him as a monster. Instead, the rebellion of 1641, the cessations of 1643 and 1646 and the settlements at the Restoration and after William III's campaigns were looked upon as the key turning points, for good and ill. Instead, the image of Cromwell as a

decisive figure in Irish history seems to have emerged, Barnard argues, only in the mid nineteenth century, the catalyst perhaps being the Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland, written by a "peppery Irish barrister", J P Prendergast, and published in 1865. Prendergast's work not only contributed to the bitter struggle between nationalists and unionists, a struggle in which differing pictures of Cromwell were used by both sides, but also in the process began a new era in Irish history in which the image of Cromwell the butcher was - and often still remains - the pervasive one.

Barnard's contribution enlivens what is otherwise a very pleasant and worthy but somewhat unexciting collection. As a contribution to Cromwellian studies and, indeed, the only work devoted to Cromwell to have appeared during the past year, members of the Association will doubtless wish to add it to their shelves. But many will balk at paying £35 for this dauntingly expensive hardback. For the same price, it would be possible to buy a whole handful of paperbacks about Cromwell currently in print - works written or edited by Barry Coward, John Morrill, David Smith, Christopher Hill and Ivan Roots spring to mind - and still have change left over.

Peter Gaunt

Of the various publications on the civil war which have appeared during the past year, one of the largest and widest readerships is likely to be achieved by the 'Pitkin Guide', The Civil War 1642-51, by Michael St John Parker (Pitkin, 1993, £1.99). In thirty pages, this colourful and richly-illustrated booklet sets out to paint a picture of the causes, nature, impact and consequences of the civil wars. Although some of the material, particularly on the background and causes, has been arranged in a broadly chronological fashion, the author has eschewed a narrative approach. Thus no attempt is made to give a potted history of the whole nine year period encompassed by the title, nor to trace the course of the first civil war of 1642-46 in any detail, though a map on the inside front cover does show (somewhat selectively) the names, locations and years of significant battles and sieges 1642-51. The map should be used with caution. Newark, Chester, St Fagans and other key locations are nowhere to be seen, Worcester appears some way south of Powick Bridge, both Edgehill and Copredy [sic] Bridge have ended up north-east of Oxford and Brentford, bored with its traditional site, has relocated in Kent.

However, it must be said that these cartographical errors, plus a few factual slips in the main text, are the exception rather than the rule. The booklet succeeds in providing a clear, sensible and attractive outline guide to the civil war. Although modern historians are generally not identified by name, the author is clearly aware of much of the current research - the complexities of multiple kingdoms and the contribution of Scottish and Irish troubles to the causes of the so-called "English" civil war, as emphasised by Professor Russell and others, find a place in the brief discussion of the background to, and causes of, the war, just as Professor Carlton's recent work on the impact of the war and on deaths in

war has clearly provided the basis for summaries of these aspects. Much of the text is given over to thematic assessments of aspects of the war - "Raising the Armies", "Arms and Equipment", "On the March", "Views from the Ranks", "The Reality of Battle", "Women in the War", "The Reckoning of War" and "The Expense of War" - many of them including extracts drawn from contemporary accounts. All are supported by a generous and intelligent selection of illustrations, most of them in colour, ranging from contemporary illustrations to modern photographs of sites, buildings and re-enactments. There are potted biographies of many of the key players. That of Oliver Cromwell is fair, balanced and perfectly accurate, though the modern head and shoulders sketch used to illustrate the text is crude and not a patch on the Cooper miniature, which appears in colour on the front cover. The pamphlet ends with a brief but useful listing of sites and buildings with civil war connections open to the public. The Civil War 1642-51 is not intended as an academic contribution to the field and it does nothing to advance the frontiers of knowledge. But as a very brief, attractive and generally sound introduction to the war, intended for the general reader, it is admirable and deserves to succeed.

Peter Gaunt

Not very much on Cromwell again this year. The most immediate is Images of Oliver Cromwell, edited by Roger Richardson, reviewed above by Peter Gaunt. There is much relevant in John Morrill's The Nature of the English Revolution (Longman, 1993, £14.99 paperback), collecting his articles over two decades. It contains 'The Making of Oliver Cromwell', which threw fresh light on that "dark night of the soul" of the younger man, helping to fuse his religious - in the widest sense - perspective of later years. The Introduction offers a lively commentary on the whole period from the Tudors to the Restoration, arguing that if early modern Britain (made up of three kingdoms and a principality under a single ruler) was inherently unstable, England was not. But perhaps there were peculiar circumstances in England which made British instability a catalyst for actual civil war. Too much can be and has been made of consensus in England, by revisionists who cannot find a consensus even among themselves. A section on 'England's wars of religion' establishes Morrill's claim never to have wavered in giving "centrality" to religion, and he is right to do so when religion is taken to extend from men's relationship with God and the next world to the way they looked at themselves in this. For once a blurb is spot on - this book is "necessary reading for all serious students of seventeenth-century history" - and for those, too, who are not so professionally engaged.

Christopher Hill has engaged with the revolution for over fifty years. A new book by him is almost an annual event. 1993 saw the publication - as an eighty-second birthday present, perhaps, to himself - of what might be taken as something of a summation of his work. The English Bible and the English Revolution (Allen Lane, 1993, £25) offers a sharp picture of an age in which friction between change and continuity produced in the mid seventeenth century a conflagration, not for Hill "the

Puritan Revolution", but one in which religion in the broad sense played a part somewhere near Morrill's centrality. Hill's men and women looked for solutions - or at least arguments about - the anxieties they felt in contemplating life here and in a world to come, in the Bible, Englished and printed for all to read or to have read to them, to expound or have interpreted in press and pulpit, in parlours and in alehouses. Such constant consultation made for "a Biblical culture" in which all manner of attitudes and aspirations could be tested as a matter of course by recourse to the words of the Word. The result of Hill's investigations is a marvellous book, characteristically erudite, inquisitive, imaginative and humane. Not surprisingly, the emphasis is on the more radical uses to which texts could be - and certainly were - put, and on how these were modified over time and developments, and to what effect - ultimately what can be called "the dethroning" of the Book itself - the whole demonstrated with copious reference to sermons, pamphlets, treatises, poems, plays and whatever. The apt epigraphs to the various chapters alone add up to a stimulating commentary. The dedication is to Edward and Dorothy Thompson, "who know that history is about people, not things, and that all our work is about the present as well as the past". Many of us will say "Amen" to that.

The Family of Love was a shadowy religious group, originating in the mid sixteenth century in the Lowlands, who used their Bibles. Tempora fata veritas - loosely Sir Walter Raleigh's optimistic "truth is the daughter of time" - is the title of one of their Elizabethan tracts taken to have had some impact during the Interregnum upon the ideas and ideals of men like William Walwyn. They turn out to be worthy of enquiry in the detail of a new volume of 'The Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History', The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630 (Cambridge UP, 1993, £35) by Christopher Marsh. This should go a long way towards dispelling myths and misunderstandings about them which grew up among both contemporaries and historians, hot for certainties. Charged with every variety of subversion and deception by the hostile and ignorant, though often otherwise well-educated, the paucity of Familists belied such fears. Scattered here and there, they were particularly bunched around Ely, Cromwell's heartland, though it may be doubted that he ever came into contact with any. Socially they were surprisingly diverse. There was even a knot among the Yeoman of the court of Elizabeth I. Marsh has found among them a few fairly rich and some very poor men, but they were mostly a prosperous, middling sort of people. "Unbroken chains" are found to link Robert Seal, Esq., with William Gifford, a weaver, revealing a movement that had some degree of internal cohesion, though it is notable that the meaner sort of people do not appear to have been invited to join "their loving friends" at formal meetings. Equality in the sight of God has rarely led to equality in the eyes of men. Puritan gentry were "worms" only when they came face to face with their Maker. The Family was attacked by James I in Basilikon Doron as "that vile sect among the Anabaptists called the Family of Love because they think themselves only pure...and all the rest of the world to be but abomination in the sight of God", but in reality James knew nothing

about them and was using them merely as a stick to beat "the Puritans". One point of interest that might have wider implications is Marsh's observation that, in spite of much religious animosity (especially at critical times), there were in that society considerable resources of religious toleration from which it was possible for people to live peaceably together within their communities, notably at village level, without making too much of their differences. Familists were not inclined "to judge others too eagerly" and perhaps in return others could feel the same about them, thinking it possible all might be mistaken. Marsh concludes this pioneering study with a sketch of what seems to have happened later in the century and into the next. Not everyone labelled a Familist actually was one. Walwyn's advocacy in The Power of Love of a radical redistribution of earthly wealth was not shared by the early Family, who also did not go out of their way to justify disobedience to oppressive magistrates. It could be illuminating to explore again, along the lines laid down here, the links between civil war radicals and earlier groups.

Prominent among the many perennial problems afflicting early seventeenth-century administrations, at the centre and in the localities, was piracy, not so much as practised by English subjects - though, continuing from Elizabethan times, there was plenty of that - as by diverse foreigners, particularly from the Barbary Coast of North Africa and from Dunkirk preying on shipping in the narrow seas. There were raids, too, upon the mainland, notably in the south-west. Kidnapping was not unknown, giving credence to the story of the Camden Wonder. Expected to do something about it, the crown sought to cope in a variety of ways - by naval force, by diplomacy and by sheer appeasement. David Hebb's Piracy and the English Government, 1616-1642 ('Studies in Naval History', Scholar Press, 1994, £40) details the making and implementation of policy in the years which saw the extension of Ship Money from the maritime areas to the country at large to provide inter alia for the improvement of the Fleet to meet perceived dangers, of which piracy was only one. Hebb pushes an interpretation in which Charles I's foreign policy shakes off Gardiner's charge of "a constitutional infirmity of purpose" in favour of stressing "a national self-interest and independence", consistent and realistic, responding positively to local appeals through local action by institutions and personnel, and calling for an overhaul of traditional awkward and dilatory administrative approaches. It is an attractive argument, though, like most revisions of the personal rule of Charles I, somehow not entirely convincing. Hebb finishes on the brink of the civil war which would bring with it problems involving different solutions, but which he suggests fit readily into a long durée of evolutionary change in English naval activity. Prominent here would be an extension of Atlantic and Mediterranean trade during the Interregnum. But piracy continued and Cromwell's acquisition of Dunkirk was not without relevance to the fight against it.

Oliver St John came into some prominence as a lawyer in the Ship Money case of 1638, and played a significant role in the politics of the Long Parliament during the 1640s. Dr William Palmer believes he has not had the attention he deserves from historians and sets out to rescue

him in a short monograph, The Political Career of Oliver St John, 1637-1649 (Delaware UP, 1993, £29.50). Certainly St John was one of the few politicians whose career embraced the whole of that formative-destructive decade. Pym was dead by December 1643 and Cromwell not really vital until 1645. Others, like Stapleton and Holles, had far shorter spells of influence. St John was there at the start, very busy in the trial of Strafford and becoming Solicitor-General in the Earl of Bedford's abortive balancing scheme of 1641. Ironically, St John clung on to the office as king and parliament drifted into war, Palmer suggests, "trying frenetically to hedge his bets". Using him as a test-case, Palmer argues against those who hold "that religious issues rather than constitutional...were pre-eminent in the minds of MPs between 1640 and 1642". He is quite right that St John's outlook was legalistic and that his religious views were muddled and vague. In that he, of course, was not alone. Not every MP was a systematic theologian. Moreover, people's priorities changed over time and circumstances. St John's certainly did. It was - and still is - difficult to know just where he was going - or thought he was going - at particular times. Palmer calls him an anomaly: in the forefront of those who would fight the war hard, directly involved in the forming of the New Model Army, but by 1647 very worried about the spread of radicalism, civil and military, and backing negotiations with Charles. Acceptance of the office of Lord Chief Justice of Common Pleas in November 1648 augured a silent move away from active politics. He had nothing to do with the trial of the King and, though named to the Commonwealth Council of State, he rarely attended. Retaining his judicial post, he refused to go into the Protector's Council or "the other House". "A dark lantern", indeed. Back in the restored Rump in 1659 he was (says Pepys, a kinsman) "very great for Monck and a free parliament". Even so, he went into exile in 1666 and died there. Little remains to establish his character and personality - no diary, no memoirs, few letters or recorded speeches. But more could have been made here of one relationship - that with John Thurloe, who gets a single mention, but who was working for him as early as 1637, and remained close for the next twenty years, as is made clear in Philip Aubrey's Mr Secretary Thurloe, of which Palmer seems unaware. Nevertheless, this somewhat truncated biography, slight though it is, is welcome. There are far too few "lives" of second-rank politicians of this era.

Peter Newman is concerned more with military men - royalists at that. He follows a biographical dictionary of royalist officers (1981) with a survey, entitled The Old Service (Manchester UP, 1993, £35), of royalist regimental colonels under a number of headings - "the concept of obligation", social and geographical origins, character and personality and so on. Of particular interest to the author is "the roman catholic presence in regimental commands", which was not without concern to propagandists on the other side. Newman tends to see all royalists as risking their political future, their families, their estates and, of course, their lives in taking on the burden of "the old service" of loyalty not only to Charles I personally but to the whole concept and reality of monarchy itself. Of the honour, decency and sacrifice of a good many there can be

no question, but the same can be said of their opponents. If royalists were "part and parcel of the entire political nation [and] not some curious amalgam of unrepresentative elements", so, too, were the parliamentarians. It is in this sense of a struggle of right versus right, rather than of right versus wrong, that the peculiar tragic inwardness of the civil war can be discerned, and it is a pity that the tone of this well-researched book should be, as Cromwell might have put it, "somewhat" partisan. Newman draws attention to many thought-provoking points. The Duke of Newcastle said, a propos of his employment of papists, that "he did not examine their opinions in religion, but looked more upon their honesty and duty" - an echo of Cromwell here. It is also to be noted that Newcastle liked to draw upon men with personal revenues to support them in their "public employment". Quoted, too, is Mrs Hutchinson's acute remark that "every county had more or less the civil war within itself". One might add "and not only every county". Newman's attention is concentrated on England and Wales. Analysis of Scots and Irish royalists seems overdue.

A royalist officer of whom Newman has little to say was Col. Joseph Bampffield (fl 1639-85), who served Charles I well in the field during the civil war and in negotiations during the search for a settlement between 1646 and the execution. After that he found, like many another active royalist, some difficulty in maintaining his loyalties along with himself in a career that lasted into the reign of James II. He published in 1685 Colonel Joseph Bampffield's Apology "written by himself and printed at his desire" in the Netherlands in both Dutch and English editions. In the form of a naturally rather self-regarding memoir, it is pretty accurate so far as the facts given go, and is of real value for the negotiations of the late 1640s - ten letters from Charles I are tipped in. Bampffield is less forthcoming on what he was up to during the 1650s - which included something for John Thurloe. His indignation at being thrown over by the king in exile and his inability after the Restoration to rehabilitate himself come over strongly. Alas, he died too soon to see if his Apology would have any effect on Charles II's successor. The English version is reprinted for the first time in an elaborate annotated edition by John Loftis and Paul Hardacre (Bucknell UP, 1993, £38.50), with a detailed biographical supplement by the former, whose interest was set off by Bampffield's relationship with Anne, Lady Halkett, who also penned her memoirs. That his life was one of "repeated frustration" is evident both from the Apology and his ample correspondence - many letters have survived in manuscript and some are in print in a variety of publications. It is certainly useful to have the Apology, but was such an expansive and expensive edition really necessary?

Making the News is an apt title for "An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England, 1641-1660", edited by Joad Raymond (Windrush Press, 1993, £19.99 paperback, £29.99 hardback). These were prolific, building on tentative beginnings over the last couple of decades and spurred on by incessant demand for information and comment flung up by war and the search for settlement. Blatantly propagandist, much concerned with military matters, but also aware of the

appeal of hot news of political, social, religious and cultural developments, they mingled the routine with the sensational. Many were stylistically pedestrian and boring, but often enough there was a genuine attempt to give colour and light and shade to presentation. Some, like those edited by Sir John Berkenhead (royalist) and Marchamont Nedham (a pen for hire), were intelligent and witty. Their availability in the Thomason Tracts and in other collections of the huge paper barrage of the war years is a bonus for the historian, offering insights into the complex mentalité(s) of seventeenth century England. Besides a substantial general Introduction, Raymond provides specific commentaries and light annotations to the ten sections into which he has marshalled his 400+ page selection of material - most of it very much more than sound-bites - on such topics as crime and punishment, women, religious dissidence and persecution, alongside great events like the trial and execution of the King and the Restoration. Mercurius Honestus (or Tom Tell-Truth) and Mercurius Publicus were still talking of Charles II as King of the Scots as late as mid-April 1660. But the latter publication went on to rejoice in January 1661 at "the public dragging of those odious carcasses of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton and John Bradshaw to Tyburn...to be hung up" and, when taken down, "their heads cut off and their loathsome trunks thrown into a deep hole", with "Oliver never more to be digged up...and there we leave him". The body, yes, perhaps, but the spirit?

A 350th anniversary is commemorated in The Battle of Winceby (Academic Artizan with Partizan Press, 1993, £5) by David Frampton and Peter Garnham. This was "a short, sharp and decisive" engagement in which Oliver's horse was shot from under him and he had to grab a trooper's mount to carry on to a parliamentary victory. The Partizan Press's English Civil War Notes & Queries has reached no 48 (£1.75) with articles on inter alia scoutmasters and scouting, the capture of Shrewsbury in February 1646 and Sir Barnabas Scudamore, the royalist governor of Hereford, who was suspected of selling the city to the parliamentarians, "though he should swear the contrary on a book". Information is asked for on "the mysterious Major Mole", sometime governor of Dudley Castle, taken by parliament in 1644, lodged in the Tower, but escaping to serve under Prince Maurice. Escapes were not uncommon in these years.

'Ideas in Context' is the title of a proliferating series of interdisciplinary volumes by Cambridge University Press. An addition is Political Discourse in Early Modern England, edited by Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (1993, £40), in essence a sixteen-contributor celebration of the work of J G A Pocock, best known to Cromwellians for his work on "the ancient constitution" and on James Harrington's Oceana (1656), but also an historian as wide-ranging and prolific as he is profound, with "an insatiable curiosity about the mental world of Anglo-Saxon politics". Invited by the editors to review in a concluding essay the rest of the volume, he suggests that in the long years between the Tudors and the later eighteenth century, English political discourse became British, thereby underlining the significance of changing relations among the constituents of the British Isles, in which

the civil war and Interregnum and the Cromwellian unification played a critical role.

A loosely cognate collection by a rather smaller team is entitled The Roots of Liberty: Magna Carta, the Ancient Constitution and the Anglo American Tradition of the Rule of Law (Missouri UP, 1992, £40.50), edited by Ellis Sandoz. In it, Paul Christianson contemplates "the ancient constitution in the age of Sir Edward Coke and John Selden", and John Phillip Reid tackles the legal historiography of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Both articles offer clear and well-reasoned discussions of the constitutional basis (or bases) of a protracted conflict of which the civil war was a major but by no means the only part. Christianson concludes that "the constitutional debates [of the Stuart era] more often pitted rival interpretations of the ancient constitution against each other than theories of absolutism against constitutionalism" - which is not to say that there were no debates of the latter sort at all. Reid puts up a case for giving more attention to the role of lawyers in these developments, seeing them as, if not a source of liberty, at least a restraining force upon arbitrary government. Corinne Weston, who discerned significance in the place of the House of Lords during the 1640s long before it became fashionable to do so, provides a fruitful Epilogue, arguing that the ancient constitution "that Pocock introduced to the scholarly world has a broader range than has hitherto been thought", and pointing out that The Roots of Liberty generally adduces evidence for one with historical origins running through (with accretions) from Edward the Confessor, and that the medieval studies of the Tudors and Stuarts came at length to be a vital "political impulse" in colonial America.

But before that consummation, the issues were patent in post-Restoration England. John Miller asks was there An English Absolutism? (Historical Association, 1993, £3). He begins with Charles II and suggests that the regime of his later years was little different from that of the early 1660s. In both there was a Tory reaction fed by bitter memories of the Interregnum. During the Exclusion Crisis the danger for them was not that "the monarchy might become too strong but that it might be too weak". Their response was not a move to facilitate absolutism, but to undertake through the crown "an exercise in partisan vengeance" upon the Whigs. James II's reign was sui generis, since whatever his motives and methods, he posed "a threat to the very fabric of the constitution", a larger, deeper threat than any that had come from a monarch before. Miller concludes that prominent among the many things that the revolution of 1688-89 may have been was a genuine deliverance from an impending peril of absolute government, hence a respectable revolution, even a glorious one. Michael Mullett's Lancaster Pamphlet, James II and English Politics 1678-88 (Routledge, 1993, £4.99) covers some of the same ground with a clear account of, and a thoughtful commentary on, events and personalities. He stresses how so many of the measures that James, blatant in his popery, initiated or pushed beyond hitherto acceptable limits, awoke "the fury" of "the landed and social élites" by threatening to displace them from their traditional roles, "proving the rule that no seventeenth-century monarch was stronger than those on whose support

all government...rested and against whose opposition no throne could maintain itself". But it still needed the intervention of William of Orange with an army to help them out. James had said in 1685 that he had been depicted as "a man for arbitrary power" but that that was not the only story to be made of him. By 1688 it was.

The significance of the Exclusion Crisis in politics and literature is explored by Philip Harth in a brilliant study of Dryden's Tory propaganda in its contexts under the apt title Pen for a Party (Princeton UP, 1993, £27.50). Dryden's contribution, which was dedicated and thorough, culminated in Absalom and Achitophel and Albion and Albanius, the former rather more read these days, though the latter is of considerable interest. It is ironical that Dryden, whose earliest poems included one in which Cromwell is depicted as "great ere fortune made him so", should become so fully committed "to every one of the government's successive campaigns aimed at winning public acquiescence in its policies". Cromwell himself is not mentioned in a book which demonstrates how the record of the Interregnum thickened the atmosphere of post-Restoration politics. A chapter on 'The Pulpit' highlights the way in which sermons preached on the anniversary of the death of Charles I drew on biblical parallels and contrasts of the sort that run through Christopher Hill's The English Bible.

Stewart Ross, a prolific writer of "popular" history, much on Scottish themes, has written - with J Beer - a comprehensive account of the 600 years of the Stewart Dynasty (Thomas & Lochar, 1993, £18.95). (Mary Queen of Scots, it seems, Frenchified the name into Stuart). Ninety pages are devoted to the rulers of the three kingdoms from James I and VI to Anne and the three generations of pretenders. The family emerges as a pretty odd lot. Ross remarks how it was characteristic of their reigns that they began happily enough but ended unluckily. At the accession of Charles I "the joy of the people devoured their mourning" for James I. Came the troubled later 1620s and then zephyr breezes during the personal rule. After that it was cold winds all the way. Ross's Charles had his good qualities, but in the end "left his captors with little alternative". His Charles II spent his life "behind a mask of charming inscrutability", and the apparent conversion on his death bed was "an appropriately enigmatic gesture". Ross has also published his first novel, initiating an historical trilogy. One Crowded Hour (Warner Books, 1994, £5.99) is set in the closing years of James I, with a law student getting involved in London life, court politics and a plot to kill a king who was no stranger to assassination scares. It is a romantic tale with all the right ingredients - royalty, sex, religion, heroism, intrigue, betrayal, secret codes, priest-holes, charred bones, an exploding box, the lot! The historical background, as one might expect from this author, has been well-researched and there is a welcome lack of gadzookery. Puritans come off badly, though - where they are "obsessive", they are "mean and cautious". One may pray and pray and be a villain. But the tale rattles along to a climax that augurs well for further adventures of Tom Verney, which will no doubt take us into the civil war and beyond.

Ivan Roots

## SUMMER SEASON 1994

\*\*\*\*\*

The Cromwell Museum,  
Grammar School Walk,  
Huntingdon.  
Tel (0480) 425830.

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

free admission

\*\*\*\*\*

Oliver Cromwell's House,  
29 St Mary's Street,  
Ely.  
Tel (0353) 662062.

open every day 10am-6pm  
(guided tours at 15 minutes past  
& 15 minutes to the hour)

admission charge

\*\*\*\*\*

The Commandery,  
Sidbury,  
Worcester.  
Tel (0905) 355071.

open Monday-Saturday 10am-5pm  
Sunday 1.30-5.30pm

admission charge

## CROMWELLIANA

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

ISBN 0-905729-05-6

