

Cromwelliana

The Journal of
The Cromwell Association



1998

The Cromwell Association

President: Dr JOHN MORRILL, DPhil, FRHistS
Vice Presidents: Baron FOOT of Buckland Monachorum
Right Hon MICHAEL FOOT, PC
Professor IVAN ROOTS, MA, FSA, FRHistS
Professor AUSTIN WOOLRYCH, MA, DLitt, FBA
Dr GERALD AYLMEYER, MA, DPhil, FBA, FRHistS
Miss PAT BARNES
Mr TREWIN COPPLESTONE, FRGS
Chairman: Dr PETER GAUNT, PhD, FRHistS

Honorary Secretary: Mr Michael Byrd
12 Milton Road, Maldon, Essex, CM9 6BT

Honorary Treasurer: Mr JOHN WESTMACOTT
1 Salisbury Close, Wokingham, Berkshire, RG41 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, CM9 6BT

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

CROMWELLIANA 1998

edited by Peter Gaunt

CONTENTS

Cromwell Day 1997. Oliver Cromwell: Peacemaker. By Professor J C Davis.	2
The Battle of Gainsborough, 28 July 1643. By Dr Peter Gaunt.	8
King-Killing No Murder: Cromwell in 1648. By Dr John Morrill.	12
Writings and Sources II. Cromwell's Letters of 1648.	22
Admiral Robert Blake (1599-1657) and Admiral Lord Nelson: Master and Disciple? By Alan Smith.	39
New Information with Regard to the Imprisonment of Major General John Lambert, 1662-1684. By Dr David Farr.	44
Cromwellian Britain XI. Harrow, Middlesex. By Jane A Mills.	57
Select Bibliography of Publications.	62
Book Reviews. By Professor Ivan Roots, Dr Peter Gaunt & Jane A Mills.	71

ISBN 0-905729-09-9

CROMWELL DAY 1997
OLIVER CROMWELL: PEACEMAKER

by J C Davis

Civil wars are doubly difficult for peacemakers. The Balkans, Central Africa and Northern Ireland, to venture no further, provide ample and obvious illustrations of this in our own day. Like civil wars, international conflicts may be ended by exhaustion, stalemate, military triumph or international intervention. But, unlike civil wars, they tend to result in communities united against a common enemy, or in the face of shared deprivation or in the aftermath of shared disaster. In making peace between countries, the enlightened peacemaker usually has some elements of social cohesion from which to work. Civil war, on the contrary, is the tragedy of a community divided against itself. The passion, mortality, injury and material damage of civil war are, in the last resort, fratricidal in intent and, consequently, such conflicts are always steeped in a sense of betrayal. Unquestioning loyalty, mutual empathy and tolerance - the ligaments which normally hold civil society together - are set aside for more partial, more sectarian causes and the resentment and hurt over what has been sacrificed runs deep. There is a social pathology to be studied by those who would understand societies emerging from the trauma of civil war. Those who would impose peace, the armed peace, are part of the pathogen. Those who would make peace - rather than impose it - must come to terms with the pathology. The legacy of civil wars is bitterness, distrust, resentment and, above all, a profound sense of betrayal. Blessed are the peacemakers but doubly blessed must be those who attempt to make peace after civil war.

The conflict which destroys civil society may also be a springboard to greatness. Such is the case for the man whose life and greatness we commemorate today. The image of Oliver Cromwell, the civil warrior, is familiar and Thornycroft's statue, at the foot of which we stand this afternoon, seeks to embody it. Without the English Civil War, Cromwell might well have remained in obscurity: a figure, perhaps, to be found in the footnotes of English history; a

not particularly adept parliamentarian, operating on the brink of political eclipse. The civil war made him. Those qualities which we have come to identify as his - vigour (verging on near hysteria in 1643); sudden decisiveness after prolonged indecision; the mystery of his tactical and strategic insight; ruthlessness and a growing skill in the exploitation of (that confirmation of providential approval) military success as a trump card in political infighting - all of these were well matched to the exigencies of civil conflict. But they are not the qualities which best equip the maker, rather than the imposer, of peace, particularly in the aftermath of civil war. Was Cromwell, then, seriously unfitted for the needs of a post-civil war England and does this explain the failure of his Protectorate? I think not and I invite you to spend a few minutes with me today considering Cromwell the peacemaker.

Let us note those things which are required to reconstruct civil society out of the ashes of civil war. First, the replacement of the rule of violence and will by the rule of law. I need refer you no further than to David Smith's excellent address to you on Cromwell Day 1994.¹ Oliver's faith in Parliament as 'a bed of reconciliation', his sense of its public responsibility as a means of procuring law based in communal consent remained undimmed. He rejected the destruction of the traditional social order in favour of winning the cooperation of those who governed the shires and boroughs. His preferred means of achieving this - however limited its success in practice - remained their representation in parliament. Equally, his decision to maintain the Commission for the Great Seal in the hands of the Earl of Kent, Bulstrode Whitelocke and Sir Thomas Widdrington was a decision to maintain the administration of the law in as near to accustomed channels as possible. The corollary of the maintenance of civil rule was, of course, the wind-down of military capability. Allowing for the fluctuations triggered by crises, Cromwell was persistent in pursuit of this goal. The military establishment fell from about 60,000 at the end of 1652, to about 53,000 in 1654, to about 45,000 in 1657. Even that political and PR disaster, the Major-Generals experiment, we now see as 'part of a plan to reduce the overall size and structure of the military'.²

So Cromwell sought to shift the post-war balance from soldiers to civilians, from swordsmen to gentlemen and lawyers. It was always

going to be extremely difficult; such is the legacy of civil wars. Without a corresponding shift of values from those of aggression and suspicion to those of fairness and regularity, tolerance and understanding, with a willingness to address genuine grievances, it was going to be impossible. What is remarkable is how hard Cromwell worked to bring that shift about. I would not wish to suggest that peacemaking is the single key to unlocking Cromwell's complexities and ambiguities, but it is important to balance the warrior with the peacemaker. The contrast we so often observe in his personal qualities may owe something to personal ambiguity but it owes as much to the shift of roles from war maker to peace maker.

Time and again we find him seeking to establish common ground with old and new adversaries; to win them over with 'no compulsion, but that of light and reason'.³ We find him insisting upon 'impartial justice'.⁴ The oath he took as Protector on 16 December 1653 saw him promise 'Justice and Law to be equally administered'.⁵ Reconciliation, as he told the first Protectoral Parliament on 4 September 1654, necessitated 'a reciprocation' if 'scatterings, division and confusion' were not to be perpetuated.⁶ Writing to presbyterian ministers in Northumberland, Durham and Newcastle on 18 December 1656, the Protector commended their healing agenda: the growth of religion; the purity and reformation of the churches; the maintenance of good magistracy; 'the endeavour of all possible union'; the forbearance of differences and the healing of breaches.⁷ It was the godly peacemaker's agenda and Cromwell not only endorsed but consistently pursued it, however thankless a task it must have appeared to him on occasion.

The Lord spoke peace to his saints. Meditating on this with the members of both Houses at Whitehall on 25 January 1658, Cromwell spoke of

Dissension, division, destruction, in a poor nation under a civil war, having all the effects of a civil war upon it. Indeed if we return again to folly, let every man consider if it be not like to be our destruction.⁸

Like many successful, indeed ruthless, military men, Cromwell came to fear the return of war. His first sustained attempts as a mediator, a fixer for peace, came in 1647 when civil war between one-time allies appeared distinctly possible. He worked to reconcile parliament and the New Model Army, to settle with the King through the Heads of Proposals and to incorporate the settlement in law through a legislative programme being pushed forward in September and October of that year. The prospect of such a settlement was wrecked by the supreme folly of the King and the intransigent idealism of Levellers and sects. Even the providential significance of victory in a second civil war did not at first inhibit him from continuing the attempt to reconcile all three to a moderate settlement. The exercise proved impossible and the execution of the King and the crushing of the Levellers followed. But the goal - moderate settlement and reconciliation - remained and is indeed the leit-motif of all the twists and turns of the 1650s. Moderation and settlement have been, of course, unfashionable but they remain the indispensables of peacemaking after civil war. Like others in that role Cromwell found, as he told his last parliament, that 'men have more anger than strength. They have not power to obtain their ends'.⁹ It was necessary, therefore, to lead them away from anger to wisdom. But to many of the saints, as William Lamont reminded you in 1993, the 'good constable' was no substitute for the 'spiritual police force' for which they longed.¹⁰ Was Cromwell right to resist their public blandishments, recognising that spiritual totalitarianism would not produce peace but further division? In the end it meant an imposed peace, if not continuing conflict, and Cromwell's goal was a made peace, peace without arms. In July 1650, as Cromwell marched upon the Scots, they were promised that no form of church government would be imposed upon them by force.¹¹ Even the Irish, earlier in the same year, were promised equal justice and liberty of conscience under the law (which, of course, excluded the mass).¹²

Within the limits of his own intellectual context, Cromwell sought to make, rather than to impose, peace. He sought to reconstruct civil society in the aftermath of civil war. Thomas Hobbes's answer to the devastation of the war of all against all was to propose a Leviathan, an authority with power sufficient to impose peace. Cromwell chose the more difficult, but more noble path, of making

peace by reconciliation and reciprocation. How should we assess his achievement in this respect? John Morley's judgement - 'Wherever force was useless, Cromwell failed' - seems to me unduly harsh.¹³ The Day of Solemn Fasting and Humiliation to which he summoned the nation in late March 1654 came with an agenda of questions for consideration and heart searching. It was once again the peacemaker's agenda, asking for tolerance, humility, mutual consideration and reciprocity. Do we contend for faith with 'Love, Patience, Tenderness, Zeal by persuasion? Or rather imposingly, proudly, carnally, provokingly, sensually...' 'Is Brotherly Love, and a Healing Spirit of that force and value amongst us that it ought?'¹⁴ In a Proclamation of 15 February 1655, Cromwell appealed for an end to religious disturbances in observation of 'the Royal Law of Love and Christian Moderation'.¹⁵ Such appeals can appear naive to us but only if we fail to grasp the alternatives. In January 1658 Cromwell recognised that there were still many who could not be satisfied with a Protector and a bicameral Parliament. Yet, what but this, he asked, could prevent England from becoming again a field of blood, an Aceldama?¹⁶ At his death, 339 years ago today, there was still no answer to his question. Such peace as there was was still an armed peace.

My purpose in focussing on Cromwell the peacemaker is not to praise him but to recognise the genuineness of his desire to make, rather than impose, peace in England after harrowing civil conflict; to acknowledge his resourcefulness and persistence in peacemaking as well as the limitations of his achievements and the reasons for them.

William Sedgewick, a not uncritical appraiser of the Protector, admonished the godly in 1656:

...though this present state of things be very reprobable, having much evil in it; yet none of you have come forth in Righteousness and Judgement against it, nor in a Light that is able either to Convince or Instruct; but a deal of weak and dark Accusations, from mindes uneasie and sick with Passion and Discontent, all tending to blow up a Spirit of Wrath and Violence, and so to multiply our Wounds and Maladies not to cure them.¹⁷

In the cause of curing those maladies and healing those wounds, Oliver Cromwell may be said to have played an honourable, even heroic, role as peacemaker.

Notes

1. David L Smith, 'Oliver Cromwell: A Great Parliamentarian?', *Cromwelliana* (1995), pp. 2-7.
2. Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London, 1996), p. 210.
3. W C Abbott (ed), *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (4 vols, Cambridge, Mass, 1937-47), I, 377, cf II, 285.
4. *Ibid*, I, 690.
5. *Ibid*, III, 137.
6. *Ibid*, III, 452, 401.
7. *Ibid*, IV, 361-2.
8. *Ibid*, IV, 720.
9. *Ibid*, IV, 717.
10. William Lamont, 'Oliver Cromwell and English Calvinism', *Cromwelliana* (1994), pp. 2-6.
11. Abbott, *Writings and Speeches*, II, 285.
12. *Ibid*, II, 196-9.
13. John Morley, *Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1904), p. 6.
14. Abbott, *Writings and Speeches*, III, 227, 226.
15. *Ibid*, III, 626.
16. *Ibid*, IV, 717-8.
17. William Sedgewick, *Animadversions upon A Letter and Paper* (1656), A2.

Colin Davis is Professor of English History and Pro-Vice-Chancellor at the University of East Anglia. His published works include *Utopia and the Ideal Society* (1981), *Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (1986) and a chapter on 'Cromwell's religion' in J S Morrill (ed), *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (1990).

THE BATTLE OF GAINSBOROUGH, 28 JULY 1643

by Peter Gaunt

The battle of Gainsborough in Lincolnshire was one of a string of medium-sized engagements fought during the first full year of the English Civil War, as the royalists advanced southwards and eastwards across England and took territory from the parliamentarians. The story of the civil war in Lincolnshire conforms very much to that general pattern. Royalist forces, by early spring dominating Yorkshire to the north, established a salient running south into Nottinghamshire and along the very western fringes of Lincolnshire, providing communications with their major stronghold of Newark. During spring and summer 1643 successive waves of royalists pushed eastwards, across the line of the Trent, attempting to eat into Lincolnshire and also the northern fringes of Cambridgeshire, both then under parliamentary control. One of their prime targets was the prosperous but lightly defended town of Gainsborough.

The course of the battle can be swiftly told. The town had already changed hands twice, captured by the royalists in March but recaptured by parliamentary forces in mid July. By the last week of July the small parliamentary garrison in Gainsborough, commanded by the lacklustre Lord Willoughby, was under pressure from a royalist army under Charles Cavendish, intent on retaking the town. The parliamentarians raised a relief army, a little over 1000-strong, predominantly of horse and dragoons. Approaching Gainsborough from the south on 28 July, the parliamentarians brushed aside a royalist advanced guard south of the town, around the village of Lea. The main royalist army was drawn up around the summit of Foxby Hill, the low hill immediately south-east of the town. If Gainsborough was to be relieved, the parliamentarians had little choice but to engage this army, which would entail attacking up the far from steep but quite noticeable slope of the hill, and over ground riddled with rabbit holes, difficult for mounted troops. Nonetheless, despite these disadvantages, the parliamentarians did push on up the hillside and, after a brief but fierce engagement, succeeded in mauling, breaking and putting to flight the royalist

army. Many of the royalists were pursued into marshy ground south of the town; many, including Cavendish himself, perished there.

In some ways the battle was of limited significance, for it did not change the course of the war in the area. A much larger royalist army approached Gainsborough on the following day and, heavily outnumbered, the bulk of the parliamentary army was forced to retreat. The small garrison left behind surrendered the town on the last day of July. The royalists continued to roll eastwards across Lincolnshire during the summer of 1643, at one point controlling two thirds of the county. The battle of Gainsborough had proved to be only a very minor and brief set-back to this royalist advance. Not until well into the autumn did the royalist tide show signs of ebbing. In part this was a result of the King's men becoming distracted by a fruitless operation against the now isolated parliamentary enclave at Hull. In part, too, the reversal was caused by the ability of the parliamentary forces to regroup and to inflict upon the royalists a far more crushing and long-lasting defeat at Winceby, near Bolingbroke, on 11 October 1643. It was Winceby which proved the turning point for parliamentary fortunes in Lincolnshire; Gainsborough had been a false and fleeting dawn.

In the wider history of the civil war, the battle of Gainsborough is probably more significant for the part played here by Oliver Cromwell. Cromwell, at this point merely a colonel, though one of the rising stars of the parliamentary war effort in the East Midlands, had already been involved in a number of sieges and minor skirmishes. At Gainsborough he had a far larger role in a much larger operation, for he seems to have been in overall command of the relieving army which engaged and defeated Cavendish's men. As such, it would have formed one of the moulding experiences in the military career of the man who came to dominate the parliamentary war effort. At Gainsborough Cromwell learned a very valuable lesson. In letters written after the battle, Cromwell recounts that he noticed that the royalist commander, Cavendish, had held back one of his regiments in reserve, even as the rest of his army was disintegrating in the face of the parliamentary onslaught - '...I, perceiving this body which was the reserve standing still unbroken...'. There was a real danger, therefore, that as the

parliamentary army lost shape, believing victory was already assured, and began pursuing royalist units off the battlefield, Cavendish might yet have been able to unleash this reserve and carry the day. With difficulty - '...with much ado...' - Cromwell was able to hold back some of his own men and prevent them joining the increasingly ragged pursuit - 'I...kept back my major, Whaley, from the chase, and with my own troop and one other of my regiment, in all being three troops, we got into a body'. The parliamentarians therefore still had troops in good order and tight formation when Cavendish duly committed his reserve, and they were able to break this last element of the royalist army:

At last the General [Cavendish] charged the Lincolnners, and routed them. I immediately fell on his rear with my three troops, which did so astonish him, that he gave over the chase, and would fain have delivered himself from me, but I pressing on forced them down a hill, having good execution of them, and below the hill, drove the General with some of his soldiers into a quagmire, where my captain-lieutenant slew him with a thrust under his short ribs. The rest of the body was wholly routed, not one man staying upon the place.

It is generally claimed, quite rightly, that one of Cromwell's main strengths as a cavalry commander lay in his ability to retain tight control over his troops on the battlefield, to prevent them disintegrating into disorder and pursuit at the first sign that the enemy forces were breaking, and instead to keep them on the battlefield until the entire enemy army had been defeated and complete victory was assured. It is often argued that he learnt this lesson at the battle of Edgehill, the first major engagement of the civil war, in October 1642, at which Prince Rupert's victorious royalist cavalry careered off the battlefield in pursuit of the broken parliamentary horse, allowing the parliamentary foot to regroup and effectively to force a draw. However, Captain Cromwell's role at Edgehill is obscure, and it is likely that he and his troop of horse did not arrive on the battlefield until very late in the day, after the main developments had occurred. Thus it is possible that Cromwell learnt the value of retaining tight control over his men, and of ensuring that they stayed on the battlefield in good order until the

entire enemy had been defeated, not at Edgehill in autumn 1642 but at Gainsborough in July 1643.

On 28 July 1995 a monument to the battle was unveiled on the lower slopes of Foxby Hill, an area now partly covered by the southern suburbs of the town. A large standing stone to which is affixed a metal plate bearing a brief memorial inscription, the monument stands adjoining the road called Foxby Hill, a quarter of a mile from its junction with Lea Road, the main Gainsborough to Lincoln road (the A156). It was erected by Gainsborough Council, with support from The Cromwell Association.

Note

Three letters by Cromwell give an account of the Battle of Gainsborough and related events. The first, dated from Lincoln at 6 pm on 29 July, was signed jointly by Cromwell and two Lincolnshire parliamentary commissioners, Edward Ayscoghe and John Broxholme, and was written in the first personal plural. The other two letters, both signed by Cromwell alone and more personal in tone, are couched in the first personal singular; they were written on 30 July and 31 July, the latter when Cromwell was back in Huntingdon. All three letters are reproduced in W C Abbott (ed), *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (4 vols, Cambridge, Mass, 1937-47), I, 240-46.

Peter Gaunt is a Senior Lecturer at University College Chester. His published works include *The Cromwellian Gazetteer* (1987), *Oliver Cromwell* (1996) and *The British Wars, 1637-51* (1997). He is Chairman of The Cromwell Association.

by John Morrill

Not the least of the unresolved problems about the career of Oliver Cromwell is the problem of quite when, how and why he decided that Charles I had to be tried and executed. This is not quite the same question as whether he believed monarchy should be overthrown, for when in 1657 he agonised over the offer of the Crown to himself, he revealed doubts about the propriety of the latter but none about the former. On 30 January 1649 Oliver was a determined Regicide, but an uncertain Republican.

There was nothing in his career down to the autumn of 1647 that suggests that Cromwell was one of that tiny minority of Parliamentarians willing to contemplate the deposition of Charles I. Although much mud was thrown at him during the debates that led into the Self-Denying Ordinance and the creation of the New Model, no allegation was made that he wished to pull down monarchy rather than press on heedless to outright military victory over the King and an imposed settlement. On the contrary, Cromwell was at the forefront of the coalition of New Model officers and M.P.s (the so-called 'Independent' alliance) who were involved in secret negotiations with Charles based on what became known as the Heads of the Proposals. Their aim was to get themselves into office, to secure the interests of the Army, and to offer a religious settlement more congenial to the King than the one offered by their rivals in Parliament and that group's Scottish allies. They wanted the King to accept a 'Presbyterian' church settlement throughout his dominions. Members of the Independent alliance were willing to permit the restoration of the old church with Bishops and Prayer Book, so long as it was shorn of all coercive power, and so long as there was a guarantee of freedom of worship and full equality of civil rights for those who wished to opt out of the national church and into their own religious assemblies and communities. At the Putney Debates in November 1647, Cromwell fiercely defended the monarchy against republican attack and he dug in on the right of himself and his fellow senior officers (under license from the General Council) to conduct a personal treaty with

Charles I. Indeed, in a forthcoming article I will maintain that it was a threat to the future of the monarchy that led to a news blackout at Putney as Cromwell and Ireton stormed out of a meeting on 5 November and ordered transcripts of that day's proceedings to be destroyed.

Yet throughout January 1649, Cromwell was to prove the most resolute of all the military and political leaders in putting the King on trial for his life. What made it more possible for him than for so many others who had travelled with him in the wars of the 1640s to reach that decision?

There are two major areas of difficulty. The first is whether, when the Army Council committed itself - no later than the great prayer meetings at Windsor in late April 1648 - to putting 'Charles Stuart, that Man of Blood' on trial for shedding the innocent blood of his subject, Cromwell was in the lead, or following hesitantly and reluctantly behind. His actions appear to support the latter view - for Cromwell seems to have delayed his return from the North after mopping up the remains of the second civil war in Yorkshire in the late autumn of 1648; and - as the political crisis deepened in London in early December - he dawdled in Hertfordshire, only finally arriving in London after Pride's Purge on 6 December. Yet his words seem to me to suggest an earlier commitment to radical action, and to this we must return. The second area of contention concerns his actions once in London in early December. S R Gardiner a century ago gathered several shards of evidence of Cromwell's reluctance to push ahead with an *immediate* trial. For example, he seems to have thrown himself behind the decision to send yet another delegation down to the King - the so-called Denbigh mission - to see if Charles would now negotiate seriously. Only when the King continued to duck and weave did Cromwell commit himself whole-heartedly to the establishment of the High Court of Justice and the trial and execution. From then on, no-one doubts Cromwell's commitment to Regicide. But Gardiner is more persuasive in showing that Cromwell sought to *defer* the trial than to *prevent* it and the significance of that distinction has not been explored as fully as it might be.

Most of the best biographies hedge their bets over these issues. For example, Sir Charles Firth, relying too heavily on what we now know to have been the heavily bowdlerised *Memoirs* of Edmund Ludlow, argues that by the spring of 1648 Cromwell was convinced of the desirability of getting rid of the King, but not of the feasibility of it. He also believes that this remained his position even after Pride's Purge and the removal of more than half of all M.P.s from the Houses on 7 December: 'he approved of the seizure of the King and had no doubt of the justice of bringing him to trial. But he doubted the policy of the King's trial and condemnation.' It was the King's refusal to treat with the Denbigh commission that Cromwell helped to set up, that finally persuaded him that 'the king preferred to part with his life rather than with his regal power'.

Barry Coward believes that

what converted Cromwell to the use of force against parliament and to regicide were his experiences in the Second Civil War...There was no overnight conversion, but during the period he was away from London...he gradually came to see events in a totally different light from those who did not take part in the war...

Coward places great weight on Cromwell's use of the word 'necessity'. In what proved his eventual commitment to Regicide on 26 December 1648, Coward believes, Cromwell said that 'providence and necessity had cast them upon it.' My problem here is with Coward's definition of 'necessity' as 'the dictates of political reality'. We shall return to this.

Peter Gaunt has a similar view of the timings: 'slowly, hesitantly and perhaps unwillingly, Cromwell came round to support both the trial and execution, driven forward by the messages which he felt God was sending to him personally and the army in general'. He too sees him as resisting Regicide until the last days of December.

It may be so. Few years in Cromwell's life after 1640 are as poorly documented as 1648. We get a series of tantalising glimpses of his state of mind in a total of some fifteen public and private statements. We do not know where he was at many crucial junctures - for

example, on 28 April when the House of Commons was reneging on its pledge not to enter into any communication with the King and simultaneously the Army Council was at prayer in Windsor beseeching God to show them the way forward. He may have been at either or neither meeting. But on the other hand, we do have letters in which he appears to lay bare the inner workings of his mind - letters to Fairfax, to Lord Wharton, to his cousin St John, letters whose principal function is to share the significance of particular biblical passages to present affairs; and above all there were the four letters to a remoter relative, Robert Hammond (son-in-law of John Hampden, brother of a future Regicide and nephew of one of the King's favourite chaplains) whose wavering support for the Army's political and religious priorities he seeks to steady.

Time and again, Cromwell resorts to the Bible *and acted on it*. Historians have often spoken of his discussions of these Biblical texts as unclear, vague or ambiguous, and implied a deliberate lack of clarity. I want to suggest that a more careful attention to the biblical rhetoric, content and context (such as those he was addressing would have had) offers clarification, not obfuscation.

Cromwell knew large parts of the Bible by heart, as his habit of quoting extracts from it containing phrases from both the King James and the Geneva versions shows. At all the crucial junctures of his life - for example after each of his greatest victories - he combined factual accounts of the battle with his sense of what that victory revealed of God's purposes. In all his more intensely personal as well as in his most excited public utterances, he would commonly write a paragraph that was a dense cluster of Biblical references, built around a core text. For example, the famous letter of 1638 in which he described his conversion experience to his cousin, Mrs St John, contains two paragraphs in which Cromwell drew on eight psalms and five epistles. But the spine of the letter, the text around which it is based and to which the others are decorations, is Philippians chapter 4, in which St Paul gives thanks for the support he has been given during his imprisonment and calls for the unity and purposefulness of the faithful under persecution. The imprisoned Paul tells of the all-sufficiency of Christ in all circumstances. Similarly his speech to the Nominated Assembly in July 1653 contains an extended meditation on what Cromwell

termed 'that famous Psalm, sixty-eighth psalm, which indeed is a glorious prophecy...of the gospel churches' - 'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered...Let the righteous be glad, let them rejoice before God, let them rejoice exceedingly...'.

I believe that a study of his speeches in 1648 allows us a clear sense of a man increasingly convinced that God is willing the King's death.

Throughout his life Cromwell had a strong sense of God's providence. It was rooted in his reading of the Old Testament, which at one level is the story of God's personal appearances - in dreams, visions, burning bushes, pillars of fire - to challenge his chosen people and to give them stark choices: obedience and reward, disobedience and punishment; obedience and the rewards of Canaan, disobedience and slavery in Egypt or Babylon. Cromwell makes more references - especially in his writings to 1649 - to the Psalms than to any other book of the Bible; and amongst the psalms, to those with the strongest sense of God's palpable presence and activity in the activities of mankind. This sense of God's visibility in scripture and human events had no doubt been developed from his childhood by his teacher Thomas Beard, who was the author of one of the standard works on God's active presence in the world rewarding virtue and punishing vice - *The Theatre of God's Judgement* - but much more he had learned from the absolutely routine rhetorical device of godly preachers as exemplified by the Fast Sermons that there was an actual and real parallel between the choices offered to the people of the Old Testament and the people of the present time. The particular dilemmas and choices of the people of England in 1648 were *precisely* the same as particular dilemmas and choices of the people of Israel. It was appropriate and necessary for men to identify the parallels in their own lives and to act on them. We will see shortly that in 1648 Cromwell seems to have meditated upon three such parallels.

The sweep of Cromwell's writings throughout 1648 suggests a man who feels guided by God and clear of the end though not quite of the means. The change can be traced back to his histrionics in Parliament on 3 January 1648 when, gripping his sword handle, he

asserted that the King had broken his trust and that this represented a fundamental change. The Army had previously committed itself to monarchy 'unless necessity enforce an alteration'. Note that word 'necessity' again. We shall return to it. He never again discussed the King except as someone who had put himself outside the protection of God's people. For the whole of 1648 Cromwell's concern was not whether to remove the King but when and how. A letter to Robert Hammond written on 3 January about the Vote of No Addresses is already robust in its language about that. Cromwell saw the second civil war as a sacrilegious act, as an affront to the sovereignty of God, and he called for condign punishment upon all its authors. And so after each of the major episodes in the second war, unlike any of those in the first, the leaders were put on trial and some were executed in cold blood. And the language of judgement on the authors of the war had to extend to the King himself. The questions were when and how, not whether. Cromwell spoke of providence throughout his life, but never with the persistence or confidence of 1648. Twelve letters speak of Providence and eight of Necessity.

By the time of Pride's Purge, Cromwell's encounter with the bible had caused him to see in the choices God had presented to his chosen people in ancient Israel the same choices he was presenting to his new chosen people. The choices were strictly comparable, but they were false choices: to follow God's preferred route and enter the Promised Land, to ignore it and trek back to Egypt. My suggestion is that if we are to understand the confidence, drive, certainty that allowed Oliver Cromwell to abandon his belief in the inevitability of Charles I and the necessity of monarchy, this is it.

By 6 December 1648, I do not believe that Cromwell doubted the need to put the King on trial. The only question was whether it was to be the culmination of the trials and investigations into the events of the previous year, or an immediate act. Cromwell was aware of the desperately narrow basis of support for what was intended. If the trial of the King was the culmination of a sequence of trials revealing the depths of his duplicity, he could hope that the civilian Independents, at least, would come back on side. Furthermore the Army had called the 'King a Man of Blood' and the Book of Numbers predicted that God would harden the heart of the Man of

Blood and that he would bring destruction on himself. Is this what lay behind the Denbigh mission: not a hope it might succeed, but a certainty that it would fail and that the King's inability to deal honestly even in extremis would become all the more obvious? I would suggest that Cromwell was not hesitant and wavering in 1648. He was letting God's plan unfold at its own pace.

As I suggested earlier, in 1648 Cromwell seems to have found three parallels between Old Testament times and present times, the first two relating directly to himself and the first and third drawn from nearby chapters of the book of Numbers. The first of these parallels was between himself and Phineas, the High Priest of the time of Moses who saved the Israelites from a great plague by standing out against idolatry and by by-passing due legal process and summarily executing a leading member of the Israelite community caught in an adulterous embrace with a Midianite (heathen) woman. This story was the basis of a sermon preached to Parliament in December 1648 and applied to current politics, and it is referred to by Cromwell both at the time and in a letter to Lord Wharton after the event.

Much more significant, however, was Cromwell's references to the story of Gideon. Let us recall the story of Gideon, who had been called from the plough to lead the armies of Israel. He winnowed the armies, reducing it to a small, compact force made of Israel's russet-coated captains and he destroyed the Midianites and harried their fleeing army for 200 miles as Cromwell did after Preston. He then executed the Kings of the Midianites, denying them quarter because they had shed innocent blood on Mt Tabor. He then refused to take the crown himself and returned, loaded with honours, to his farm. It is not surprising that Cromwell found this a powerful story and suitable to his condition in 1648. He made reference to the story of Gideon on four occasions. Indeed his account of the battle of Preston, written the day after the battle and sent to Speaker Lenthall, reads less like other accounts of the battle of Preston than it does of the Biblical account of Gideon's defeat of the Midianites at Ain Harod. Perhaps the most graphic use of the story came in an early outburst to Fairfax in the middle of letter full of nitty-gritty military matters as he swept through South Wales in June 1648:

I pray God teach this nation...what the mind of God may be in all this, and what our duty is. Surely it is not that the pious godly people of this Kingdom should still be the objects of wrath and anger, nor that our God would have our necks under a yoke of bondage; for these things that have lately come to pass have been the wonderful works of God; breaking the rod of the oppressor, as in the day of Midian, not with garments much rolled in blood but by the terror of the Lord.

This passage draws on Galatians, on Acts and on the Second Letter to the Corinthians, but the central image with its reference to the breaking of the Midianites is from Isaiah chapter 9, and as we will see shortly, that might in the end be the more important point. For against my hope and desire, Cromwell's allusions to Gideon are all passing ones; there is no sustained meditation on his story.

The third possible Old Testament parallel was with the typing of 'Charles I' as 'the Man of Blood' - that is a man who had shed innocent blood and against whom God required justice at human hands. It was this that led many junior officers and soldiers to demand in Cromwell's hearing at Windsor that Charles Stuart as 'a man of blood' should atone for his shedding of innocent blood in accordance with the requirements of the Book of Numbers [35 v. 33]:

Ye shall not defile the land wherein ye are: for blood it defileth the land; and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it.

The application of this to that man of blood Charles Stuart sustained many in the months that followed. But Cromwell himself never endorsed it, although he did for the only time that I can discover, twice draw on references from the Book of Numbers in the course of 1648.

In the end, these personal applications tantalise more than they convince. But the more general point, that Cromwell returns again and again to key texts and themes is, I think, more persuasive. Thus the June letter to Fairfax was just one of several occasions on which

he meditated on Isaiah chapters 8 and 9. Indeed he wrote to Oliver St John on 1 September 1648, a week after the Battle of Preston, telling him that 'this scripture hath been of great stay with me, Isaiah eight, 10. 11. 14. Read the whole chapter...'. The early chapters of Isaiah are a sustained and bitter attack on the arrogance and hypocrisy of the rulers of Israel, and chapters 8 and 9 are about how most of the people have missed out on righteousness and those who follow the idolatrous leaders of Judah and Israel will be destroyed. So

Associate yourselves, o ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces...gird yourselves and you shall be broken in pieces...But I will wait upon the Lord that hideth his face from the house of Israel, and I will look for him, Behold I and the children whom the Lord has given me are for signs and wonders in Israel...

Within days he was writing in wonder at how a godly minority had seized power in Scotland, expelled the corrupt majority from the Scottish Parliament and set up godly rule: 'Think of the example and of the consequences, and let others think of it too.' The connection between this wonderment and the subsequent purge of the English Parliament is palpable.

Cromwell was working out his own destiny in relation to God's plan, and God was no democrat. He had worked through a godly remnant in the days of Isaiah and he could and would do so again. This is the essence of those remarkable letters Cromwell wrote to Robert Hammond in the late autumn of 1648, pleading with him to discern God's providential hand in current affairs. Nowhere was the clustering of biblical gobbets more dense. One paragraph alone in the letter of 25 November has 24 citations from eleven biblical books, with especial focus on the Epistle of James [ch. 1 vv. 2-6] with its exhortation to Christians 'to ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed', and from Romans 8, with its great cry that, freed from the law, the true Christian must look beyond present deprivations to the presence of the Holy Spirit. Life in such a situation, says both St Paul and Cromwell, is life beyond hazard.

Cromwell's encounter with scripture empowered him and his only way of explaining and justifying himself to himself in his most intimate letters and to others in his public statements was by taking his auditors through his own process of discovery and revelation. Time and again, he tells his critics that their arguments are intellectually strong - unanswerable indeed - but that they are not *necessary* arguments. And necessity for Cromwell meant the process of discernment and falling in with the will of God. Power, he told the Nominated Assembly on 4 July 1653, 'has come to you by way of necessity: by the wise providences of God'; and in rejecting the offer of the crown in 1657, he begs those negotiating with him to show him that the 'necessary grounds' and he clearly means the God-given grounds. He could not rebut their arguments, he told them, they were 'so strong and rational.' They were arguments of expediency and 'probability towards conclusiveness'. But they were not rooted in Necessity, for God had appeared providentially in striking down the person and office, and the only argument that could convince him was a providentialist one, that God had revealed his Will to be the restoration of the title and office. That would be the 'necessary ground'.

So when Cromwell says in 1648 that 'providence and necessity' had cast him and his fellow-officers upon Regicide, he meant not that they had fallen in with political reality, but with the revealed Will of God. As Colin Davis put it: the concern for religious liberty in the English Revolution had 'less to do than we care to think about the preoccupation of groups and individuals than with the freedom of God Almighty', but the ability to discern and identify with God's freedom could be and was for men like Oliver Cromwell utterly liberating and utterly empowering. Like all forms of belief in divine mandates, it troubles the modern secular mind. But when it comes to explaining the only true revolution in British History, it has an explanatory force whose depths we have not yet plumbed.

John Morrill is Fellow and Vice Master of Selwyn College and Reader in Early Modern History at the University of Cambridge. He has written and edited a large number of books, including *The Revolt of the Provinces* (1980), *Reactions to the English Civil War* (1982), *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (1990) and *The Impact of the English Civil War* (1991). He is President of The Cromwell Association.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES II

CROMWELL'S LETTERS OF 1648

Cromwell's letters constitute probably the best and most important source for reconstructing his life and career between the outbreak of the civil war and the beginning of the Protectorate. Few letters survive from the pre-war decades of relatively obscurity; from 1653 onwards the letters become fewer and less informative and are eclipsed by the string of great and revealing speeches which Cromwell delivered to the Nominated Assembly, his Protectorate parliaments and other military and civilian gatherings. But for a period of a little over ten years, the most important years of Cromwell's life during which he rose from inexperienced captain to all-conquering Lord General and from obscure backbencher to statesman and head of state, we possess an abundance of letters, a rich seam repeatedly quarried by historians. Through his letters, we can reconstruct Cromwell's travels around England and Wales and to Ireland and Scotland, can follow his military campaigns in what are now coming to be called the 'British wars' or the 'wars of the three kingdoms', and can discern his growing power and involvement in politics. But more than this, we can gain insights into Cromwell the man, his hopes and fears, his ambitions, achievements and set-backs, his assurance that he was following God's will and the strong religious beliefs which drove him forward.

Elsewhere in this edition, John Morrill has sought to explore how Cromwell's attitude towards the King and his views on a possible trial and execution unfolded and were revealed during 1648, the year of renewed civil war in England and Wales and of a pro-royalist invasion launched by parliament's former allies, the Scots. Dr Morrill draws heavily upon Cromwell's letters of 1648, though - as he notes - the surviving correspondence is disappointingly thin. In part to complement Dr Morrill's paper, in part to mark Cromwell's role in this the 350th anniversary of the year of the second civil war, some of Cromwell's letters of 1648 are reprinted here.

The letters printed in part or in whole below form only a selection of those which survive from 1648. There are others, concerning his son Richard's proposed marriage, giving military accounts of his actions in South Wales, at Preston and before Pontefract, relating to his mission to Scotland in the early autumn, and recommending named individuals for appointment or support. The letters reprinted here have been chosen because they reveal something of Cromwell's political as well as his religious thinking and to a greater or lesser extent convey his thoughts about the King and/or the future political settlement of the country. The texts have been taken from Thomas Carlyle's *The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, which was first published in the 1840s but which went through many subsequent editions, edited by Carlyle and later by others, steadily enlarged to incorporate further Cromwellian material that had come to light. Footnotes indicate significant variations in the texts which W C Abbott printed in his huge *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* in the 1930s and 1940s.

In the closing weeks of 1647 the defeated King escaped from Hampton Court but got no further than the Isle of Wight, where he was imprisoned in Carisbrooke Castle. Effectively abandoning his fruitless and insincere negotiations with parliament and the parliamentary army, and firmly rejecting four Bills which contained elements of a proposed constitutional settlement, Charles instead concluded a separate deal with the Scots. Under the terms of this Engagement, the Scots would intervene militarily to restore Charles to full power in England and Wales, probably assisted by renewed royalist risings. With clear evidence of the King's duplicity and the spectre of renewed civil war at home and invasion from Scotland looming, the mood in parliament became more hawkish and, as recounted here, on 3 January 1648 the House of Commons voted to end all dealings with Charles I. The recipient of this letter, Robert Hammond, military colleague, friend and distant relation by marriage of Cromwell, was governor of the Isle of Wight and thus found himself responsible for keeping Charles prisoner, a role he clearly did not relish.

For Colonel Robert Hammond, Governor of the Isle of Wight: These, for the Service of the Kingdom. Haste: Post Haste.

3d January 1647[8]. (My Lord Wharton's, near Ten at night).

Dear Robin,

Now, blessed be God, I can write and thou receive freely. I never in my life saw more deep sense, and less will to show it unchristianly, than in that which thou didst write to us when we were at Windsor, and thou in the midst of thy temptation, - which indeed, by what we understand of it, was a great one, and occasioned the greater by the Letter the General sent thee; of which thou wast not mistaken when thou didst challenge me to be the penner.

How good has God been to dispose all to mercy! And although it was trouble for the present, yet glory has come out of it; for which we praise the Lord with thee and for thee. And truly thy courage¹ has been such as occasions much honour to the name of God and to religion. Go on in the strength of the Lord; and the Lord be still with thee.

But, dear Robin, this business hath been, I trust, a mighty providence to this poor Kingdom and to us all. The House of Commons is very sensible of the King's dealings, and of our brethren's², in this late transaction. You should do well, if you have anything that may discover juggling, to search it out, and let us know it. It may be of admirable use at this time; and because we shall, I hope, instantly go upon business in relation to them, tending to prevent danger.

The House of Commons has this day voted as follows: 1st, They will make no more Addresses to the King; 2nd, None shall apply to him without leave of the Two Houses, upon pain of being guilty of high treason; 3rd, They will receive nothing from the King, nor shall any other bring anything to them from him, nor receive anything from the King; lastly, the Members of both Houses who were of the Committee of Both Kingdoms are established in all that power in themselves, for England and Ireland, which they had to act with England and Scotland³; and Sir John Evelyn of Wilts is added in the room of Mr Recorder, and Nathaniel Fiennes in the room of Sir Philip Stapleton, and my Lord of Kent in the room of the Earl of Essex. I think it good you take notice of this, the sooner the better.

Let us know how it is with you in point of strength, and what you need from us. Some of us think the King well with you, and that it concerns us to keep that Island in great security, because of the French, etc.: and if so, where can the King be better? If you have more force, you will be sure of full provision for them.

The Lord bless thee. Pray for
Thy dear friend and servant,
Oliver Cromwell.

1. Abbott has 'carriage'.
2. The Scots, formerly allies of parliament, now allied to the King.
3. Abbott has '...to act with Both Kingdoms'.

By the end of June civil war had begun once again. Lord General Fairfax had led part of the main parliamentary army to quell a royalist rising in Kent, successfully expelling them from Maidstone. However, many escaped into Essex and, gathering further support, occupied Colchester, forcing Fairfax to undertake a long and bitter siege of this strongly fortified town. Cromwell, meanwhile, had led the rest of the army to South Wales, the other main theatre of royalist activity. Even before he arrived, local forces had defeated the rebels in battle at St Fagans, but again many escaped and they sought refuge in the walled town of Pembroke. Thus Cromwell, too, was engaged on a long, formal siege. All the while, the Scots were gathering an army north of the border, preparing to invade. The renewal of war hardened military hearts against the King - feelings had become clear at a military prayer meeting held at Windsor at the end of April - though there were many in parliament who, worried by such sentiments, sought to reopen negotiations with Charles and speedily to reach a settlement that would preserve the person and the institution of monarchy intact.

To his Excellency the Lord Fairfax, General of the Parliament's Army:
These.

Before Pembroke, 28th June 1648.

My Lord,

[Gives an account of the siege of Pembroke and of the dispatch of some troops north to counter the Scottish-royalist threat.]

I rejoice much to hear of the blessing of God upon your Excellency's endeavours. I pray God that this Nation¹, and those that are over us, and your Excellency and all we that are under you, what the mind of God may be in all this, and what our duty is. Surely it is not that the poor Godly People of this Kingdom should still be made the object of wrath and anger; nor that our God would have our necks under a yoke of bondage. For these things that have lately come to pass have been the wonderful works of God; breaking the rod of the oppressor, as in the day of Midian, - not with garments much rolled in blood, but by the terror of the Lord; who will yet save His people and confound His enemies, as on that day. The Lord multiply His grace² upon you, and bless you, and keep your heart upright; and then, though you be not conformable to the men of this world, nor to their wisdom, yet you shall be precious in the eyes of God, and He will be to you a horn³ and a shield.

My Lord, I do not know that I have had a Letter from any of your Army, of the glorious successes God has vouchsafed you. I pray pardon the complaint made. I long to []⁴ with you. I take leave; and rest,

My Lord,
Your most humble and faithful servant,
Oliver Cromwell.

1. Abbott has 'I pray God teach this nation...', which makes more sense, for as it stands there is no principal verb in this sentence.
2. Abbott has 'spirit'.
3. Abbott has 'sun'.
4. Apparently a word is omitted here. Carlyle suggests 'be', Abbott 'rejoice'.

After the surrender of Pembroke on 11 July, Cromwell hurried north to meet and engage the Scottish-royalist army of invasion. He defeated much of that army at Preston on 17 August; the remaining elements were pursued through Lancashire and mopped up over the following days. As he had done several times towards the end of the first civil war, in his letter to the Speaker giving news of victory Cromwell also aired his thoughts on how that God-given victory should be interpreted and on how parliament should now act to fulfil God's revealed will.

To the Honourable William Lenthall, Esquire, Speaker of the House of Commons: These.

20th August 1648.

Sir,

[Gives a long and detailed account of the Battle of Preston and its aftermath.]

Surely, Sir, this is nothing but the hand of God; and wherever anything in this world is exalted, or exalts itself, God will pull it down; for this is the day wherein He alone will be exalted. It is not fit for me to give advice, nor to say a word what use you should make of this; - more than to pray you, and all that acknowledge God, That they would exalt Him, - and not hate His people, who are as the apple of His eye, and for whom even Kings shall be reprov'd; and that you would take courage to do the work of the Lord, in fulfilling the end of your Magistracy, in seeking the peace and welfare of this Land¹, - that all that live peaceably² may have countenance from you, and they that are incapable³ and will not leave troubling the Land may speedily be destroyed out of the Land. And if you take courage in this, God will bless you; and good men will stand by you; and God will have glory, and the Land will have happiness by you in despite of all your enemies. Which shall be the prayer of,

Your most humble and faithful servant,
Oliver Cromwell.

1. Abbott has '...seeking the peace and welfare of the people of this Land'.
2. Abbott has '...that all that live quietly and peaceably...'
3. Abbott has 'implacable'.

After Preston, Cromwell remained in the north, for he had orders to neutralise the Scottish threat. From North Yorkshire at the beginning of September he wrote to his friend and cousin, Oliver St John.

For my worthy Friend Oliver St John, Esquire, Solicitor-General: These, at Lincoln's Inn.

Knaresborough, 1st Sept.

Dear Sir,

I can say nothing; but surely the Lord our God is a great and glorious God. He only is worthy to be feared and trusted, and His appearances particularly¹ to be waited for. He will not fail His People. Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord! -

Remember my love to my dear brother H Vane: I pray he make not too little, nor I too much, of outward dispensations; - God preserve us all, that we, in simplicity of our spirits, may patiently attend upon them. Let us all be not careful what men will make of these actings. They, will they, nill they, shall fulfil the good pleasure of God: and we - shall serve our generations.² Our rest we expect elsewhere: that will be durable. Care we not for to-morrow, nor for anything. This Scripture has been of great stay to me: read Isaiah Eighth, 10, 11, 14; - read all the Chapter.

I am informed from good hands, that a poor godly man died in Preston, the day before the Fight; and being sick, near the hour of his death, he desired the woman that cooked³ to him, To fetch him a handful of Grass. She did so; and when he received it, he asked Whether it would wither or not, now it was cut? The woman said, Yea. He replied, So should this Army of the Scots do, and come to nothing, so soon as ours did but appear, or words to this effect; and so immediately died. -

My service to Mr W P, Sir J E, and the rest of our good friends. I hope I do often remember you,

Yours,

Oliver Cromwell.

My service to Frank Russel and Sir Gilbert Pickering.

1. Abbott has 'patiently'.
2. Abbott has '...: and so shall serve our generations'.
3. Abbott has 'looked', which perhaps makes more sense in this context.

On the following day Cromwell wrote to another old friend, Lord Wharton. This letter, like that to St John, is imbued with a profound sense that God had determined and directed the course of recent events and was using His chosen instruments, including Cromwell and the army, to fulfil a divine purpose.

For the Right Honourable the Lord Wharton: These.

2d Sept 1648.

My Lord,

You know how untoward I am at this business of writing; yet a word. I beseech the Lord make us sensible of this great mercy here, which surely was much more than the House expresseth. I trust the goodness of our God, time and opportunity to speak of it to you face to face. When we think of our God, what are we! Oh, His mercy to the whole society of saints, - despised, jeered saints! Let them mock on. Would we were all saints! The best of us are, God knows, poor weak saints; - yet saints; if not sheep, yet lambs; and must be fed. We have daily bread, and shall have it, in despite of all enemies. There's enough in our Father's house, and He dispenseth it. []¹ I think, through these outward mercies, as we call them, Faith, Patience, Love, Hope are exercised and perfected², - yea, Christ formed, and grows into a perfect man within us. I know not well how to distinguish: the difference is only in the subject; to a worldly man they are outward, to a saint Christian; - but I dispute not.

My Lord, I rejoice in your particular mercy. I hope that it is so to you. If so, it shall not hurt you; not make you plot or shift for the young Baron to make him great. You will say, He is God's to dispose of, and guide for; and there you will leave him.

My love to the dear little Lady better than the child. The Lord bless you both. My love and service to all Friends high and low; if you will, to my Lord and Lady Mulgrave and Will Hill. I am truly,

Your faithful friend and humblest servant,
Oliver Cromwell.

1. There follows a very imperfect and incomplete sentence, here omitted, which Carlyle (in a footnote) and Abbott attempt to reproduce.
2. Abbott has '...Love, Hope, all are exercised...'

By the time Cromwell wrote to Speaker Lenthall in the second week of October, two developments were underway. To the dismay of many in the army, the Long Parliament, reversing the Vote of No Addresses and resuming negotiations with the King, had sent a delegation to confer with him at Newport, Isle of Wight; they sought a compromise deal or treaty with Charles that would allow a speedy constitutional settlement and would thus thwart the more radical demands for vengeance and reform which were emanating from the army. Secondly, and far more welcome to Cromwell, the pro-royalist government of Scotland had collapsed in the wake of the defeat of their army of invasion and been replaced by a non-royalist clique, who stood by the old alliance with the English parliamentarians and who wished to re-establish good relations with the English regime. Cromwell and much of his army entered Scotland in early October as the allies and guests of the new Scottish government. As ever, Cromwell saw these Scottish developments as willed and guided by God, a point he drove home in this letter. Was Cromwell suggesting that God's will as revealed now in Scotland should serve as an exemplar for the policies to be pursued in England and Wales?

To the Honourable William Lenthall, Esquire, Speaker of the Honourable House of Commons: These.

Dalhousie, 9th October 1648.

Sir,

[Gives an account of his reception by, and negotiations with, the new government of Scotland.]

Having proceeded thus far as a Soldier, and I trust, by the blessing of God, not to your disservice; and having laid the business before you, I pray God direct you to do further as may be for His glory, the good of the Nation wherewith you are intrusted, and the comfort and encouragement of the Saints of God in both Kingdoms and all the World over. I do think the affairs of Scotland are in a thriving posture, as to the interest of honest men: and like to be a better neighbour to you now than when the great pretenders to the Covenant and Religion and Treaties, - I mean Duke Hamilton, the Earls of Lauderdale, Traquair, Carnegy, and their confederates, - had the power in their hands. I dare say that that Party, with their pretences, had not only, through the treachery of some in England (who have cause to blush), endangered the whole State and Kingdom of England; but also brought Scotland into such a condition, as that no honest man who had the fear of God, or a conscience of Religion, the just ends of the Covenant and Treaties, could have a being in that Kingdom. But God, who is not to be mocked or deceived, and is very

jealous when His Name and Religion are made use of to carry on impious designs, hath taken vengeance of such profanity, - even to astonishment and admiration. And I wish from the bottom of my heart, it may cause all to tremble and repent, who have practised the like, to the blasphemy of His Name, and the destruction of His People; so as they may never presume to do the like again! And I think it is not unseasonable for me to take the humble boldness to say thus much at this time.

[Gives a further account of the disbanding of royalist forces in Scotland and the friendly stance of the new government. Says he is now marching towards Carlisle.]

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

Oliver Cromwell.

By early November Cromwell had left Scotland, pleased to see in power there a group of politicians with whom he believed the English regime could work and relieved that he had not had to fight a former ally and a nation of fellow-Protestants. Cromwell spent much of November based in Yorkshire, besieging the isolated castle of Pontefract, still in the hands of royalist rebels. From Yorkshire, Cromwell wrote two long and complex letters to his friend Robert Hammond, outlining his thoughts. In this, the first of the two letters, Cromwell's main purpose was to defend himself from accusations that he should have imposed a military settlement upon Scotland or at least taken a firmer line with its new Presbyterian government. However, in several places he also referred or alluded to English politics; near the beginning, for example, he focused on the dangers incurred in trying to conclude with the King a settlement not sanctioned and approved by God, and towards the end he talked of the circumstances in which a parliamentary minority might seek to impose its will on the majority.

For the honourable Colonel Robert Hammond, Governor of the Isle of Wight.

Knottingly, Novembr 6 1648.

Dear Robin,

I trust the same spirit that guided thee heretofore is still with thee; look to thy heart, thou art where temptations multiply. I fear lest our friends should burn their fingers, as some others did not long since, whose hearts have ached since for it. How easy is it to find arguments for what we would have; how easy to take offence at things called Levellers, and run into an extremity on the other hand, meddling with an accursed thing.

Peace is only good when we receive it out of our Father's hand, it's dangerous to snatch it, most dangerous to go against the will of God to attain it. War is good when led to by our Father, most evil when it comes from the lusts that are in our members. We wait upon the Lord, who will teach us and lead us whether to doing or suffering.

Tell my brother Herne¹ I smiled at his expression concerning my wise friend's opinion, who thinks that the enthroning the King with presbytery brings spiritual slavery, but with a moderate episcopacy works a good peace. Both are a hard choice. I trust there's no necessity of either, except our base unbelief and fleshly wisdom make it so; but if I have any logic it will be easier to tyrannise having that he likes and serves his turn, than what you know and all believe he so much dislikes.

But as to my brother himself, tell him indeed I think some of my friends have advanced too far, and need make an honourable retreat, Scots treaties having wrought some perplexities; and hindering matters from going so glib as otherwise was hoped, especially taking in some doubts that Sir Roger² and brother Fountayne³ are also turned Presbyterians. Dear Robin, tell brother Herne that we have the witness of our consciences that we have walked in this thing (whatsoever surmises are to the contrary) in plainness and godly simplicity, according to our weak measure, and we trust our daily business is to approve our consciences to Godward, and not to shift and shirk, which were exceeding baseness in us to do, having had such favour from the Lord, and such manifestations of His presence, and I hope the same experience will keep their hearts and hands from him, against whom God hath so witnessed, though reason should suggest things never so plausible.

I pray thee tell my brother Herne thus much from me; and if a mistake concerning our compliance with presbytery perplex an evil business (for so I account it), and make the wheels of such a chariot go heavy, I can be passive and let it go, knowing that innocency and integrity loses nothing by a patient waiting upon the Lord. Our papers are public; let us be judged by them. Answers do not involve us. I profess to thee I desire from my heart, I have prayed for it, I have waited for the day to see union and right understanding between the godly people (Scots, English, Jews, Gentiles, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, and all). Our Brothers of Scotland (really Presbyterians) were our greatest enemies. God hath justified us in their sight, caused us to requite good for evil, caused them to acknowledge it publicly by acts of state, and privately, and the thing is true in the sight of the sun. It is an high conviction upon them. Was it not fit to be civil, to profess love, to deal with clearness with them for removing of prejudice, to ask them what they had against us, and to give them an honest answer? This we have done, and not more. And herein is a more glorious work in our eyes than if we had gotten the sacking and plunder of Edinburgh, the strong Castles into our hands, and made

conquest from Tweed to the Orcades; and we can say, through God we have left by the grace of God such a witness amongst them, as if it work not yet there is that conviction upon them that will undoubtedly bear its fruit in due time.

Tell my brother Herne, I believe my wise friend would have had a conquest, or if not, things put in a balance; the first was not very unfeasible, but I think not Christian, and I was commanded the contrary by the two houses; as for the latter by the providence of God it is perfectly come to pass, not by our wisdom, for I durst not design it, I durst not admit of so mixed, so low a consideration, we were led out (to the praise of our God be it spoken) to more sincere, more spiritual considerations; but I said before the Lord hath brought it to a balance; if there be any dangerous disproportion it is that the honest party (if I may without offence so call them) in my apprehension are the weaker, and have manifold difficulties to conflict withal, I wish our unworthiness here cast not the scale both there, and here the wrong way.

I have but one word more to say. Thy friends, dear Robin, are in heart and in profession what they were, have not dissembled their principles at all. Are they not a little justified in this, that a lesser party of a Parliament hath made it lawful to declare the greater part a faction, and made the Parliament null, and call a new one, and to do this by force, and this by the same mouths that condemned it in others. Think of the example and of the consequence, and let others think of it too, if they be not drenched too deep in their own reason and opinions.

Robin, be honest still. God keep thee in the midst of snares. Thou has naturally a valiant spirit. Listen to God, and He shall increase it upon thee, and make thee valiant for the truth. I am a poor creature that write to thee, the poorest in the work⁴, but I have hope in God, and desire from my heart to love His people, and if thou hast opportunity and a free heart, let me hear from thee how it is with thee. This bearer is faithful, you may be very free to communicate with him; my service to all my friends, and to my dear brother Herne whom I love in the Lord, I rest,

Thy true and faithful friend,
Heron's brother.

1. 'Herne' or 'Heron' was Cromwell's pet name for Sir Henry Vane, junior, one of the few radical MPs, favourably inclined to the army, who agreed to serve on the parliamentary delegation to Newport.
2. A colleague in Scotland, perhaps Sir Arthur Hesilrig or John Lambert.
3. Cromwell himself.
4. Perhaps 'world' is intended.

During November the mood of the main parliamentary army, based in Hertfordshire under Fairfax, hardened against not only the King but also the efforts of parliament to do a deal with him. Army petitions, papers and discussions early in the month culminated in mid November in the preparation and approval of a draft 'Remonstrance', calling for a military purge of parliament to bring to an end the Newport negotiations and to open the way for the trial of the King and other leading royalists involved in the second civil war. Around the same time Cromwell, still in Yorkshire, wrote to Fairfax to forward a batch of papers from officers under his command which similarly called for justice to be exacted. Although cautious in his choice of words, Cromwell here explicitly endorsed and supported those calls for justice.

For his Excellency the Lord General Fairfax.

Knottingley, 20th November 1648.

My Lord,

I find in the Officers of the Regiments a very great sense of the sufferings of this poor Kingdom¹; and in them all a very great zeal to have impartial Justice done upon Offenders. And I must confess, I do in all, from my heart, concur with them; and I verily think and am persuaded they are things which God puts into our hearts.

I shall not need to offer anything to your Excellency: I know, God teaches you; and that He hath manifested His presence so to you as that you will give glory to Him in the eyes of all the world. I held it my duty, having received these Petitions and Letters, and being desired by the framers thereof, - to present them to you. The good Lord work His will upon your heart, enabling you to it; and the presence of Almighty God go along with you. Thus prays,

My Lord,

Your most humble and faithful servant,
Oliver Cromwell.²

1. Abbott has '...of the sufferings and the ruin of this poor kingdom...'
2. Sometime in late November, shortly before leaving Yorkshire to return to London, Cromwell wrote to Fairfax to praise the Remonstrance, copies of which were by that time circulating in Cromwell's army: 'We have read your declaration here, and see in it nothing but what is honest and becoming Christians and honest men to say and offer. It's good to look up to God, who alone is able to sway hearts to agree to the good and just things contained therein.'

In this second letter of November to Hammond, again written during the prolonged operation against Pontefract, Cromwell attempted not only to raise Hammond's spirits and confidence but also, more importantly, to allay the grave doubts and uncertainties which Hammond had expressed over the course of action which many of his military colleagues - his 'friends' - intended to follow. Cromwell sought to justify the proposed actions by pointing to the past victories of the parliamentary army and to the religious convictions of the Godly as signs that the Lord willed and supported military intervention; these considerations over-rode the fears and doubts of others and obedience to parliament. In this long and striking letter, Cromwell also pointed to his belief that God disapproved of and therefore condemned the Newport negotiations, parliament's actions and Charles I himself.

To Colonel Robert Hammond: These.

November 25 1648.

Dear Robin,

No man rejoiceth more to see a line from thee than myself. I know thou hast long been under trial. Thou shalt be no loser by it. All must work for the best.

Thou desirest to hear of my experiences. I can tell thee: I am such a one as thou didst formerly know, having a body of sin and death; but I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord there is no condemnation, though much infirmity; and I wait for the redemption. And in this poor condition I obtain mercy, and sweet consolation through the Spirit. And find abundant cause every day to exalt the Lord, and abase flesh, - and herein I have some exercise.

As to outward dispensations, if we may so call them: we have not been without our share of beholding some remarkable providences, and appearances of the Lord. His presence hath been amongst us, and by the light of His countenance we have prevailed. We are sure, the good-will of Him who dwelt in the Bush has shined upon us; and we can humbly say, We know in whom we have believed; who can¹ and will perfect what remaineth, and us also in doing what is well-pleasing in His eyesight.

I find some trouble in your spirit; occasioned first, not only by the continuance of your sad and heavy burden, as you call it, but by the dissatisfaction you take at the ways of some good men whom you love with your heart, who through this principle, That it is lawful for a lesser part, if in the right, to force [the majority] etc.

To the first: Call not your burden sad or heavy. If your Father laid it upon you, He intended neither. He is the Father of lights, from whom comes every good and perfect gift; who of His own will begot us, and bade us count it all joy when such things befall us; they being for the

exercise of faith and patience, whereby in the end we shall be made perfect (James i).

Dear Robin, our fleshly reasonings ensnare us. These make us say, heavy, sad, pleasant, easy. Was there not a little of this when Robert Hammond, through dissatisfaction too, desired retirement from the Army, and thought of quiet in the Isle of Wight? Did not God find him out there? I believe he will never forget this. - And now I perceive he is to seek again; partly through his sad and heavy burden, and partly through his dissatisfaction with friends' actings.

Dear Robin, thou and I were never worthy to be door-keepers in this Service. If thou wilt seek, seek to know the mind of God in all that chain of Providence, whereby God brought thee thither, and that Person to thee; how, before and since, God has ordered him, and affairs concerning him: and then tell me, Whether there be not some glorious and high meaning in all this, above what thou hast yet attained? And, laying aside thy fleshly reason, seek of the Lord to teach thee what that is; and He will do it. I dare be positive to say, It is not that the wicked should be exalted, that God should so appear as indeed He hath done. For there is no peace to them. No, it is set upon the hearts of such as fear the Lord, and we have witness upon witness, That it shall go ill with them and their partakers. I say again, seek that spirit to teach thee; which is the spirit of knowledge and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, of wisdom and of the fear of the Lord. That spirit will close thine eyes and stop thine ears, so that thou shalt not judge by them; but thou shalt judge for the meek of the Earth, and thou shalt be made able to do accordingly. The Lord direct thee to that which is well-pleasing in His eyesight.

As to thy dissatisfaction with friends' actings upon that supposed principle, I wonder not at that. If a man take not his own burden well, he shall hardly others'; especially if involved by so near a relation of love and Christian brotherhood as thou art. I shall not take upon me to satisfy; but I hold myself bound to lay my thoughts before so dear a friend. The Lord do His own will.

You say: God hath appointed authorities among the nations, to which active or passive obedience is to be yielded. This resides in England in the Parliament. Therefore active or passive resistance², etc.

Authorities and powers are the ordinance of God. This or that species is of human institution, and limited, some with larger, others with stricter bands, each one according to its constitution. I do not therefore think the Authorities may do anything, and yet such obedience be due. All agree that there are cases in which it is lawful to resist. If so, your ground fails, and so likewise the inference³. Indeed, dear Robin, not to multiply words, the query is, Whether ours be such a case? This ingenuously is the true question.

To this I shall say nothing, though I could say very much; but only desire thee to see what thou findest in thy own heart to two or three plain considerations. First, whether *Salus Populi* be a sound position? Secondly, Whether in the way in hand, really and before the Lord, before whom conscience has to stand, this be provided for⁴; - or if the whole fruit of the War is not like to be frustrated, and all most like to turn to what it was, or worse? And this, contrary to Engagements, explicit Covenants⁵ with those who ventured their lives upon those Covenants and Engagements, without whom perhaps, in equity, relaxation ought not to be? Thirdly, Whether this Army be not a lawful Power, called by God to oppose and fight against the King upon some stated grounds; and being in power to such ends, may not oppose one Name of Authority, for those ends, as well as another Name, - since it was not the outward Authority summoning them that by its power made the quarrel lawful, but the quarrel was lawful in itself?⁶ If so, it may be, acting will be justified *in foro humano*. - But truly this kind of reasonings may be but fleshly, either with or against: only it is good to try what truth may be in them. And the Lord teach us.

My dear Friend, let us look into providences; surely they mean somewhat. They hang so together; have been so constant, so clear, unclouded. Malice, swoln malice against God's people, now called Saints, to root out their name! - and yet they, getting arms⁷, and therein blessed with defence and more! - I desire, he that is for a principle of suffering would not too much slight this. I slight not him who is so minded: but let us beware lest fleshly reasoning see more safety in making use of this principle than in acting! Who acts, if he resolve not through God⁸ to be willing to part with all? Our hearts are very deceitful, on the right and on the left.

What think you of Providence disposing the hearts of so many of God's people this way, - especially in this poor Army, wherein the great God has vouchsafed to appear! I know not one Officer among us but is on the increasing hand. And let me say it is here in the North, after much patience, we trust the same Lord who hath framed our minds in our actings, is with us in this also. And this contrary to a natural tendency, and to those comforts our hearts could wish to enjoy with others. And the difficulties probably to be encountered with, and the enemies, not few, even all that is glorious in this world, with appearance of united names, titles and authorities, and yet not terrified; only desiring to fear our great God, that we do nothing against His will. Truly this is our condition.

And to conclude. We in this Northern Army were in a waiting posture; desiring to see what the Lord would lead us to. And a Declaration is put out⁹, at which many are shaken: - although we could perhaps have wished the stay of it till after the Treaty, yet seeing it is come out, we trust to rejoice in the will of the Lord, waiting His further pleasure. - Dear

Robin, beware of men; look up to the Lord. Let Him be free to speak and command in thy heart. Take heed of the things I fear thou hast reasoned thyself into; and thou shalt be able through Him, without consulting flesh and blood, to do valiantly for Him and His people.

Thou mentionest somewhat as if, by acting against such opposition as is like to be, there will be a tempting of God. Dear Robin, tempting of God ordinarily is either by acting presumptuously in carnal confidence, or in unbelief through diffidence: both these ways Israel tempted God in the wilderness, and He was grieved by them. Not the encountering [of] difficulties, therefore, makes us tempt God¹⁰; but the acting before and without faith. If the Lord have in any measure persuaded His people, as generally He hath, of the lawfulness, nay of the duty, - this persuasion prevailing upon the heart is faith; and acting thereupon is acting in faith; and the more the difficulties are, the more the faith. And it is most sweet that he who is not persuaded have patience towards them that are, and judge not: and this will free thee from the trouble of others' actings, which, thou sayest, adds to thy grief. Only let me offer two or three things, and I have done.

Dost thou not think this fear of the Levellers (of whom there is no fear), that they would destroy Nobility, etc, has caused some to take¹¹ up corruption, and find it lawful to make this ruining hypocritical Agreement, on one part? Hath not this biased even some good men? I will not say, the thing they fear will come upon them¹²; but if it do, they will themselves bring it upon themselves. Have not some of our friends, by their passive principle (which I judge not, only I think it liable to temptation as well as the active, and neither of them good but as we are led into them of God, and neither of them to be reasoned into, because the heart is deceitful), - been occasioned to overlook what is just and honest, and to think the people of God may have as much or more good the one way than the other? Good by this Man, - against whom the Lord hath witnessed; and whom thou knowest! Is this so in their hearts; or is it reasoned, forced in?

Robin, I have done. Ask we our hearts, Whether we think that, after all, these dispensations, the like to which many generations cannot afford, - should end in so corrupt reasonings of good men; and should so hit the designings of bad? Thinkest thou, in thy heart, that the glorious dispensations of God point out to this? Or to teach His people to trust in Him, and to wait for better things, - when, it may be, better are sealed to many of their spirits? And I, as a poor looker-on, I had rather live in the hope of that spirit, and take my share with them, expecting a good issue, than be led away with the others.

This trouble I have been at, because my soul loves thee, and I would not have thee swerve, or lose any glorious opportunity the Lord puts into thy hand. The Lord be thy counsellor. Dear Robin, I rest thine,

1. Abbott has '...is able...'
2. Abbott has '...active or passive obedience, etc', but the meaning is clear enough. Hammond has put it to Cromwell that parliament has been appointed and empowered by God and so must be obeyed and cannot be resisted. Cromwell goes on to set out counter-arguments.
3. Abbott has 'interference'.
4. That is, whether the proposed treaty with the King will ensure the safety of the people?
5. Abbott has '...contrary to engagements, declarations, implicit covenants with...'
6. Abbott phrases the second part of the question differently and more clearly: 'and being in power to such ends, may not oppose one name of authority, for those ends, as well as another, the outward authority that called them not by their power making the quarrel lawful, but it being so in itself?'
7. Abbott has 'and yet they, by providence, having arms...'
8. Abbott has 'Who acts, and resolves not through God...'
9. The army's Remonstrance; Cromwell goes on to say that he wishes it had not been issued until the conclusion (or collapse) of parliament's negotiations - 'Treaty' - with the King at Newport.
10. Abbott has 'The encountering difficulties, therefore, makes us not to tempt God;...'
11. Abbott has 'rake'.
12. Abbott has '...their fear will come upon them;...'

ADMIRAL ROBERT BLAKE (1599-1657) AND ADMIRAL LORD NELSON: MASTER AND DISCIPLE?

by Alan Smith

It is perhaps a vain pursuit to try to assign relative greatness to admirals belonging to different centuries and acting in vastly different circumstances, but the comparison of Nelson with Blake and vice versa is one that seems to come naturally to mind. Hannay began his brief 1886 study of Blake with Nelson's own assessment. Just before he sailed for the ill-fated Santa Cruz venture, Nelson wrote to Earl St Vincent:

I do not reckon myself equal to Blake but, [in a reference to Blake's own attack on that harbour] if I recollect aright, he was more obliged to the wind coming off the land than to any exertions of his own.¹

The first part of this is, for Nelson, surprisingly modest and the second, rather than being uncharacteristically ungenerous, simply shows that Nelson, like many others since, had been misled by garbled accounts of Blake's action. In fact, the wind did not change in Blake's favour until 23 April, two days after he had left the bay of Santa Cruz.²

In any juxtaposition of the two great names, comparisons and contrasts readily suggest themselves. Portraits of Blake are rare and often of dubious authenticity but we do know that, while like Nelson he was only of middle height, he was thickset and stocky with fleshy features, in direct contrast to Nelson who was of slight physique, though perhaps some descriptions make too much of this. Note too that in contrast to Nelson, who was an instant hero, Blake had to wait three hundred years for his first public monument, his greatness being only realised in retrospect.

Nelson's life is fully and amply documented but, as Hannay remarks, 'the authorities for the life of Blake are scanty and of dubious value'. Formal references in the State Papers are unrevealing. There are narratives of the various actions, but 'no life

of the Admiral was written until nearly half a century after his death'. Indeed, so little was known of Blake's person and personality that when John Oldmixon's *History and Life of Robert Blake, Esq* was published in 1718, it was illustrated with a portrait of Drake!

The dearth of hard evidence for the details of Blake's career is all the more tantalising because of his manifest versatility. Nelson had one career only, though a superb one. Blake had had three other fields of action before attaining fame as military commander and then greatness as Admiral. Born in 1599, son of a substantial merchant of Bridgwater, Blake went from the local grammar school to Wadham College, Oxford, where, it is said, he had prospects of academic preferment. The death of his father in 1625 brought him back home to care for a large, and no doubt demanding, family of younger siblings, so he became Robert Blake, merchant. However, his next fifteen years leave no certain mark on the public records. He was possibly based in Dorchester or even had a period of residence in Holland. He reappears in 1640 as M.P. for Bridgwater and later represented Taunton. Under the Commonwealth he held other offices of state, but the politician was soon eclipsed by Blake the soldier. As the country drifted to civil war, Blake identified himself with the parliamentary cause and, when war came, took part in the defence of Bristol and then that of Lyme. Later, as commander, he took Taunton and held it in two royalist sieges. Now well established as a successful soldier he was, in 1649, called upon along with Popham and Deane to become a 'General-at-Sea'. (Nelson, it will be recalled, attempted a reverse move. Feeling that his land service in Nicaragua and, more specifically, Corsica had not been adequately appreciated, he asked to be rated as Brigadier-General but finally settled for pay as Colonel of Marines.³)

What, then, were the qualities later found so admirable in this soldier turned sailor? When Nelson became Rear Admiral of the Blue in 1797 he had been at sea for twenty six years. When Blake became 'General-at-Sea' he is most unlikely ever to have set foot on a warship before. He may well have had some sailing time as a merchant, though certainly not in any position of command. He had to learn the trade of sea fighting from scratch and learn it quickly. As Lewis has pointed out, in Elizabeth I's nineteen year war with Spain there was only one fleet in action, that against the

Armada. In the Commonwealth's First Dutch War there were six in two years. Blake and his colleagues fought the Dutch, not always brilliantly but doggedly, forged the fleet into a fighting machine and himself emerged as 'the first naval officer' with (eventually) 'a record hardly surpassed even by Nelson'.⁴

Blake began his maritime career by pursuing Prince Rupert's fleet from Kinsale to the Tagus, finally destroying it off Cartagena. In 1651 he took part in reclaiming the Isles of Scilly, learning valuable lessons there. 1652 and 1653 were devoted to the Dutch threat but, after a period of sickness, Blake was next ordered to the Mediterranean to exact compensation for wrongs done to English merchants. The 'hit list' included French privateers, the Duke of Tuscany, the Knights of Malta and North African corsairs. He was also to watch a French fleet under the Duc de Guise thought to have designs against Naples and Sicily. His 'showing the flag' proved highly effective, but his plan to chastise the corsairs received an apparent set back when stormy weather forced his ships to seek shelter at Leghorn. There he received news that made him see the hand of Providence at work. The Republic of Venice, which enjoyed good relations with Cromwell's Commonwealth, was hard pressed by the Turks who had taken Cyprus and were now attacking Crete, both former Venetian territories. The Turks were relying on aid from the Moslem states of North Africa and to this end a fleet was now said to be assembling at Tunis. On learning this, Blake decided to forget his formal limitation to exacting compensation and resolved totally to destroy the corsair fleet. Sir Julian Corbett summarised thus:

Authority or no authority, a blow for the relief of Crete was in the spirit of the high purpose for which he had been sent out...It was the true Nelson touch and nothing in Nelson's life marks more indisputably the spirit of the great commander...He perceives the broad stream of policy on which his superiors are floating and dares to show them, even before they clearly see themselves, the course they should steer.⁵

On 3 April 1655 the fleet at Porto Farina, with its protecting fortress, was destroyed by guns from the sea, a trial run for the similar action at Santa Cruz two years later.

Britain was now at war with Spain and Blake next showed his mettle in his 'long watch' off Cadiz, keeping station there throughout the winter, a then unprecedented feat. In celebration the poet Waller wrote with pardonable exaggeration

Others may use the Oceans as their road
Only the English make it their abode.

Supplies were low and the ships really unfit for service. Blake himself was gravely ill from an old wound and the effects of scurvy but, in Nelsonian vein, he was able to write, 'We are all together and behold one another's faces with comfort'.

In April 1657 Blake heard that the awaited Spanish treasure fleet had put into Santa Cruz de Tenerife. The position was a strong one, the bay being defended by a castle and seven forts, all connected by breastworks for musketeers. The ships themselves were drawn up close to the shore, so close in fact that they masked the fire of their would-be defenders. The treasure had already been taken ashore for safety, but the destruction of the ships would be a grave hurt to Spanish maritime capability. This Blake duly achieved and, moreover, brought all his ships out again with minimal casualties. For the second time Blake had shown that land fortifications could be destroyed from the sea by a determined commander.

After Santa Cruz came four more months of blockade off Cadiz; then, at last, Blake was ordered home. Pausing only to negotiate the release of all captives held at Salee, he turned for England but died on 17 August, two hours before his ship, the *George*, came into Plymouth.

What, then, was his achievement? In the oft-quoted words of the royalist Clarendon,

he was the first man that declined the old track and made it manifest that the science might be attained in less time than

was imagined...He was the first man who brought the ships to contemn castles on shore...He was the first that gave example of...naval courage and bold and resolute achievements.

More specifically, he introduced the Articles of War and the Fighting Instructions. His was the quiet, solid work and stolid courage of 'a plain blunt man'. If his victories were of a less spectacular character than those of Nelson, it was because Blake was laying foundations whereas Nelson placed coping stones, completing an edifice of British naval power that dominated the affairs of the nineteenth century. In another respect, too, Blake must yield place to Nelson. His life contains none of the romantic interest so loved by biographers. His life was devoted to providing for his extensive family and the service of the state. His biography, rather like that of Cook, must essentially be an account of his career. It seems unnecessary to speculate, as some have done, about his 'monkish disposition' or even an alleged woman-hating proclivity to account for the fact that he never married.

Notes

1. D Hannay, *Admiral Blake* (London, 1886), p. 1.
2. R Beadon, *Robert Blake* (London, 1935), p. 259.
3. R Southey, *Life of Nelson* (London, 1813), p. 67.
4. M Lewis, *The History of the British Navy* (Harmondsworth, 1957), p. 88.
5. Quoted in Beadon, *Blake*, p. 221.

Alan Smith is a former editor of *Cromwelliana* and is a member of The Nelson Society as well as of The Cromwell Association.

NEW INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPRISONMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL JOHN LAMBERT, 1662-1684

by David Farr

Following the Restoration and his trial in June 1662 Major General John Lambert was imprisoned for the rest of his life, first in Castle Cornet Guernsey and then, from 1670, on St. Nicholas Island, off the coast of Plymouth. Here Lambert died in March 1684. However, little detail is known of the years he spent incarcerated after his trial. What follows is a very short summary of some of the key events during Lambert's imprisonment that are easily traceable in the major records, followed by an evaluation of new evidence that has come to light.

Lambert was sent from the Tower of London to Guernsey in October 1661.¹ For much of his time Lambert was restricted to close confinement in Castle Cornet, no doubt to prevent a repeat of his earlier escape from the Tower.² His wife, Frances, petitioned that she and ten children be allowed to reside in a house the King had allowed Lambert to have on Guernsey.³ On 17 February 1662 a licence for Frances and three of her children 'to go and remain with her husband' was directed to Sir Hugh Pollard, then Governor of Guernsey. However, their time together on Guernsey was interrupted at the start of April 1662 when the Duke of York sent ships for Lambert and Vane, who was imprisoned on Scilly, to be brought for trial in London. On 22 April Lambert and Vane were handed over to Sir John Robinson, Governor of the Tower. On 25 April Robinson received a warrant to allow Lambert's wife and her children 'to have access to her husband, and to converse with him in presence of his keeper'.⁴ Following his trial in 1662 Lambert was returned to Castle Cornet.⁵

At times Lambert was allowed out of close confinement. Some of this greater freedom seems to have been due to illness. In 1663/4 Frances petitioned that she be allowed to live with her husband who she felt should have more liberty because he was ill.⁶ A warrant

allowing Lambert more liberty was issued in November 1664.⁷ The nature of the liberty, however, was limited to the terms of an earlier period of increased freedom of November 1661 when Lambert had scurvy. This earlier liberty 'there was afterwards found reason to abridge'.⁸ The nature of the limited freedom allowed Lambert in 1661 and again in 1664 is outlined in a letter from the Lieutenant Governor of Guernsey, Nathaniel Darell.⁹

Lambert's confinement was eased by the fact that his wife Frances and some of his children were allowed to live close to him. However, at various times of danger he was put under increased scrutiny. Shortly after Lambert had been given more liberty in November 1664 a plot was discovered which aimed to free him. New orders were issued that Lambert should 'be kept a close prisoner and if at any time an enemy should appear before the island that he be shot for having had correspondence with the king's enemies'.¹⁰ One of the reasons stated by Charles II for his removal of Lord Hatton, Governor of Guernsey, was a failure to 'keep a stricter vigilance over Mr. Lambert the prisoner in his custody'.¹¹ Given Hatton's pre-1660 links with Lambert and the marriage of Mary Lambert to one of his sons, Charles Hatton, the authorities were probably worried about his loyalty.¹² At the time of a threatened invasion in July 1666 orders were given that Lambert should be shot immediately if troops arrived on the island.¹³ Finally in December 1667, after an appeal by Lord Belasyse, Viscount Fauconberg and Sir Thomas Ingram, Lambert was allowed to take a house with his wife and family on the island.¹⁴ However, a year later, Lambert was again in close custody. His wife and daughter Mary, who had married Charles Hatton, were allowed to stay with him because he was again ill.¹⁵

It is clear, then, that Lambert's conditions of imprisonment were subject to frequent change. In 1670 a more drastic change occurred when Lambert was transferred from Guernsey to St. Nicholas Island.¹⁶ While he was imprisoned off Plymouth, Samuel Pepys, Miles Halhead and James Yonge recorded having visited Lambert.¹⁷ Unfortunately, it was during his imprisonment at Plymouth that Lambert's wife, Frances, died in 1676.

Most of the above has come down to us because it is in the records of people who visited Lambert or in the official orders regarding his imprisonment. The survival in the State Papers of some of the events during Lambert's imprisonment meant that they could be easily related by Lambert's biographer.¹⁸ However, most of the events we know of to date were, if anything, probably not the norm for his imprisonment - thus they have left a record. It is clear, however, that besides the restrictions on his life, Lambert's imprisonment presented him with other problems with regard to his estates in Yorkshire, providing for his extensive family and his own subsistence as a prisoner. Rather than the events of the official records, it was these concerns which would have been of more immediate significance to Lambert during his long imprisonment. Some of the details relating to Lambert's subsistence are now clear through the survival of chancery proceedings from 1692, eight years after Lambert's death.

In the chancery proceedings the eldest son of the civil war Major General, also called John Lambert, brought a complaint against two of his brothers-in-law, Daniel Perrott and John Blackwell, and a Daniel Cox.¹⁹ Indeed, the records of the case refer to another of Lambert's brothers-in-law, Charles Hatton, and other members of the kinship circle of his father, Lord Belasyse and Thomas Heber, as well as figures from the interregnum world, John Rushworth and Henry Hatsell. As well as shedding more light on the Major General's imprisonment, the case gives more evidence regarding his death and how his business transactions were firmly rooted in his kinship circle after 1660 as they had been since his father's death in 1632.²⁰

In his complaint, Lambert stated that his father, the Major General, had, in 1660, land in Yorkshire totalling a yearly value of no more than £300. However, having been 'concern'd in ye late unhappy Warrs in ye times of Kg Charles ye first' these lands were forfeited to Charles II. An application was made

upon your Orators behalfe by diverse psons of honour & quality representing ye innocency of your Orator & ye sufferings of diverse of your Orators freind & relacons on his said Maties behalfe in ye unhappy troubles.

The lands were granted 'to diverse psons of quality & their heires to ye use & for ye benefitt of your Orator & his heires'. His father in the meantime 'was sent to ye Isle of Gurnsey where he continued prisoner dureing most of his life'. As his father and mother had 'contracted diverse Debts & being Destitute', Lambert supported them to the tune of £240 a year, reserving to himself only £100 p.a. He further stated that he had no legal obligation to do this but supported them because of 'filiall duty & nrall affection'.

Lambert then described how he was persuaded by the defendants to subscribe to an agreement 'or short note', outlining his payment of £240 a year to his father. He stated that he paid the amount for several years but, because of the distance of his father's imprisonment from Yorkshire, sometimes had to send the money to London to be passed on to his father. Two of people who were to do this for him he listed as 'Daniel Parrott now of Hogsden in ye County of Middlex Merchant who married your Orators sister & John Blackwell of ye Citty of London Esqr who married another of your Orators Sisters'. They, according to Lambert,

observing & finding Orator to be punctuall in his yearly paymts of ye sd two hundred & forty pounds for his said fathers use made use of your Orators sd fathers hard circumstances & by diverse indirect meanes pswades him yt your Orator might be ordered to secure to them...ye sume of six hundred & ninety pounds out ye sd yearly allowance to your Orators said father & to be discounted to your Orator in his future paymts where your Orator upon ye earnest entreaties of all ye sd psons complyd.

The defendants promised that they would accept Lambert's bond for the £690 and drew up a warrant of attorney to that effect. However, Lambert was concerned that he should not pay what he felt was his father's attempt for bettering the defendants' portions with his daughters. He did not want to be obliged by a judgement to pay the £690. According to Lambert the defendants told him that 'he should not be prejudiced by his Executing of ye sd Warrt of Attorney for they would not enter up any judgmt thereby but onely keep the same as if it were onely a Security'.

At the same time Lambert argued that Perrott and Blackwell persuaded him to become bound to a Dr Daniel Cox of London in the sum of £100, alleging that it was his father's debt, though he believed it was actually their debt. Since that time they gave him written demands for debts of his father of around £1000, though he argued he was not obliged to pay his father's debts, even if the debts were genuine.

Lambert claimed he paid the £240 a year to his father until 'his death wch happened on or about ye Year of our Lord God One thousand six hundred Eighty & four' and then paid 'sixty pounds & upwards for his funerall expenses'.²¹ Lambert also claimed that he paid the £690 but that the defendants, to get more money out of him, entered upon a Judgement upon the Warrant of Attorney and that they had his note concerning the payments of £240 and all the receipts for those payments which they gave to Cox. According to Lambert, the defendants had made out that he owed money to Cox for debts contracted from his father. Cox, as a result, sued him at Common Law and the others had taken a writ before the Sheriff of Yorkshire who, as a result, was investigating his estate as a means to paying the defendants off.

For their part, Perrott, Blackwell and Cox made a joint answer. First they claimed that the Major General's lands in Yorkshire were closer to the value of £400 plus p.a. Secondly, that the application to the King was

not on behalfe of the complt as in the said bill is suggested but for and on behalfe of the said complts ffather and ffrances then wife of the said John Lambert the ffather who was neerly related to the then right Honoble John Lord Bellasis and also of their children[;] his said Matie was graciously pleased by his lters patents bearing date on or about the second day of Aprill in the ffifteenth yeare of his raigne

to grant them to Belasyse in trust for Lambert the father and his wife. There then followed deeds involving Belasyse, Rushworth and Heber so that the lands were settled as Lambert the father and his wife should direct. Later £100 of these lands were settled on Lambert the son and his wife Barbara for her jointure. The rest of

the lands were settled on Perrott, Henry Hatsell and Edmund Harrison and their heirs in trust for Lambert the father for his life, then his wife and then for the eldest son, with £100 to Thomas Lambert, a younger son. In August 1673 Lambert the son requested that he become tenant to the lands at a yearly rent of £240 p.a. Lambert the father instructed Perrott to receive the rent and then return it to him 'the said John Lambert the ffather and ffrances his wife being then both at the Castle of St Nicholas Island near Plymouth' to sustain them and 'most of their children which was many'. Rent of £120 was due 'at the birth of our saviour in winter' and a further £120 at the 'ffeast of St John the Baptist in sumer'. A contract to this effect was drawn up, dated 15 November 1674. Perrott claimed that

the said John Lambert the ffather and ffrances his wife often complaining by letters to this defendt of the complt neglect in payment of his said rent and of the great straights and necessityes they were putt outt by reason thereof this defdt at their request and for their necessary support did very often advance sumes of money to them.

Finally, the father, being angry with 'the Complt for his high and riotous way of liveing', wrote to Perrott to get Blackwell to go to Yorkshire and turn his son out of the lands and settle them on some good tenant.

Blackwell claimed that, authorised by Perrott, Hatsell and Harrison with a letter of 22 February 1681, he journeyed to Yorkshire at the start of March in that year. Blackwell at first claimed that Lambert the son protested that the estate was only worth £300 p.a. but, when shown the figures, admitted that it was worth £400 p.a. Then Lambert claimed that he had difficulties paying because of the loss of cattle. However, Blackwell

inquiring alsoe into that matter did find the Complts cattle by which he received any losse were for the most part hare & horses of his said ffather and the Complts owne wife had and did complaine to this defendt were the cause of his Extravangces and ill Company Keeping.

Lambert then claimed he had undertaken a lot of building improvements. Blackwell felt they were not necessary for farming but more to do with his 'riotous Companions'. Finally, Blackwell came to an account of the arrears amounting to £450 and with a future yearly rent of £240 the son gave a warrant of attorney for £690. A judgement was entered into in relation to this in Hilary term 1682/3. According to Blackwell the son wrote apologising to the father and the father thanked Blackwell by letter.

Furthermore, Blackwell stated that in November 1658 he had become bound with Lambert the father to £2000 in bonds to various people, to enable the Major General to purchase land in Coverdale.²² One bond of 3 November 1658 was £1000 to Daniel Cox of New Windsor, Berkshire, for the payment of £515. All bonds were paid off except £280 to Cox. When Blackwell returned from Ireland in 1670, Cox pressed him for the remaining £280 with interest and threatened to sue. Thus Blackwell paid £120 and Lambert's son and Charles Hatton, who 'married the Eldest sister of the Complt', gave a bond in 1671 of £200 to Cox, being aware it was the Major General's debt. Blackwell also had to give another bond to Cox, and when Hatton and Lambert's son did not pay their part, he had to give Cox another £100. He claimed that in return he only received £10 from the father so he was, according to his reckoning, still owed £210. Blackwell further claimed that he had a bond from the Major General of 3 November 1659, in relation to the debt for £515, of £1200 and that Lambert because of his imprisonment told Blackwell that he should claim the money from the arrears of rent owed by his son. Blackwell then went on to question whether the son actually paid for the funeral expenses.

Throughout their answer, the defendants several times referred the court to documents backing up their story, whereas Lambert claimed that he has no such documents. In orders of the court Lambert did try to get his attorney, Mr Farneham, to get an injunction to stop the defendants proceeding at Common Law against him until they responded to his suit.²³ Following this a Mr Stedman, the defendants' council, showed that they had answered the complaint and that therefore the injunction against them proceeding against the son should be dissolved.²⁴ Lambert then responded through another attorney, a Mr Rawlinson.²⁵ In the last

recorded order of the court the injunction was dissolved because Lambert had taken no action.²⁶

Unfortunately there is, to date, no further evidence relating to these proceedings. From what is known, however, the case of the defendants is more plausible than Lambert's. Charles II did grant Lambert's lands to Lord Belasyse in trust for 'Dame Frances Lambert and her children'.²⁷ After Lambert's trial, Belasyse took further action to secure the land for Lambert's use.²⁸ Belasyse's actions were based on his kinship link with Lambert and should also be seen in light of Lambert's similar actions during the time of his power.²⁹ In 1667 Belasyse tried to improve the conditions of Lambert's imprisonment.³⁰ The lands were held in trust for Lambert with the aid of Thomas Heber and John Rushworth. Lambert's steward, Rowland Steward, appears to have ensured that Lambert received the rents from his properties.³¹ Rushworth and Heber in late 1669 transferred the lands to John Lister and Adam Baynes.³² This appears to have been in preparation for a settlement, drawn up three days later on 13 December, for Lambert's wife and children involving his eldest son, William Claton, John Rushworth, Thomas Heber, John Lister and Adam Baynes.³³ The marriage settlement of Lambert's eldest son with Barbara Lister in 1672 stated that Rushworth and Heber had conveyed the estates to William Claton and John Lister. They were settled in trust for the life of Lambert, then to the use of his wife, then to his eldest son for life with provision for his wife if she survived him.³⁴ This clearly fits with the information given by the defendants in their answer. The names of the people acting on Lambert's behalf - Claton, Heber, Rushworth and Baynes - also fit with their association and business with Lambert before his imprisonment.³⁵

Indeed, other information we have regarding the defendants backs up their side of the story. Lambert had many opportunities to come into contact with Blackwell.³⁶ Blackwell's father had property at Mortlake next to Lambert's estate at Wimbledon, and in 1658 Blackwell and Lambert sold land in Mortlake to John East.³⁷ This clearly points to further financial transactions between the two which Blackwell outlines in his answer. Indeed, Nuttall has convincingly argued that Blackwell's marriage in 1672 to one of Lambert's daughters was part of their financial co-operation.³⁸ With

regard to a detail within Blackwell's answer, it is documented that he petitioned Charles II for leave to confer with Lambert on business.³⁹

As to the other defendants, Daniel Perrott married Anne Lambert and was in contact with, or possibly even housed, Frances Lambert during her husband's early imprisonment.⁴⁰ Dr Daniel Cox was a leading figure in the medical profession and the main proprietor in West New Jersey. Daniel Cox was his son.⁴¹ The Edmund Harrison referred to was probably the member of the Levant Company and New Mediterranean Sea Company - thus his connection to Cox, Blackwell and Hooke.⁴² In 1700 an Edmund Harrison leased coal, stone and slate in Coverdale from Lambert's eldest son.⁴³ Henry Hatsell was an agent in the Admiralty Court, a Major General's commissioner, navy commissioner, customs official and M.P.⁴⁴

What we know concerning Lambert's eldest son also tends to support the picture of him drawn by the defendants in their answer. He is noted as having spent time and money hunting, drinking, and with artistic friends.⁴⁵

It is also clear that the men involved in this case as defendants conducted much business together and that their actions on behalf of Lambert were only one of the many transactions they undertook together. Blackwell established interests in America. Given this, it is probable that he was also involved with another of Lambert's sons-in-law, John Hooke.⁴⁶ Hooke was partnered by the same Daniel Cox who was Blackwell's co-defendant in the case of 1692. They had a scheme to settle in America because of the renewed danger from popery represented by James II. However, it is clear that their venture and cooperation did not go smoothly.⁴⁷ Blackwell's involvement is also suggested by the statement that he

had come to New England in 1685 and taken up land in north-eastern Connecticut in the interest of certain English and Irish Dissenters...preparing to settle down in Windham County, Connecticut....⁴⁸

Daniel Perrott, another of Blackwell's co-defendants in the 1692 case, undertook an unsuccessful business venture with Lambert Blackwell, son of John Blackwell.⁴⁹

These records from the proceedings of 1692, then, give more personal detail on some of the problems that faced Lambert during his long imprisonment than the State Papers. What is very clear is how reliant Lambert was on the actions of others. In such a vulnerable situation it was no wonder that Lambert turned to the men who were tied to him by kinship link and, in the case of Blackwell, a shared experience as comrades in arms. That Lambert had them conducting his business mirrors his relations with kin from 1632. Such a relationship with your kin was a natural feature of seventeenth century life. However, as this case and the disputes by the defendants in other chancery proceedings show, things did not always go smoothly when you did business with those close to you.

Notes

1. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* [hereafter *CSPD*], *Charles II, 1661-62*, p. 118, issuing of a warrant for Lambert to be taken to Guernsey by a Captain Hugh Hide.
2. P Gaunt, *The Cromwellian Gazetteer* (Gloucester, 1987), p. 22. For Lambert's escape from the Tower see British Library, Stowe Ms 185, ff. 153-4; E Ogle, W H Bliss, W D Macray & F J Routledge (eds), *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers* (5 vols, Oxford, 1872-1970), IV, 653-4; Bodleian Library, Clarendon Ms 71, ff. 225-6. After his recapture, it is clear that Lambert was considering making another escape. Elias Ashmole was examined by Secretary Nicholas on 5 March 1661 and reported that Lambert had been lately hesitating whether to endeavour an escape or to seek from the King release on bail. Lambert had consulted the astrologer William Lilly, who advised the latter course, since if he tried to escape he would be sure to be discovered. For this see *CSPD, Charles II, 1660-61*, p. 526. Lilly had constructed the 'nativity of General Lambert', probably on Lambert's instructions; see Bodleian Library, Ashmole Ms 174, f. 153. For Lilly see D Parker, *Familiar to All. William Lilly and Astrology in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1975).
3. *CSPD, Charles II, 1661-62*, p. 276. This mirrored an earlier petition by Frances that she be allowed to take 'a small house in the Tower, and for

- her husband to have the liberty thereof, that he may live with her and their 10 children...'; CSPD, *Charles II, 1661-62*, p. 216.
4. CSPD, *Charles II, 1661-62*, pp. 276, 329, 345, 350.
 5. For the trial see British Library, Egerton Ms 2979, f. 144; CSPD, *Charles II, 1661-62*, p. 399; M Exwood & H L Lehmann (eds), *The Journal of William Schellinks' Travels in England 1661-1663* (Camden Society, 5th series, volume 1, London, 1993), pp. 92-3; *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1661-64*, pp. 11, 154-5; British Library, Additional Ms 21425, f. 225.
 6. CSPD, *Charles II, 1663-64*, pp. 508, 514.
 7. Public Record Office [hereafter PRO], SP 47, Ms Calendar 1663-1724, Ind 1 6898 no. 35, November 1664, warrant allowing 'such liberty...to Lambert...as is consistent with the security of his person'.
 8. CSPD, *Charles II, 1661-62*, p. 574.
 9. *Ibid.* It appears as if Frances Lambert was on reasonably good terms with Christopher Hatton and Nathaniel Darrell; see British Library, Additional Ms 29551, f. 57.
 10. PRO, SP 47, Ms Calendar 1663-1724, Ind 1 6898, nos. 35, 39.
 11. PRO, SP 47, Ms Calendar 1663-1724, Ind 1 6898, nos. 40, 51.
 12. PRO, SP 29/51/32; British Library, Additional Ms 29569, f. 212; J T Rutt (ed), *Diary of Thomas Burton, Esquire* (4 vols, London, 1828), II, 182. In 1669 Lord Hatton wrote the following, trying to justify himself: 'Attempts have been made to accuse me of fault, because of the misfortune of my son's marriage with a prisoner's daughter there, whose father was attainted, and she had no portion. I did not know of the match till a year after and then I turned my son out of doors, and have never given him a penny since...'; see CSPD, *Charles II, 1668-69*, pp. 643-4.
 13. PRO, SP 47, Ms Calendar 1663-1724, Ind 1 6898, no. 86.
 14. CSPD, *Charles II, 1667-68*, p. 59. This should be seen in relation to the action Lambert took on the behalf of these royalist kin during the interregnum; see D Farr, 'The Military the Political Career of John Lambert, 1619-57', (unpublished doctoral thesis, Cambridge University, 1996).
 15. CSPD, *Charles II, 1667-68*, p. 234.
 16. J. Yonge, *Plymouth Memoirs* (edited J J Beckerlegge, Plymouth, 1951), p. 228 dates Lambert's arrival pre-March 1668, but CSPD, *Charles II, 1670, Addenda*, pp. 443, 452-3, 482 dates Lambert's arrival at Plymouth as 25 September 1670.
 17. R Latham & W Matthews (eds), *The Diary of Samuel Pepys* (12 vols, London, 1970-85), X, 217; E Chappell (ed), *The Tangier Papers of Samuel Pepys* (Navy Records Society, London, 1935), pp. 6-7. It is possible that part of the reason for Pepys's visit was to act as a line of

- communication between Lambert and Lord John Belasyse, who was Governor of Tangier, where ultimately Pepys was journeying to.
18. W H Dawson, *Cromwell's Understudy: The Life and Times of General John Lambert* (London, 1938).
 19. PRO, C 7/216/48.
 20. For a detailed consideration of Lambert's kinship circle and his finances see Farr, 'The Military the Political Career of John Lambert, 1619-57'.
 21. Before the discovery of this document, the only evidence relating to Lambert's death was the entry in Yonge, *Plymouth Memoirs*, p. 42. £60 would represent a considerable expenditure on a funeral; see D Cressy, *Birth, Marriage and Death* (Oxford, 1997).
 22. Lambert clearly was in possession of land in Coverdale; see CSPD, *Charles II, 1661-62*, p. 478; CSPD, *Charles II, 1660-61*, p. 289; Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Calton Deeds, DD 203, no. 153; Skipton Public Library, Serjeantson Ms 985, copy of the 'Grant by Letters Patent of Forfeited Estates of John Lambert, Esq., Attainted of High Treason, to John, Lord Belasyse', 2 April 1663; PRO, C 6/190/130.
 23. PRO, C 33/280, f. 57.
 24. PRO, C 33/280, f. 381.
 25. PRO, C 33/280, f. 617.
 26. PRO, C 33/282, f. 263.
 27. CSPD, *Charles II, 1661-62*, p. 478.
 28. CSPD, *Charles II, 1663-64*, pp. 30, 41, 166.
 29. Farr, 'The Military the Political Career of John Lambert, 1619-57'.
 30. CSPD, *Charles II, 1667-68*, p. 59.
 31. PRO, C 5/43/39.
 32. Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Ms 731d Belsay Ms Box 71/I/12.
 33. Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Ms 731d Belsay Ms Box 71/I/13.
 34. Dawson, *Cromwell's Understudy*, pp. 412-11.
 35. Farr, 'The Military and Political Career of John Lambert, 1619-57'.
 36. For example, during the campaigns of the New Model or when Blackwell was a Treasurer of War, a Commissioner for Charitable Uses with Lambert, a trustee for Deans and Chapters land, a member of the Committee for Durham College with Lambert or in parliament for Surrey. See *A more exact relation of the great defeat given to Goring's Army in the West, by the victorious Sir Thomas Fairfax. Sent in a letter from Captain Blackwell to his father in London* (London, 11 July 1645; British Library, Thomason Tract, E293 (8)); British Library, Stowe Ms 185, f. 113, Additional Mss 4196-7; *Publick Intelligencer*, 12-19 November 1655, p. 97; *Perfect Occurrences of Every Daie journall in Parliament*, 20-27 April 1649, p. 293; *Calendar of State Papers Commonwealth X*, pp. 50, 56-7, 66; Rutt (ed), *Burton's Diary*, passim.
 37. PRO, E 317/Surrey/72; PRO, CP 25(2)/602.
 38. W L F Nuttall, 'Governor John Blackwell: His Life in England and Ireland', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (April 1964), p. 139.
 39. CSPD, *Charles II, 1661-62*, p. 49.

40. Sheffield City Library Archives, Bright Papers, BR 71, f. 43; T Paulkner, *History and Antiquities of Kensington* (London, 1820), p. 369.
41. I hope to outline Dr Cox's relationship with John Blackwell and John Hooke in more detail in the near future.
42. M K Geiter, 'The Incorporation of Pennsylvania and late Stuart Politics', (unpublished doctoral thesis, Cambridge University, 1993).
43. On 22 August 1700; see Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Calton Deeds, DD, 203, no. 153.
44. R L Greaves & R Zaller (eds), *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century* (3 vols, Brighton, 1982-4); S K Roberts, *Recovery and Restoration in an English County* (Exeter, 1985); P D Shuter, 'The Role of Cromwell's Councillors in the First and Second Protectorate Parliaments', (unpublished MLitt thesis, Lancaster University, 1982); W B Cogar, 'The Politics of Naval Administration, 1649-60', (unpublished doctoral thesis, Oxford University, 1983).
45. British Library, Stowe Ms 746, ff. 34, 37; PRO, C 6/313/51; J H Turner (ed), *The Rev. Oliver Heywood, BA, 1630-1702: His Autobiography, Diaries, Anecdote and Events Books* (4 vols, Brighouse, 1882), II, 284.
46. John Hooke married Lambert's daughter Elizabeth, who died 26 January 1736. Hooke was born in Drogheda, the son of a clerk also called John. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and then admitted to Gray's Inn on 3 February 1675. No doubt due to his marriage into the family, Hooke was a witness to the marriage of Sarah Lister, the grand-daughter of Sir William Lister - Frances Lambert's father. Hooke also acted as the attorney for John Lambert junior in another chancery proceeding and mortgaged property to him in 1697. In 1700 Hooke was made a Serjeant at Law and was eventually Chief Justice for Wales. He is said to have died in 1712. In his will of 22 March 1710 Hooke left everything to his wife with instructions that Sir Lambert Blackwell help her in the future. Nathaniel Hooke, the Roman historian, was Hooke's son. For John Hooke see British Library, Additional Ms 26739, f. 224, Additional Ms 29655, f. 89; PRO, C 9/374/45, C 33/307, f. 191, C 6/313/51, C 5/24/4, PROB 11/526, f. 361; Yorkshire Archaeological Society, MD 335 Box 54 L 28; W R Williams, *The History of the Great Sessions in Wales 1542-1830, Together with the Lives of the Welsh Judges* (Brecknock, 1899); H L L Denny, *Memorials of an Ancient House: A History of the Family of Lister or Lyster* (Edinburgh, 1913); J Foster, *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn 1521-1889* (London, 1889).
47. PRO, C 9/374/45, C 7/592/33.
48. C M Andrews, *Colonial Period of American History* (3 vols, Yale, 1937), p. 308.

49. PRO, C 8/564/76, 1696. This was Sir Lambert Blackwell of Sprowston Hall, Norfolk, M.P. for Wilton 1708-10, envoy to the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Republic of Genoa.

In 1996 David Farr completed a Cambridge doctoral thesis on the career of John Lambert down to 1657. He is a teacher at Norwich School.

CROMWELLIAN BRITAIN XI HARROW, MIDDLESEX

by Jane A. Mills

Harrow is definitely Saxon in origin, as its place names can testify. It forms part of Middlesex, land of the Middle Saxon, and the coat of arms of the county displays three Saxon seaxes, which are curved notched short swords.

During the ninth to the eleventh centuries there was a well established ecclesiastical organisation and the emergence of a simple system of local government. The first level was the Tun which later became town; it was made up of a group of homesteads. Families were bound together in groups of ten known as a tithing; each group had a head man and petty disputes could be dealt with at the chief's house. The level above the Tun was the Hundred, which consisted of an area which had sufficient land to sustain a hundred families. The Hundred Court tried criminals, settled disputes, witnessed transfer of land and apportioned taxes. The final level was the Shire, which had civil and criminal jurisdiction. After the Conquest this Saxon form of local government was absorbed into the Norman feudal system and continued until the nineteenth century.

Middlesex was divided into six Hundreds, and Harrow was included in the fifth, the Hundred of Gore, from Anglo-Saxon "Gara" meaning corner of land. The land of Harrow was owned by the monks of Christ Church Canterbury until 1066, when Earl Leofwine, King Harold's brother, took control of the area. After

the Conquest William replaced Stigand the Saxon Archbishop of Canterbury with Lefrance from the Abbey of Le Bec Normandy and returned the control of Harrow to him.

Under the Norman feudal system the manor was all important. In 1086 the Hundred of Gore consisted of Harrow (Pinner was a Chapelry of Harrow), Hendon, Kingsbury, Edgware, Little Stanmore and Great Stanmore. Harrow was the largest manor in Middlesex, consisting of sufficient land for seventy ploughs, pasture for cattle and woodland for two thousand pigs. It was fourth in monetary value and fifth in population.

As Harrow was an archiepiscopal manor, it was farmed by tenants using the three crop rotation method, though the emphasis was on oats due to the clay soil; they also kept sheep, pigs and cattle. The northern part of the parish was woodland and therefore important for timber and charcoal. It attracted London merchants and courtiers to be landholders, among them Edward III's mistress, Alice Perrers.

During the unrest of 1381 Harrow residents did not appear to lack motivation in voicing their opinion regarding the opposition to the Poll Tax. Several disturbances occurred in Harrow and Pinner. When Archbishop Simon Sudbury, Lord of Harrow and Chancellor of England, was beheaded on Tower Hill by Wat Tyler, Harrow residents took advantage of the situation, refusing to pay rent and trespassing on the Archbishop's property and destroying the manorial records. A royal inquiry followed and some of the inhabitants were excluded from the general royal pardon. Sir Nicholas Brembre, a landowner in Roxeth and Northolt and a Lord Mayor of London, had been knighted for his part in stopping the Peasant's Revolt, but later put to death at Tyburn when it became apparent he had unlawfully executed twenty two prisoners.

Some two hundred and fifty years later Harrow again rebelled against taxation and actively refused to cooperate over Charles I's ship money. In 1635 the collectors had difficulty in obtaining payment in full and again in 1640 the Harrow residents opposed the King's men and it is recorded that there were forty seizures of property for non-payment.

Dr Richard Layton was the Rector of Harrow from 1537 to 1544, during which time he was commissioned by Henry VIII's Chancellor, Thomas Cromwell, to undertake the leadership of the Visitation of the Monasteries, a task he seemed to relish. He is particularly remembered for exhuming Thomas Becket's remains and burning them; he totally destroyed the magnificent shrine and the treasures were taken to Whitehall.

On 30 December 1545 Archbishop Cranmer was forced to hand the manor over to Henry VIII who sold it six days later to Sir Edward Dudley, Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations. It remained in his family's ownership until 1630.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Harrow became popular amongst the gentry as the ideal location, due to its proximity to London for parliament and court. Several notables had residences on and around the Harrow-On-The-Hill, which accounted for its popularity and growth. In 1562 Harrow was shown in the background of the topographical drawing of London commissioned for Philip of Spain on his marriage to Mary Tudor, a testimony if any to signify the area's importance.

John Lyon, an educated wealthy farmer and landowner, had longed to set up a school in Harrow on the lines of Eton and Merchant Taylor's. His patience was adequately rewarded in 1572 (Tudor calendar 1571) when together with his friend Sir Gilbert Gerard, the Attorney General, who owned an estate in Sudbury, they were granted a royal charter by Elizabeth I. The first Governor of the school was Gerard's brother, William Gerard, who lived in a house called Flambards located on Harrow-On-The-Hill, and which was used as the school until John Lyon built his school in 1615.

William Gerard enlarged the town well, erecting a pump house to provide water for all the tenants, and laid pipes to provide water at Flambards. Both John Lyon and William Gerard have monuments in St Mary's, Harrow-On-The-Hill. By the seventeenth century the manor consisted of a windmill and eight hundred acres and William's son Gilbert spent three thousand pounds on further improvements. In 1664 Flambards was the largest house in the

parish of Harrow; it had twenty five hearths, which became a liability when the Hearth Tax was introduced between 1662 and 1689. The house was pulled down sometime towards the end of the nineteenth century to make way for more houses, due to the railway boom.

During the 1630s Sir Gilbert Gerard became involved in a series of disputes with a George Pitt over the enclosure of Sudbury Common to be used as a rabbit warren. Gerard championed the tenants' cause against Pitt. The dispute became nasty when Gerard as JP sentenced Pitt's warrener to prison for supplying bowls on Whit Sunday, and Pitt cut down the elms in front of Gerard's house, which led to Gerard taking the case to the Star Chamber. In 1640 the landowners and tenants finally agreed to the warren at Sudbury. Gerard had used his position to protect the rights of the common for the tenants.

It is interesting to note that the Gerards are a typical civil war family in that they were split over their support for both sides. That part of the family descended from Attorney General Sir Gilbert actively supported the King; his great grandson Charles, first Baron Gerard of Brandon, fought at Edgehill, Lichfield, Bristol, Newark, Wales, left England with Prince Rupert and became Vice-Admiral of the royalist fleet in 1648, and it was he who was the instigator of his cousin John Gerard's planned assassination of Cromwell. Colonel John Gerard was arrested in May 1654 and stood trial on 3 June for his part in planning to kill Cromwell on the way to Hampton Court Palace. He was beheaded on 10 July 1654. A full and detailed account of the plot can be found in S R Gardiner's *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* volume three. Another cousin, Richard Gerard, commanded the bodyguard which escorted Henrietta Maria from the Hague to Bridlington Bay and he fought at the second battle of Newbury.

That part of the family descended from William of Flambards supported parliament and his grandson, Sir Gilbert (knighted by James I), became involved in the puritan network of marriage alliances when he married Mary Barrington, first cousin to Oliver Cromwell. Sir Gilbert was Member of Parliament for Middlesex, sitting in five parliaments between 1623 and 1640. He became

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and sat in Cromwell's Upper House. He became actively involved in the puritan movement to found puritan colonies in America; during the 1630s there was a great migration, and Gerard gave his support to his brother-in-law, Sir Thomas Barrington, and the Providence Island Company. He served with Hampden and Hesilrige on the Grand Committee for Religion to investigate the growth of popery, the decay of preaching and scandalous ministers. He was dismissed from his position as magistrate over his opposition to the ship money. During the summer of 1640, Sir Gilbert and another wealthy puritan, Sir William Roberts, together led the opposition in Middlesex in refusing to pay coat and conduct money for a new expedition against the Scots.

Though there was no fighting in Harrow, there is evidence from a 1643 dispatch that there was a military establishment at Harrow-On-The-Hill, where officers received their orders. Sir Gilbert raised a regiment on parliament's behalf from Harrow men and later was responsible for four thousand auxiliaries. He served as 'Treasurer at Warres' for parliament and announced in February 1643 that he was unable to pay the troops as the coffers were empty and that it would be necessary to levy regular taxes. A committee was appointed which led to a tax of five per cent, monthly contributions, and the rents of sequestrated estates.

In 1854 an old town well was filled in and Harrow school house, Rendalls, was built. In 1925 a plaque was placed on the building stating it was the location of the well where Charles I watered his horses on his flight from Oxford in 1646. Apparently his horse needed a shoe, so one of his companions took the horse to the blacksmith which stood near what is now Station Road.

Harrow is accessible by road via the A40, by British Rail and by the Underground. It is worth a visit to see the school museum, St Mary's Church and the Headstone Manor Museum.

Jane Mills has been a member of The Cromwell Association since 1988 and has written articles and book reviews for both *Cromwelliana* and *English Civil War Notes & Queries*.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PUBLICATIONS

I. Books

- J Adair, *By the Sword Divided* (new edn, Sutton, 1998).
 R Ashton, *The English Civil War* (new edn, Phoenix, 1997).
 R Askew, *Muskets and Altars: Jeremy Taylor and the Last of the Anglicans* (Mowbray, 1997).
 T Barnard, *The English Republic, 1649-60* (new edn, Longman, 1997).
 A Beer, *Sir Walter Raleigh and his Readers in the Seventeenth Century* (Macmillan, 1997).
 M Bennett (ed), *A Nottinghamshire Village in War and Peace: The Accounts of the Constables of Upton, 1640-66* (Thoroton Society Record Series 39, 1995).
 I Bostridge, *Witchcraft and its Transformations, c1650-c1750* (Clarendon, 1997).
 R L Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict and London's Overseas Traders 1550-1653* (Princeton UP, 1997).
 J Briggs, *The Stage-Play World: Texts and Contexts, 1580-1625* (new edn, Oxford UP, 1997).
 C C Brown & A F Marotti (eds), *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England* (Macmillan, 1997).
 S Bull & M Seed, *Bloody Preston: The Battle of Preston, 1648* (Carnegie, 1997).
 G Campbell, *A Milton Chronology* (Macmillan, 1997).
 C Carlton (ed), *State, Sovereigns and Society in Early Modern English History: Essays in Honour of A J Slavin* (Sutton, 1998).
 J Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
 B Coward, *Social Change and Continuity: England 1550-1750* (new edn, Longman, 1997).
 D Cressy, *Birth, Marriage and Death: Ritual, Religion and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford UP, 1997).
 R Cust & A Hughes (eds), *The English Civil War* (E Arnold, 1997).
 S Davies, *Unbridled Spirits. Women of the English Revolution, 1640-60* (Women's Press, 1998).
 H Diehl, *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism and Popular Theater in Early Modern England* (Cornell UP, 1997).
 M J Dobson, *Contours of Death and Disease in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 1997).

- D Doerksen, *Conforming to the Word: Herbert, Donne and the English Church Before Laud* (Associated UP, 1997).
 C Durston, *Charles I* (Routledge, 1998).
 J Eales, *Women in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (University College London Press, 1997).
 P Elliot-Wright, *The English Civil War* (Brassey's, 1997).
 K Fincham (ed), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church, II, 1625-42* (Boydell Press, 1998).
 J Fitzmaurice (ed), *Major Women Writers of Seventeenth Century England* (Michigan UP, 1997).
 P Gaunt, *The British Wars, 1637-51* (Routledge, 1997).
 G Geis & I Bunn, *Trial of Witches: A Seventeenth Century Witchcraft Prosecution* (Routledge, 1997).
 J D Grainger, *Cromwell Against the Scots: The Last Anglo-Scottish War, 1650-52* (Tuckwell Press, 1997).
 T Gray (ed), *Devon Household Accounts 1627-58, II. Henry, 5th Earl of Bath and Rachel, Countess of Bath, 1637-55* (Devon & Cornwall Record Society, 1996).
 A Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain* (British Museum Press, 1998).
 A Guibbory, *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton: Literature, Religion and Cultural Conflict in Seventeenth Century England* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
 A Halasz, *Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
 J K Hale, *Milton's Languages* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
 D B Haley, *Dryden and the Problem of Freedom: The Republican Aftermath, 1649-80* (Yale UP, 1997).
 J R Hammer, *Protector: A Life History of Richard Cromwell* (Vantage Press, 1997).
 J P P Higgins, *Urban Renaissance and Structural Change: Shrewsbury 1650-1775* (Birmingham UP, 1997).
 C Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution, Revisited* (Clarendon, 1997).
 C Hill, *Milton and the English Revolution* (reissued, Faber, 1997).
 C Hill, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (reissued, Phoenix, 1997).
 C Hill, *England's Turning Point* (Bookmarks, 1998).
 D Howard, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Macmillan, 1997).
 G K Hunter, *English Drama, 1586-1642* (Oxford UP, 1997).
 B Hurley (ed), *Wiltshire Protestation Returns 1641-2 and Taxation Records for the Warminster Division 1640* (Wiltshire Family History Society, 1997).

- M I. Kaplan, *Culture of Slander in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
- D R Kelley & D H Sacks (eds), *Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric and Fiction, 1500-1800* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
- S Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic: Political Culture of the English Commonwealth* (Manchester UP, 1997).
- A B Kernan, *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright: Theater in the Stuart Court, 1603-13* (Yale UP, 1997).
- F Kitson, *Prince Rupert* (Constable, 1998).
- D Lindley (ed), *Court Masques: Jacobean and Caroline Entertainments, 1605-40* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- C E Long (ed), *Richard Symonds's Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army* (reissued, Cambridge UP, 1997).
- J Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars* (Macmillan, 1997).
- D K McColley, *Poetry and Music in Seventeenth Century England* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
- P E McCullough, *Sermons at Court, 1559-1625: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- T MacLachlan, *The Civil War in Wiltshire* (Rowan Books, 1997).
- H Marchitello, *Narrative and Meaning in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
- P Marshall (ed), *Impact of the English Reformation, 1500-1640* (E Arnold, 1997).
- S A Meigs, *The Reformations in Ireland: Tradition and Confessionalism, 1400-1690* (Macmillan, 1997).
- S H Mendelson & P Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- J Miller, *The Restoration and the England of Charles II* (new edn, Longman, 1997).
- J Murdoch, *Seventeenth Century Miniatures in the Collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum* (HMSO, 1997).
- W G Naphy & P Roberts (eds), *Fear in Early Modern Society* (Manchester UP, 1997).
- D Oldridge, *Religion and Society in Early Stuart England* (Scolar Press, 1998).
- G Parker & L Smith (eds), *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (new edn, Routledge, 1997).
- D Parnham, *Sir Henry Vane, Theologian* (Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1997).
- J Partridge & P Chadwick, *Historical Account of the Town and Parish of Nantwich, with a Particular Relation of the Remarkable Siege it Sustained in the Grand Rebellion of 1643* (Book Cellar Press, 1997).
- W B Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge UP, 1998).

- C Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
- L Picard, *Restoration London* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1998).
- A Plowden, *Our Women All On Fire: Women of the English Civil War* (Sutton, 1998).
- P & E Razzell (eds), *The English Civil War: A Contemporary Account, III (1643-7), IV (1648-56), V (1657-75)* (Caliban, 1997).
- M Reed, *Buckinghamshire Glebe Terriers, 1578-1640* (Buckinghamshire Record Society, 1997).
- P M Remfry, *Brampton Bryan Castle 1066-1399 and the Civil War 1642-46* (SCS Press, 1997).
- J M Rosenheim, *The Emergence of a Ruling Order. English Landed Society, 1650-1750* (Longman, 1998).
- A J Rowland, *Military Encampments of the English Civil Wars, 1639-59* (Stuart Press, 1997).
- A Sharpe (ed), *The English Levellers* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- J Sharpe, *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550-1760* (new edn, E Arnold, 1997).
- R Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell. King in All But Name, 1653-58* (Sutton, 1997).
- D Smith, *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603-1707: The Double Crown* (Blackwell, 1998).
- N Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-60* (new edn, Yale UP, 1997).
- S Smith-Bannister, *Names and Naming Patterns in England, 1538-1700* (Clarendon, 1997).
- R T Spence, *Lady Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery* (Sutton, 1997).
- L Spring, *Campaigns of Sir William Waller's Southern Association, 1643-45* (Stuart Press, 1997).
- L Spring, *The Battle of Cheriton, 1644* (Stuart Press, 1997).
- D Stevenson, *Union, Religion and Revolution in Seventeenth Century Scotland* (Variorum, 1997).
- A Stewart, *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton UP, 1997).
- M Stoye, *Plymouth in the Civil War* (Devon Archaeology, 1998).
- R Strong, *Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography, III, Jacobean and Caroline* (Boydell Press, 1997).
- D A Symonds, *Weep Not for Me: Women, Ballads and Infanticide in Early Modern Scotland* (Pennsylvania UP, 1997).
- S D Thompson (ed), *The Book of Examinations and Depositions before the Mayor and Justices of Southampton, 1648-63* (Southampton Records Society 37, 1994).

- S Trill, K Chedgoy & M Osborne (eds), *Lay By Your Needles Ladies, Take the Pen: Writing Women in England 1500-1700* (E Arnold, 1997).
- J Twynning, *London Dispossessed: Literature and Social Space in the Early Modern City* (Macmillan, 1997).
- N Tyacke (ed), *A History of the University of Oxford, IV, Seventeenth Century Oxford* (Oxford UP, 1997).
- N Tyacke (ed), *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800* (University College London Press, 1997).
- T L Underwood, *Primitivism, Radicalism and the Lamb's War: Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford UP, 1997).
- J P Ward, *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity and Change in Early Modern London* (Stanford UP, 1997).
- A R Warmington, *Civil War, Interregnum and Restoration in Gloucestershire, 1640-72* (Royal Historical Society, 1997).
- D Watt, *Secretaries of God: Women Prophets in Late Medieval and Early Modern England* (Brewer, 1997).
- T Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movements, 1620-43* (Cambridge UP, 1997).
- C V Wedgwood, *Montrose* (reissued, Sutton, 1998).
- G Williams, *The Great South Sea: English Voyages and Encounters, 1570-1750* (Yale UP, 1997).
- S Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- M Wolffe, *Gentry Leaders in Peace and War: The Gentry Governors of Devon in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Exeter UP, 1997).
- E M & N Wood, *Trumpet of Sedition: Political Theory and the Rise of Capitalism, 1509-1688* (Pluto Press, 1997).
- M B Young, *Charles I* (Macmillan, 1997).
- P Young, *Marston Moor 1644* (reissued, Windrush Press, 1997).
- P Zagorin, *History of Political Thought in the English Revolution* (reissued, Thoemmes Press, 1997).

II. Articles

- D Armitage, 'Making the empire British: Scotland in the Atlantic world, 1542-1717', *Past & Present* 155 (1997).
- M Bennett, '"My plundered townes, my houses devastation": the civil war and North Midlands life, 1642-46', *Midland History* 22 (1997).
- M J Braddick, 'Resistance to royal aid and further supply in Chester, 1664-72', *Northern History* 33 (1997).
- M J Braddick & M Greengrass (eds), 'The letters of Sir Cheney Culpepper, 1641-57', *Camden Miscellany* 23, 5th series, 7 (1996).
- A E Button, 'Penruddock's Rising, 1655', *Southern History* 19 (1997).
- B Capp, 'George Wharton, *Bellum Hybernicale*, and the cause of Irish freedom', *English Historical Review* 112 (1997).

- C Churches, 'Women and property in early modern England: a case study', *Social History* 23 (1998).
- J T Cliffe (ed), 'The Cromwellian decimation tax of 1655. The assessment lists', *Camden Miscellany* 23, 5th series, 7 (1996).
- C Condren, 'Liberty of office and its defence in seventeenth century political argument', *History of Political Thought* 18 (1997).
- J A Davies, 'A civil war coin hoard from Wartwell, South Norfolk', *Norfolk Archaeology* 42 (1994).
- C Durston, 'The fall of Cromwell's Major-Generals', *English Historical Review* 113 (1998).
- J Egan, 'Milton's aesthetics of plainness, 1659-73', *The Seventeenth Century* 12 (1997).
- C S Egloff, 'John Hobart of Norwich and the politics of the Cromwellian Protectorate', *Norfolk Archaeology* 42 (1994).
- M Evenden, 'Gender differences in the licensing and practice of female and male surgeons in early modern England', *Medical History* 42 (1998).
- J Fendley, 'William Rogers and his correspondence', *Recusant History* 23 (1997).
- N R R Fisher, 'Sir Peter Balle of Mamhead: a study in allegiance', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association* 129 (1997).
- A Fox, 'Rumour, news and popular political opinion in Elizabethan and early Stuart England', *Historical Journal* 40 (1997).
- J Fox, 'Sevenoaks, Seal and Ightham, 1560-1650', *Archaeologia Cantiana* 116 (1996).
- M Gaskill, 'Reporting murder: fiction in the archives of early modern England', *Social History* 23 (1998).
- P Gaunt, 'William Prynne's reception at Chester in 1637', *Cheshire History* 37 (1997-8).
- I Gentles, 'The New Model officer corps in 1647: a collective portrait', *Social History* 22 (1997).
- L Gowing, 'Secret births and infanticide in seventeenth century England', *Past & Present* 156 (1997).
- R Grassby, 'The decline of falconry in early modern England', *Past & Present* 157 (1997).
- R Grassby, 'Love, property and kinship: the courtship of Philip Williams, Levant merchant, 1617-50', *English Historical Review* 113 (1998).
- R Greaves, '"Let truth be free": John Bunyan and the Restoration crisis of 1667-73', *Albion* 28 (1996).
- P Griffiths, 'Secrecy and authority in late sixteenth and seventeenth century London', *Historical Journal* 40 (1997).
- J Gurney, 'George Wither and Surrey politics 1642-9', *Southern History* 19 (1997).
- T Harris, 'What's new about the Restoration', *Albion* 29 (1997).

- K Hill, 'Mathematics as a tool for social change: educational reform in seventeenth century England', *The Seventeenth Century* 12 (1997).
- S Hindle, 'Power, poor relief and social relations in Holland fen, c1600-1800', *Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- S Hindle, 'Persuasion and protest in the Caddington Common enclosure dispute, 1635-9', *Past & Present* 158 (1998).
- R Hutton, 'The experience of the civil war in the west', *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society* 138 (1995).
- I Ide, 'John Kent (1558-1630) of Devizes, Potterne and Winsley', *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 88 (1995).
- J Kepler, 'The international entrepot at Dover in crisis: English fishing entrepreneurs, Dunkirk privateers, government policy and the character of King Charles I, 1637-40', *Archaeologia Cantiana* 116 (1996).
- R Law, 'The first Scottish Guinea Company, 1634-39', *Scottish Historical Review* 76 (1997).
- R Lawson-Peebles, 'The many faces of Sir Walter Raleigh', *History Today* 48 (March 1998).
- K Lindley, 'Whitechapel Independents and the English Revolution', *Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- P Little, '"Blood and friendship": the Earl of Essex's protection of the Earl of Clanricarde's interests, 1641-6', *English Historical Review* 112 (1997).
- J R Maddicott, 'Plague in seventeenth century England', *Past & Present* 156 (1997).
- P Malloy, 'Unexpected clues in a seventeenth century Anglican recension of a Roman Catholic devotional book', *Bodleian Library Record* 16 (1997).
- P Moloney, 'Leaving the Garden of Eden: linguistic and political authority in Thomas Hobbes', *History of Political Thought* 18 (1997).
- H Morgan, 'Festive Irishmen: an "Irish" procession in Stuttgart, 1617', *History Ireland* 5 (1997).
- M Morris, 'The rise of the English sailcloth industry, 1565-1643', *Mariner's Mirror* 84 (1998).
- K Noonan, '"The cruell pressure of an enraged, barbarous people": Irish and English identity in seventeenth century policy and propaganda', *Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- C North, 'Fustians, figs and frankincense: Jacobean ship inventories for Cornwall', *Journal of the Royal Institution of Cornwall* new series II, 2 (1995).
- M O'Callaghan, '"Talking politics": tyranny, parliament and Christopher Brooke's *The ghost of Richard the third* (1614)', *Historical Journal* 41 (1998).

- J Overhoff, 'The Lutheranism of Thomas Hobbes', *History of Political Thought* 18 (1997).
- D Parrott, 'The Mantuan succession, 1627-31: a sovereignty dispute in early modern Europe', *English Historical Review* 112 (1997).
- C Patterson, 'Conflict resolution and patronage in provincial towns, 1590-1640', *Journal of British Studies* 37 (1998).
- J T Peacey, 'Order and disorder in Europe: parliamentary agents and royalist thugs, 1649-50', *Historical Journal* 40 (1997).
- L L Peck, 'Beyond the Pale: John Cusacke and the language of absolutism in early Stuart Britain', *Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- C Peters, 'Single women in early modern England', *Continuity & Change* 12 (1997).
- S E E Pitts, 'The Slingsbys of Scriven, c1600-88', *Northern History* 33 (1997).
- L A Pollock, 'Childbearing and female bonding in early modern England', *Social History* 22 (1997).
- M Power, 'Councillors and commerce in Liverpool, 1650-1750', *Urban History* 24 (1997).
- M Questier, 'Loyalty, religion and state power in early modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean oath of allegiance', *Historical Journal* 40 (1997).
- M Questier, 'The politics of religious conformity and the accession of James I', *Historical Research* 71 (1998).
- L Racaut, 'The "Book of Sports" and sabbatarian legislation in Lancashire, 1579-1616', *Northern History* 33 (1997).
- A Randall, 'Recusancy in Carmarthenshire', *Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 33 (1997).
- D R Ransome (ed), 'The parliamentary papers of Nicholas Ferrar, 1624', *Camden Miscellany* 23, 5th series, 7 (1996).
- J Raymond, 'An eyewitness to King Cromwell', *History Today* 47 (July 1997).
- J Rigney, 'An uncatalogued item by Thomas Blount (1618-79)', *Bodleian Library Record* 16 (1997).
- S K Roberts, 'War and society in Devon, 1642-6', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association* 128 (1996).
- D Scott, '"Hannibal at our gates": loyalists and fifth columnists during the Bishops' Wars - the case of Yorkshire', *Historical Research* 70 (1997).
- K Sharpe, 'Private conscience and public duty in the writings of Charles I', *Historical Journal* 40 (1997).
- A Shepard, 'Cambridge University Courts 1560-1640', *Journal of Legal History* 19 (1998).
- C J Sommerville, 'Surfing the coffeehouse', *History Today* 47 (June 1997).

- N H Stacy, 'From the font to the grave in early modern Dyrham', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 113 (1995).
- M Stoye, 'The last refuge of a scoundrel: Sir Richard Grenville and Cornish particularism', *Historical Research* 71 (1998).
- J T Swain, 'Capital formation by clothiers in north-east Lancashire, c1550-1640', *Northern History* 33 (1997).
- C Thompson, 'The reaction of the House of Commons in November and December 1621 to the confinement of Sir Edwin Sandys', *Historical Journal* 40 (1997).
- S Thurley, 'The lost Palace of Whitehall', *History Today* 48 (January 1998).
- B Till, 'The Worcester House Declaration and the restoration of the Church of England', *Historical Research* 70 (1997).
- R Tittler, 'Reformation, civic culture and collective memory in English provincial towns', *Urban History* 24 (1997).
- M Todd, 'A captive's story: puritans, pirates and the drama of reconciliation', *The Seventeenth Century* 12 (1997).
- V Treadwell & J McLaughlin, 'New light on Richard Hadsor', *Irish Historical Studies* 30 (1997).
- P Tudor-Craig, 'Times and Tides', *History Today* 48 (May 1998).
- G Ungerer, 'The Earl of Southampton's donation to the Bodleian in 1605 and its Spanish books', *Bodleian Library Record* 16 (1997).
- E R Wagstaff, 'Robert Browne, Leader of the Brownists', *Northamptonshire Past & Present* 9 (1996-7).
- R White, 'Christmas with Sam and Elizabeth', *History Today* 47 (December 1997).
- J Wilson, 'Patronage and pietas: the monuments of Lady Anne Clifford', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 97 (1997).
- A Wood, 'The place of custom in plebeian political culture: England 1550-1800', *Social History* 22 (1997).
- J Woodward, 'Images of a dead queen', *History Today* 47 (November 1997).
- E A Wrigley, 'How reliable is our knowledge of the demographic characteristics of the English population in the early modern period?', *Historical Journal* 40 (1997).
- J R Young, 'Seventeenth century Scottish parliament rolls and political factionalism: the experience of the Covenanting movement', *Parliamentary History* 16 (1997).

BOOK REVIEWS

In *Inventing a Republic* (Manchester UP, 1997, £29.95), Sean Kelsey examines 'the political culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-53', with a view to restoring and enhancing the reputation of the parliamentary republic which for over four years governed England and took over Ireland and Scotland, claiming for itself the dynastic Stuart inheritance dissolved by the execution of Charles I. Dr Kelsey states the 'common' charge against the Commonwealth at its strongest: it was 'a feckless, shallow and unconvincing expedient'. The epithets are his own. No other historian has used all three together. Accepting that the Rump's revolutionary fervour was somewhat subdued, he argues that the experience of governing exhilarated the M.P.s, stiffened their self-confidence and made them *de facto* republicans. 'Regardless of a relative lack of republican theory...they embraced radical change as the only guarantor of continuity'. Certainly continuity is a kind of change, otherwise it is stagnation, but what is striking about the public image of the republic is how much it retained of what Halifax would later describe as 'the tinsel' of the old monarchy - ceremonial at Whitehall, as before, 'a government compound' with controlled access, a site for spectacles which were, as always, outward significations - icons - of the inwardness of the regime. Embarrassed by 'sitting on bayonets', mostly men of a conservative moderate disposition, they were anxious to make a civil impact on their own populace and a wider world. Stress was on 'traditional' parliamentarianism laced with English patriotism. A chapter on honour, seeking novelties, shows in fact how much of the old values and their expression survived. If the House of Lords was abolished, hereditary titles lived on, and if no new ones were accorded, in such designations as Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal there was 'a kind of functional ennoblement', and the patronage and influence that had always gone along with honour endured, giving opportunities for charges of corruption. Alongside civil honour ran military honour - Mark Kishlansky's 1647 stress maintained in the 1650s and crackling the surface glaze of dignity which the Commonwealth worked to fuse.

The dissolution of April 1653 is identified in a chapter on politics as 'a key moment in the representation of the regime...historiographically almost the defining moment'. Everything comes to focus on the notoriously missing Bill for a new representative. Even with so much ingenuity in elaborating what could, must, might be in it, we cannot be sure of its thrust. Did Cromwell destroy it? Dr Kelsey thinks he did. But why, then, did not the Commonwealthmen in the Cromwellian parliaments expose

its contents? Could no-one remember them? (Sir John Elliot had no difficulty with the 'three resolutions' in 1629.) When in 1659 the restored Rump ordered a search for it, it could not be found. So they left it to historians to argue with heat and light about it. Dr Kelsey makes a good case for the seriousness and skill with which the men who framed the Commonwealth - not to be identified *tout court* with the Commonwealthmen who plagued the Protectors - set about creating a free state without a king or House of Lords. Perhaps given a longer life it might have become deserving of a longer life by being positively experimental both in style and substance. Even so, on balance it seems still an expedient, though a few favourable epithets might be applied to it. The Protectorate, with its written constitutions, for all its faults, would be rather more experimental.

If 1649-53 saw moves towards inventing a republic, 1653-59 found government with 'somewhat of monarchical in it'. Roy Sherwood, whose *The Court of Oliver Cromwell* (1977) brought out the aulic aspects of the Protectoral household, extends his coverage to the organs and organisation of government in *Oliver Cromwell. King in all but Name* (Sutton, 1997, £18.99). He has no difficulty in showing how Cromwell's head - which in its mummified form has obsessed collectors of such curiosities - came close to being crowned *de jure* regal. There was even talk, not confined to England, that he might become 'august Emperor of the British Isles'. Certainly Oliver took over, as Kelsey shows the Commonwealth doing, much of the symbolism of the old monarchy, but it was one worn with a difference. The Protector was a brilliant actor, too, of majesty. Ambassadors, thinking they would encounter a country bumpkin, found a man who seems almost a right down regular royal king. What could be said for and against kingship - much of both - was said in parliament and outside in the spring of 1657, when kinglings were worked on by that 'royalist-cum-Cromwellian' - note the order of words - Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill, dabbler throughout the 1650s in the fates of all three erstwhile kingdoms. It is clear that Cromwell was under great pressure, external and internal, sustained by private discussions, party games, music and tobacco. In the end his 'no' was, Sherwood feels, deference to 'the men who had bled all along in the cause and hazarded their lives against monarchy', which many of his current entourage had not. The revised Protectorate was, then, not regal, though the second installation smacked of it, extended to the use of the Stone of Destiny used in coronations since 1308, 'nothing wanting', according to Edward Hyde, '...but a crown and an archbishop' - a lack which did not stop some from talking about 'the Protector Royal'. Soon Oliver was issuing letters patent, creating hereditary peers and baronets. Sherwood sees him dying as a king, a view reinforced by the proclamation of Richard, 'a precise replication of the traditional procedure followed when sovereign followed sovereign'. Someone called Richard

'Richard IV' in parliament and 'Queen Dick', a title emphasising both royalty and the lack of some of the qualities of 'that great prince' (Andrew Marvell), his father, who would be accorded the 'great show' of a royal funeral.

Sherwood's thesis is well-researched and clearly presented, but his book remains, like Kelsey's on the Commonwealth, too readily convinced of its own case. Cromwell was ambivalent about everything, kingship included. In rejecting the title, for all his protestations about 'a feather in his cap', Cromwell really was rejecting the office too. A systematic analysis of the contents (and the implementation) of the Humble Petition and Advice is called for to help clinch the matter.

Roger Hainsworth's *The Swordsmen in Power* (Sutton, 1997, £25) offers a largely narrative survey of 1649-60, 'a decade of intense interest [which] has provided valuable lessons about power and its exercise' and the danger of army officers coming up with 'simplistic solutions to complex and confused political situations'. Cromwell was obviously a swordsman and in power during most of these years, but he was also consistently and continuously seeking to return himself and the state to civilian life. Pragmatism and principle competed within him and Hainsworth is inclined to agree with Blair Worden that in dissolving the Rump in 1653 he was acting in 'a mood of spiritual exaltation', but also with Ian Gentles that he had been meditating on a seizure of power over several months, confident of doing a decent job. When the Nominated Assembly gave up, he was not alone in seeing himself as the 'only serious repository of power in the state'. It would be hard to resist the view that if Cromwell had not accepted the Instrument of Government, there would have been a collapse and the emergence of naked rule of an amorphous lot of swordsmen or a drift into anarchy, out of which a restoration might have emerged, though hardly without bloodshed. The Instrument was not a blue-print for soldierly government. Though it gave Oliver 'potentially...immense power', it was power limited from various directions, including his own inclinations. 'Swordsmen in power' is not a completely apt designation for the 1650s. Hainsworth himself seems aware of that. He also gives much attention to Scotland - Oliver did not want it to be just 'a conquered province' - and Ireland - where Henry Cromwell's policy 'achieved much', some of it, it may be added, lasting. There is a welcome attention to foreign policy, 'the final achievement' of the Protectorate, 'the world's mistake' according to Slingsby Bethel a decade later. It was certainly disastrous in its impact on the Protectoral finances. Hainsworth has produced an intelligent and stimulating book, not always well proportioned - parliamentary affairs, for example, command more attention - but worthy of the attention of all Cromwellians.

Subtitled *The Double Crown* - surely it ought to be 'triple' - *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603-1707* by David L. Smith (Blackwell, 1998, £17.99 paperback) is the first volume of a series, 'founded' by Sir Geoffrey Elton and under the general editorship of John Stevenson, covering the area from 1529 to the present day. The approach is of 'an analytical and interpretative narrative', mainly political but with other aspects interwoven, perhaps tipped in. Stress is on the nature of the kingship and the personalities and outlooks of successive wearers of the crown, including one ruler who almost but not quite put it on. Curiously given current interests and the general theme, 'the British problem' is not addressed in the Preface and is only lightly tackled throughout. The 1650s is succinctly - too succinctly - covered in 30 pages, perhaps because Charles I's 'final commitment to a constitutional monarchy guarding popular liberties and the Church of England would ultimately provide the basis for the Restoration', and we might as well get on with it. Even so, much of value is said. The calling of the Nominated Assembly casts doubt on Oliver's personal ambition. He seems 'genuinely surprised' when it resigns. His manic energies as Protector hark back to the depression and introspection followed by conversion in the 1630s. Penruddock's rising reveals apathy to both king in exile and usurper. The regime is finally 'blown away by its own contradictions', with Monck, inscrutable to the last, letting events take their course. Smith's book is written with verve and clarity, is up-to-date in its historiography, marked by his own research, and provides for civil war and interregnum buffs, as we all are, a vivid context in its coverage of the whole century.

A portable archive of material life from cradle to grave during what might be called 'the long seventeenth century' has been got together by Mary Abbott in her *Life Cycles in England, 1560-1720* (Routledge, 1996, £12.99 paperback). Part I, backed with copious quotations, runs through such topics as conception, birth, infancy, love and 'the business of marriage', householding, old age, funerals, death, the lot! It includes Isaac Newton's formidable 'list of sins' committed in 1662. The second part is a rather eclectic, but absorbing, selection of documents - extracts from the Prayer Book of 1662 on baptism and the churching of women, parish registers, wills (Hobbes's and Pepys's), inventories, indentures, advice to housewives, duties within families ('discord betwixt man and wife in a house is as contentious betwixt master and pilot in a ship'), breast-feeding, education, witchcraft beliefs, 'reckoning', herbal medicine and murder. A light running commentary helps: Part III is 'a dossier of illustrative images', some of which are difficult to connect up with the earlier material, but which include a few memorable memorials - 'most of the community [though] went to unmarked graves'. An 'unknown boy', in a skirt, pushes

himself around in a baby-walker - 'while children were often classified as less than fully human, crawling on all fours like an animal was something to be discouraged'. The emphasis here is post-Restoration, but the claim that *Life Cycles* provides a lively and acceptable introduction to social history over a large tract of the early modern period is fair enough.

A work of a different order, imaginative, perceptive, integrated, and beautifully produced, is David Cressy's *Birth, Marriage and Death: Ritual, Religion and the Life Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford UP, £25), again concerned with all stages of the life cycle and particularly the rituals that accompanied them, about which conflict could arise, drawing on diverse religious, social and political attitudes, from the national down to parochial level - nay, even within families. Prescribed locations, timing, words, gestures, recognised participations could still contain contradictions, ambiguities open to different interpretation and significance - things necessary, things indifferent - particularly in an age of criticism and mingled conservatism and innovation. A cornucopia of sources - ballads, sermons, church and lay records, diaries, letters, treatises - feeds a study which, while commentating on the major rites of passage of the title, takes in a wealth of others - weaning, the breeching of boys, catechisms, matriculation, espousals, anniversaries and whatever - setting out what *should be*, while observing what *was* - the effects of gossip and malice, for instance.

Cressy stresses how over his two centuries English people coped - some more, some less - with 'the complex demands of custom, authority and religions at the critical moments in the life cycle', observing rituals, chiefly but not exclusively religious - customary or ordained - which gave them a sense of discipline and dignity within the congeries of communities - e.g. parish, family - within which life was lived out. Some show the gentry and the meaner sort coming together in the earlier years, but show that after the Restoration the elite, the privileged class, drew away from ceremonials open to all into privacy. Here the troubles of 1640-60 must have had an impact - that of extraordinary times on ordinary doings. Smashing a font was something more than mere vandalism.

Cressy concludes with a query - should early modern England be considered as a cultural entity in this field of activity (or any other) or should regional and local patterns be sought out? I am inclined to support the latter. He also calls rightly for comparative studies with Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Europe and the American colonies - a vast but surely worthwhile enterprise, for which this pioneer work of intense curiosity, acute observation, vibrant ideas and imagination provides pointers. Written with clarity, elegance and vivacity, it can stand confidently

alongside Keith Thomas's equally innovative *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (1971).

The Introduction by Jonathan Barry, with Marianne Hester and Gareth Roberts (eds), *Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge UP, 1996, £40 cloth; 1997, £15.95 paperback), evaluates Thomas's book in the light of a 1991 conference at the University of Exeter. Barry sees *Religion and the Decline of Magic* as 'a supreme effort of sympathy, to make rational (to the rational) that which could easily be dismissed as irrational' - an approach which Barry suggests exaggerates the historical nature of the sources used while discounting their conventional literary and rhetorical nature, blurring the line between fact and fiction, history-telling and story-telling and, willy nilly, 'underplaying the fictional aspect'. Barry does accept that Thomas did comment that there was 'still much about the fantasy...of witch beliefs which cries for explanation'. The conference papers show how much witchcraft studies have advanced since 1971, to say nothing of since Montagu Summers and Margaret Murray, and how much more must remain for investigation. Of particular interest here to Cromwellians is, first, an article by Peter Elmer on 'quakerism, demonology and the decline of witchcraft in seventeenth century England', which suggests that the Quakers, in what may be called the revolutionary phase in the 1650s, 'were beginning to take the place of the witch as a cause of fear and panic about religion and social disorder in the minds of some of the men who ruled England in the 1650s'. It was claimed in 1655 that 'the Devil hath [in the Quakers] a finer way of witchcraft now than ever he had since the world began'. James Naylor, whose 'case' contains so many layers of historical interest, was asked 'whether you in your quaking fraternity be saints or sorcerers?' Such a question could never be asked of the 'decent' Foxian post-Restoration Quakers. James Sharpe contemplates 'the Devil in East Anglia' in a reconsideration of the Witchfinder Hopkins trials of 1645-7, often seen as untypical of English prosecutions, taken as little concerned with pacts with the Devil, still less sexual intercourse with him. Sharpe *per contra* finds 'one constant indication that the Devil featured fairly prominently in people's consciousness' in the first half of the century. Consequently the Hopkins trials might benefit from being studied comparatively with witch-hunting everywhere. Sharpe hints already at a possible conclusion: that a polarity between the devil of the learned demonologists and that 'imagined' by the populace at large might be more apparent than real. 'Witchcraft in early modern Kent', by Michael Gaskill, examines stereotypes and the background to accusations over a century which produced a fair quota of witches and, in Sir Robert Filmer of *Patriarcha* fame, a sceptic. (Filmer commented thoughtfully on the Maidstone trials of 1651, the theme of my own first published historical work, in *The Maidstonian*, my school magazine, all of sixty-one years ago.

It was not very searching.) Gaskill finds that the Thomas/MacL'artano model, whereby 'an incongruous and unconforming individual' - typically an elderly woman living alone - was in effect the victim of social and economic pressures, does not apply here. Rather, accusations could arise out of 'intense...conflict between [and within] competing households', which, naturally enough, comprised both men and women of all ages. Misogyny, it seems, was not enough. Examples of men popularly charged appear, confirming the learned William Perkins's opinion that males were not exempt from the sin. Accusations might, it is hinted, release tensions for which 'no other legitimate means of expression existed', the effect of malice rather than maleficium, misunderstandings, cumulative resentments. They could originate, too, from an urge of 'the weak to undermine the position of social superiors' in strained relationships. There are other stimulating articles in a volume which shows how far witchcraft has receded from the 'lunatic fringe' of historical studies into the mainstream.

Women's history, too, is ceasing to be the 'minority' study it should never have been, underplayed by women themselves as much as by men. The law in Stuart England may have been a husband's law, but there were all sorts of husbands, all sorts of wives, and the way people live has never been totally dictated by 'ought' or 'must'. Women - wives, spinsters and widows - could and did display initiatives, in trading, estate-running, decision-making. The civil war, when the world seemed to be turning upside down, provided them with unusual opportunities. Alison Plowden's pleasant study *Women All On Fire* (Sutton, 1998, £19.99) shows some of their responses. Not surprisingly the emphasis is on women of the higher classes, notably the 'she-generalissima' Henrietta Maria. Anne Fairfax, Sir Thomas's helpmeet from a military background, was captured riding pillion among the cavalry at Bradford in 1645, to be returned next day by the Earl of Newcastle, 'the perfect gentleman'. (Anne, masked but obvious, would cry out when the roll of members of the court to try Charles I was called that her husband had more sense than to be there.) 'The Lady of Lathom', Charlotte, Countess of Derby, resisting a protracted siege, was held to have stolen the Earl's breeches. Later Nan, the vulgar wife of George Monck, would play a part (with Anthony Ashley Cooper) in bringing about the Restoration by persuading her enigmatic husband to have 'the secluded members' come back into the Rump in February 1660. Detail of the activity of women of the middling or meaner sorts can be found if you search it out. Alison Plowden reports on 'the bonny Besses in sea-green dresses' of the Levellers, demanding the 'rights and freedoms of the nation' - for their men, but one suspects for some of them for themselves. We read of 'poor female cattell', who by their 'seasonable noise' gave warning of enemies clambering over the works by night, where some by day had helped the men at the diggings. Curiously, no room is

found here for the women of the Cromwell household, none of them insipid, or for the twenty daughters that the long-suffering wife of William Walwyn produced, or for the stunning Mrs John Lambert, or the truly formidable wife and daughters of Richard Cromwell, who surely contributed to his long sojourn in exile. Admittedly, the stress of the book is on the 1640s, but a postscript does get into the Restoration. Much of the material used has been used before and many of the women are familiar, but their stories deserve retelling and, *pace* Lawrence Stone and those who see marriage then as a business transaction, Plowden points out 'the high degree of love and trust existing between husbands and wives'. Read Henry King's *The Exequy*.

Richard Symonds, from a divided Essex family, joined Charles I's life-guards at Oxford as a gentleman-ranker late in 1643 to take part at Newbury. He found he had leisure enough in the field to pursue antiquarian interests, recorded along with useful military details in his *Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army*, notably in the south-west in 1644 as Charles I pursued Essex to his defeat at Lostwithiel. He sketched coats of arms and monuments, stained glass windows and comments on architecture. Crediton, called he tells us by the vulgar Kirton, was 'a great lousy town'. Curiously, he fails to mention the church and St Boniface, of which the modern populace is so proud. A transcription was published by the Camden Society in 1845, now reissued in facsimile (Cambridge UP, 1998, £45 cloth, £15.95 paperback) with a valuable introduction by Ian Roy, who ascribes 'a considerable value' to it as an aid to our understanding of the war. If 'somewhat fragmentary', Symonds's account is the only one known by a royalist trooper, who would have pleased George Monck, as 'obeying orders rather than giving them'.

Ivan Roots

Stephen Porter, *Destruction in the English Civil Wars* (Sutton, paperback 1997).

Twenty years ago, Stephen Porter was employed as a research assistant for Volume V of *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*, and later he researched for Ian Gentles's book on *The New Model Army*. It was while he was travelling the country researching that he started gathering information which was used eventually in his own book *Destruction in the English Civil Wars*. It is an account of the extent and type of destruction which took place during the civil wars. We often read or talk about battles and sieges, but we do not realise the effect they had on property and

people. Porter analyses the causes, method and ultimate ~~con~~ of destruction. In some cases, it was planned in order to build fortifications or earthworks or to clear possible shelter for the enemy. Owners often received compensation, though if it was felt that it would cause economic hardship to an area, properties were saved. Trade routes were disrupted, which was serious, especially if an area relied on a single industry or commodity. There are chapters devoted to rebuilding and the legacy, as well as a gazetteer. This is an important research project which will help to disprove the notion that Cromwell was responsible for all destruction. This publication is an incredible feat of research; it will interest not only the military historian but also those of you who, like myself, are interested in social and economic history. It is a valuable addition to our clearer understanding of this period in history.

Jane A. Mills

Double Vision: Michael B Young, *Charles I* (Macmillan, 1997, £11.99) and Christopher Durston, *Charles I* (Routledge, 1998, £6.99).

Within the past twelve months two excellent accounts of the life and reign of Charles I have been published, by Macmillan in their 'British History in Perspective' series and by Routledge in their 'Lancaster Pamphlets' series, both aiming to provide a concise introduction to their subject, designed for students as well as general readers. Michael Young and Christopher Durston take a similar approach to their subject, dividing the reign chronologically into five or six principal chapters and providing not merely a straightforward narrative but also a strong historiographical insight. Both authors give particular weight to summarising the often conflicting views of other historians before presenting their own interpretations. And both, having charted their way through traditional, revisionist and post-revisionist viewpoints, take a generally dim view of Charles. For Young he was 'out of his depth', with a 'glaring lack of interpersonal skills', 'just plain scary', obsessed with 'order and control', lacking 'political aptitude', combative and untrustworthy; for Durston he was 'an abject failure', cold, suspicious and unsuited for the office of king, who must bear most of the responsibility for the catastrophes which engulfed man, office, nation and people in the mid seventeenth century.

Some differences do emerge between these two accounts. Most noticeable, perhaps, Durston lays greater weight on the novelty and disruptive impact of Charles's anti-Calvinist religious policies than does Young, who tends to see religious tension rooted more in anti-Catholicism than in anti-

Arminianism. Accordingly, while Durston stresses divisions caused by Charles's religious policies as a major cause of the breakdown of trust in the opening years of the reign, Young focuses more on fiscal, political and constitutional issues. Another significant difference is in overall length, for Young's book is almost three times as long as Durston's. This allows him to explore some issues at greater depth and also to incorporate a separate, introductory chapter, outlining the broad trends in historians' treatment of Charles I. Young also has a fuller biography and includes detailed references and an index. Working to a tighter word-limit, Durston's narratives of events and analyses of Charles's responsibilities tend to be sharper and more concise, and he includes a useful chronological table.

These two accounts, which undeniably overlap but which have different strengths and which at times take a slightly different line, can usefully be read with Brian Quintrell's study of the pre-civil war reign, *Charles I 1625-40* (Longman, 1993) in the 'Seminar Studies' series. Together, these three works now provide an excellent, informed and quite detailed introduction to the man and to his reign as king of England (Scotland and Ireland tend to receive limited attention), and give a picture of man and reign which is clearer and sharper than that found in the various full-length biographies of Charles I which are available.

Peter Gaunt

SUMMER SEASON 1998

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

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

admission free

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

open every day 10am-5.30pm

admission charge

The Commandery,
Sidbury,
Worcester.
Tel (01905) 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 0-905729-09-9

