

Cromwelliana

The Journal of
The Cromwell Association



1999

The Cromwell Association

- President: Professor 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 AYLMER, MA, DPhil, FBA, FRHistS
Miss PAT BARNES
Mr TREWIN COPPLESTONE, FRGS
Chairman: Dr PETER GAUNT, PhD, FRHistS
- Honorary Secretary: Mr Michael Byrd
5 Town Farm Close, Pinchbeck, near Spalding,
Lincolnshire, PE11 3SG
- 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, 5 Town Farm Close, Pinchbeck, near Spalding, Lincs, PE11 3SG

Press Liaison Officer: office to be filled

CROMWELLIANA 1999

edited by Peter Gaunt

CONTENTS

Cromwell Day Address 1998 By Roy Sherwood	2
Humphrey Mackworth: Puritan, Republican, Cromwellian By Barbara Coulton	7
Writings and Sources III. The Siege of Crowland, 1643 By Dr Peter Gaunt	24
Cavalry of the English Civil War By Alison West	32
Oliver Cromwell, Kingship and the Humble Petition and Advice By Roy Sherwood	34
'The Flandric Shore': Cromwellian Dunkirk By Thomas Fegan	43
Oliver Cromwell By the Rt Hon Frank Dobson, MP	59
Cromwellian Britain XII. Islington, London By Jane A Mills	65
Select Bibliography of Publications	71
Book Reviews By Professor Ivan Roots & Dr Peter Gaunt	78

ISBN 0-905729-10-2

by Roy Sherwood

I beheld a great multitude of people gathering together and thronging and pressing exceedingly. I beheld all spirits of people were up in wonderment and admiration, gazing they were and hurrying as if some marvellous and great thing had happened to them or was to be seen by them. I felt the spirits of men, women and children were all on fire and they were in an admiring frame and in a condition not usual.

Such was the evocative account of Quaker Edward Burrough of the bustle and excitement engendered by the magnificent royal state funeral of the man we commemorate here today, Oliver Cromwell.

The funeral took place on 23 November 1658 and, according to the poet Abraham Cowley, the expectation of this extraordinary event had brought people thronging to the capital from as far away as Orkney and Cornwall.

The reason for the long delay between Oliver's death on 3 September 1658, 340 years ago to this very day, and his state funeral was because the magnificence of the obsequies was such that it had taken that long to prepare them. His funeral was, in fact, even more magnificent than that of King James I, thirty-three years earlier, on which it had been modelled.

In accordance with royal custom all the symbolism and ceremonial of Cromwell's obsequies were attached to and revolved around a life-size effigy of the deceased, his actual body having already been buried in a private ceremony in the Chapel of the Kings in Westminster Abbey. Traditionally royal funeral effigies were sumptuously dressed, usually in clothes from the monarch's own wardrobe, over which was draped the raiment of sovereignty. As it had been with past Kings so it was with Protector Oliver.

The Protector's funeral effigy was clothed in the elegant attire that Oliver had worn at the wedding of his youngest daughter, Frances, a year earlier. This comprised a shirt of fine linen trimmed with a richly laced neckband and cuffs, a costly doublet and breeches 'of the Spanish fashion' made of uncut grey velvet, a pair of silk stockings with shoestrings and gold-laced garters to match and gold-buttoned shoes of black Spanish leather. Then came a surcoat, richly laced with gold, over which was draped an imperial robe of purple velvet lined with ermine of the sort worn by Kings at their

coronation and by Cromwell at his second investiture as Lord Protector in June 1657. The figure was girded with a kingly sword. In its right hand it held a golden sceptre and in the left an orb. While on the head had been placed a richly ornamented imperial crown. It was this effigy of the Protector that, twelve weeks after his death and two weeks after the burial of the body, was conveyed in a seven-hour spectacle from its lying in state at Somerset House in the Strand to Westminster Abbey. It was, as one royalist described it, 'a great show'.

What Cromwell would have thought about all this is impossible to say. What we do know is that at this time royal ceremonial and pageantry served an important function and that function was to illustrate and reinforce the authority, dignity and legitimacy of rulers. What function, therefore, could the very royal state funeral of Oliver Cromwell have served other than to illustrate and reinforce the Protector's regal status? It was certainly not at variance with the king-making ceremony that was Cromwell's second investiture in June 1657 when he was vested with an imperial robe of royal velvet, girded with a kingly sword and enthroned in the Coronation Chair holding a solid gold sceptre as a symbol of royal power.

Not surprisingly, this, like the Protector's state funeral, disgusted republicans and the more puritan elements who saw in it a blatant manifestation of those very evils against which the civil war was supposed to have been waged and Cromwell had himself fought. But any suggestion of either hypocrisy or betrayal is simply not valid.

The regal Oliver, the Protector Royal of his second investiture, robed as a King and enthroned in the Coronation Chair, sceptre in hand, is as consistent with the man and his beliefs as is the persistent stereotypical image of what some might see as the 'real' Oliver - the godly, russet-coated captain, cavalry sword in one hand and Bible in the other, so well portrayed in his likeness that stands outside the Houses of Parliament on Cromwell Green. After all, the desire to know and to do God's will cast Cromwell into many roles. There was the transformation, in middle age, from tenant farmer to brilliant cavalry commander and consummate general, having never before drawn a sword in anger. And there was his rise from relatively obscure Member of Parliament to eminent statesman. Each new role was more remarkable than the last but none more remarkable than Oliver's ability to rise to the requirements of what he felt was expected of him as God's instrument. And this was never more so than when he reached what one of Cromwell's contemporaries called 'the highest pitch of government and sovereign power'.

Thus, two months after his first investiture in December 1653, Protector Oliver rode in state to the City of London to receive the traditional civic reception afforded to monarchs following their coronation. As befitted his new status, he was dressed in a rich riding coat embroidered with gold lace, astride a horse resplendently adorned with rich trappings and accompanied by heralds and flunkies in rich apparel. But this was no exercise in self-aggrandisement. Rather it was a recognition on the part of Cromwell of the necessity to project an appropriate image of the governing authority. For this very reason Oliver opened his Parliaments with all the ritual and pageantry of a King - riding to Westminster in his magnificent state coach accompanied by Yeomen of the Guard dressed in the Protector's own sumptuous livery with the Master of the Horse leading the Horse of State equipped with a saddle exquisitely embroidered with gold and pearl.

Likewise, Cromwell received foreign ambassadors in the very same place and in the very same splendidly ritualistic manner as his predecessor, Charles I. He did so because the honour and dignity of the nation demanded it. He was, after all, the personification, as head of state, of what had become, to the general satisfaction of the nation, the most feared and respected country in Europe.

And the Protectoral court reflected this. It was, according to the Venetian ambassador, the most revered and the most remarkable court in Europe, displaying to the world, as it did, the not inconsiderable wealth and greatness of the nation and demonstrating its ruler's magnificence. Which was, of course, the reason why Cromwell occupied the sumptuously refurbished ex-royal palaces of Whitehall and Hampton Court surrounded by liveried servants and the like. Sovereign princes were *expected* to live in sumptuously furnished palaces surrounded by liveried servants: the honour and dignity of the nation they represented demanded it.

Even Cromwell's near acceptance of the crown in 1657 was not at variance with the notion of himself as God's instrument in bringing about a godly reformation. After all, his divine mission did not commit him to, or preclude him from, any specific constitutional arrangement. And he was certainly not insensitive to Parliament's argument that a more stable and permanent political settlement would be effected, and therefore the rights and liberties of the people better protected, if he were to accept the crown. Indeed, it was not the *office* of King that Cromwell would argue against, only the *title*. His words were, in effect, why should the person in whom the supreme authority resides be any less a King simply because his title is spelled P-R-O-T-E-C-T-O-R? In Cromwell's very own words during the kingship debate: 'Signification goes to the thing, certainly it does, and *not* to the name.'

Cromwell therefore chose, for the time being at least, to occupy the *office* of King but without the title, his second investiture, under the new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice, being, in effect, a king-making ceremony. 'His Highness was sworn Royal Protector...and had all the formalities as all the Kings but a crown', ran one pro-Cromwellian description, while a royalist account of the event similarly concluded that Cromwell had indeed been made 'Protector Royal'.

But the Cromwellian Protectorship Royal was not seen as constituting a permanent political settlement. The indications are that Cromwell was ultimately expected to grasp the nettle and formalise completely his already regal status by adopting the title of King. One of the more compelling intimations that the Protector intended to adopt the title of King came in May 1658, just four months before his death, when the Protectoral Master of the Wardrobe ordered to be made up two crimson and velvet caps of state. The significance of this is that such caps were worn by Kings as badges of rank in place of a crown. And this was in line with the continuing and growing speculation throughout the last year of his life that Cromwell would indeed accept the crown. As I have already said, Cromwell as King was in no way at variance with the notion of himself as God's instrument in bringing about a godly reformation.

In the event death intervened. But in death Cromwell would wear the crown that many had expected him ultimately to wear in life. The symbolism of his state funeral undoubtedly placed Oliver, Protector Royal, in the pantheon of the nation's sovereign princes. It was certainly suggested in the nineteenth century that his statue should join those of the other national sovereigns proposed as an adornment to the House of Commons. But in the end those who were opposed to the idea prevailed. Instead Oliver Cromwell stands outside the Houses of Parliament, more visible and infinitely more imposing in his splendid isolation. He is not, of course, portrayed in regal robes as the sovereign prince he undoubtedly was. Had he been portrayed as such that image would have been just as consistent with the man as the godly reforming soldier standing on Cromwell Green.

For a view of how, in practice, the kingly Oliver was consistent with the earlier godly reforming soldier we need look no further than one of Cromwell's most vociferous critics, Dr George Bate - George Bate, originally physician to Charles I and subsequently to Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector, who had, with the collapse of the Protectorate and the restoration of the Stuarts, attempted to get himself restored to the post of royal physician. In order to facilitate this, to oil the wheels as it were, Bate published a vitriolic condemnation of Cromwell, the master he had once

been only too pleased to serve. And yet, and yet, in this vitriolic condemnation Bate felt compelled to admit, albeit grudgingly, that:

To give the devil his due, he restored justice almost to its ancient dignity and splendour; the judges without covetousness discharging their duties according to law and equity; and the laws (unless some few that particularly concerned Cromwell) having full and free course in all courts without hindrance or delay. Men's manners also, at least outwardly, seemed to be reformed for the better, whether by really subtracting the fuel of luxury or through fear of the ancient laws now revived and put in execution.

His own court also was regulated according to a severe discipline; here no drunkard, nor whoremonger, nor any guilty of bribery, was to be found without severe punishment. Trade began again to prosper; and in a word, gentle peace to flourish all over England.

© Roy Sherwood, 1998

Author and historian Roy Sherwood is a long-standing member of the Cromwell Association, serving as Vice-Chairman for a number of years. His books include *The Civil War in the Midlands, 1642-1651* (Sutton Publishing), *The Court of Oliver Cromwell* (Willingham Press) and *Oliver Cromwell King In All But Name 1653-1658* (Sutton Publishing).

HUMPHREY MACKWORTH: PURITAN, REPUBLICAN, CROMWELLIAN

by Barbara Coulton

On 2 February 1654 the Protectorate Council of State recommended that Colonel Mackworth should be added to their number; on 7 February, Cromwell having signified his assent, Mackworth was admitted to this select body which now governed England under the Instrument of Government of 16 December 1653. Mackworth was immediately appointed to committees and attended meetings of the Council. He was working closely with men like John Lambert, John Desborough, Edward Montagu and William Sydenham. Some members of the Council were primarily soldiers, others were civilians with military experience, among them the gentleman-lawyer Humphrey Mackworth, governor of Shrewsbury. Clearly he had qualities which recommended him to Cromwell and the Council but he has remained an obscure figure in history; indeed Shrewsbury and Shropshire have remained obscure in modern studies. Mackworth has now found a place as a 'Missing Person' in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, but his career and the activities of the Shropshire group of which he was a leading figure warrant further consideration.¹

Humphrey Mackworth was born in January 1603, the only son of Richard and Dorothy, daughter of Lawrence Cranage of Keele, Staffordshire. The Mackworths had various properties in north Shropshire, making up a moderate estate; their home was at Betton Strange whose hall and demesne lands lay in the parish of St Chad's in Shrewsbury. In January 1614 Humphrey entered Shrewsbury's famous school. His great-uncle and namesake had been a pupil of the first Elizabethan headmaster, Thomas Ashton of St John's College, Cambridge; also there was Philip, son of Sir Henry Sidney whose protégé that Humphrey was ('a boy of my own breeding'), going with him to Ireland where he was killed in 1582. Among fellow scholars of the younger Humphrey Mackworth was the slightly older Thomas Hunt, son of Richard, a leading member of the powerful Drapers' Company of Shrewsbury - 'merchants of London', as their records describe them. A group of these men were active puritans, supporters of the preaching ministries in the town. Notable among them, as well as Richard Hunt, were his brother-in-law John Nicholls and William Rowley who was also a wealthy brewer. Richard Mackworth died in 1617 so Humphrey was heir-in-waiting before he went to Cambridge University. It was at that point that the first known decision of

significance in Mackworth's life was made, though we do not know who was responsible for making it; advice may have come from a preacher.²

The town had long had reformist preachers. Thomas Price had been at St Chad's for nearly forty years. William Bright of Emmanuel College, the Cambridge puritan seminary, was curate of St Mary's and public preacher in Shrewsbury. Thomas Ashton, in the ordinances drawn up for the school, had not only laid down a programme of classical-humanist education (Greek was taught as well as Latin) but had secured for the town the right to appoint the curate of St Mary's, a royal peculiar exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. From 1580 the bailiffs and the headmaster appointed learned men who were paid extra by the town to serve as public preacher. The puritan group were also able to appoint a 'lecturer' or preacher, at a third church, with an annuity granted by the Shrewsbury-born London merchant Rowland Heylyn, whose sisters were married to Richard Hunt and John Nicholls. In 1614 the borough assembly recorded that Heylyn 'out of Love to the Corporation he being a Burgess was willing to grant a Rent or yearly annuity of £20 to be employed towards a publick Lecture to be read twice every week at St Alkmund's' - this had been Heylyn's parish church. The payment was in line with the many examples of London preachers at churches such as St Antholin's. During the years 1614 to 1617 the puritan leaders were looking for a lecturer and also choosing a Cambridge college for their sons. Rowley made the unsurprising choice of Emmanuel for his son Roger in July 1616. He was also instrumental in bringing the preacher Julines Hering to Shrewsbury, in 1617. Samuel Clarke wrote that when his friend's ministry in Derbyshire was threatened (Hering had been placed at Calke by the influence of a famous puritan, Arthur Hildersam), 'God (by means of Master William Rowley, a wise religious man, and his faithful friend) was pleased to open the door for the more publike exercise of his Ministry in Shrewsbury.'³

Born in Montgomeryshire, Hering had been brought up in Coventry and educated at Cambridge. A brother-in-law of his was Oliver Bowles who had been a fellow of Queens' College and tutor to John Preston, now a famous preacher and tutor at the same college. His strictness and godliness impressed puritan parents, and his entertainment at the college of suspended and 'persecuted' preachers such as Hildersam and John Dod must have politicized at least some of his students. Among them were four young men from Shrewsbury: Thomas Nicholls entered Queens' in September 1616; his cousin Thomas Hunt at Easter 1617; Humphrey Mackworth at Easter 1619; and the younger Hunt brother, Rowland, at Easter 1622. The fact that Rowland moved to Emmanuel in the October - precisely when Preston was made Master of that college - strengthens the supposition that the choice of Queens' was made because of the presence of

Preston. Thomas Hunt stayed longest at Cambridge, until he graduated MA, but all four, and Roger Rowley, went on to Gray's Inn where there was another famous and inspirational preacher, Richard Sibbes; John Preston became preacher at Lincoln's Inn. These were the two most radical Inns. The preachers reminded King James that the crown should support the church but not interfere; rich men and magistrates were told of their responsibilities to serve the Lord; and there were warnings that the church and commonwealth would have 'some seasons and times when men should be set aworke to doe more than at other times'. Roger Rowley, Rowland Hunt and Mackworth became barristers, a process taking several years, so they were in a radical environment at a period of legal, constitutional and religious conflict. In April 1624 Mackworth came into his estates. Soon afterwards he married Ann, sister of his Gray's Inn colleague Thomas Waller; their father, Thomas Waller of Beaconsfield, was third prothonotary of the court of Common Pleas (1609-1627), with responsibility for managing the business of that court. He was described in splendid legal français as 'un honest grave home et skillful in son office et mult beloved'.⁴

In November 1631 several members were called to the bar, including Roger Rowley, Thomas Waller and Thomas Fell of Ulverston. There is no record of Mackworth's being called but he must have qualified as a barrister, probably about the same time, because he acted as 'learned counsel' to the borough of Shrewsbury in this decade. He divided his time between his home town and Westminster where he acted as reporter on cases in the King's Bench; the reports of 1627-31, attributed to the official reporter of Gray's Inn, Sergeant Thomas Hetley, are thought to be by Mackworth. J.H. Baker points out that as litigation reached a peak in the period 1590-1640 'law reporting became a routine occupation for keen young lawyers and part of the way of life for some of their elders'. With his family settled at Betton Strange, Mackworth had a house or lodgings in the town - in suit rolls of 1632-34 he is listed as a resident of Dogpole. He advised the borough on the school's ordinances and the appointment of a headmaster in 1635-37 - he had to explain to the bishop of Lichfield why the bailiffs did not approve the candidate put forward by St John's College. His advice was also wanted on preserving the independent spiritual jurisdiction of St Mary's, on the application of money bequeathed for the poor, and on a new charter for the town - as petitioned for by Thomas Nicholls, leader of the puritan group (identified by the privy council as a 'party'). In September 1635 Nicholls and Mackworth were made aldermen of Shrewsbury.⁵

Since Mackworth was active both in London and Shrewsbury it might be useful to consider the issues in which he would have been interested or

involved; this may throw light on his later involvement in civil war politics.

First there was the matter of puritan preachers and their lay patrons. In Shrewsbury Julines Hering had the support of some influential people including Drapers. The Company leased him their splendid Hall, formerly leased to the public preacher. In 1632 Hering apprenticed his son Jonathan, aged eighteen, to the draper Thomas Poole (of Dogpole) for seven years. In London Rowland Heylyn, Richard Sibbes and Christopher Sherland, a lawyer of Gray's Inn, were members of a group of thirteen trustees known as the Collectors of St Antholin's or the Feoffees for (the buying of) Improvements, set up in 1626 to fund puritan preachers in various parts of the country. Secret meetings were held in houses and chambers and detailed records were kept. In 1628 Heylyn made a private purchase of tithes and of the advowson of St Alkmund's in Shrewsbury. These he conveyed to his brother-in-law Richard Hunt - 'a puritan', as his enemies described him - who paid preachers in Shropshire out of the interest. Presumably it was hoped that the incumbent of St Alkmund's would depart, one way or another, so that Hering could be appointed. In London a campaign was waged against the Feoffees, instigated by William Laud's follower Peter Heylyn (great-nephew of Rowland). They were said to be 'chief Patrons of Faction' and were prosecuted in Chancery in 1633, as an illegal corporation; judgement went against them. Rowland Heylyn had died in 1631 leaving properties to his Shrewsbury nephews Thomas Nicholls and Thomas Hunt, as well as money for the poor in London and Shrewsbury.⁶

In Shrewsbury Julines Hering and the puritans had a strong opponent in the curate of St Chad's, Mackworth's and Rowley's parish. This man, Peter Studley, eventually put his feelings into print in 1633 in a contribution to the Laudian campaign against puritans. His prejudice was aggravated by resentment of Hering's popularity and the financial support that he received from people of all parishes, including Studley's own: 'an underhand maintenance by private Benevolences of seduced friends', as the curate of St Chad's described it. Before this publication Studley had denounced many puritans in presentments at the episcopal visitations. In 1626 he named William Rowley for admitting people to his house on Sunday evenings to hear sermons, sing psalms and pray; he hinted that this might constitute a conventicle. In 1633, when Laud was in power, Studley named Humphrey Mackworth and his family, Thomas Nicholls, William Rowley and many others for not bowing their heads at the name of Jesus. This was not the only Laudian innovation embraced eagerly by Studley. In August 1635 Sir William Brereton recorded his impressions of Shrewsbury. He admired the good government of the town (one of the bailiffs, John

Prowde, was a puritan), and the vast brewhouse adjoining Rowley's Mansion, but he was horrified by the interior of St Chad's:

This church is of late gaudily painted, wherein you may find many idle, ridiculous, vain and absurd pictures, representations and stories, the like whereunto I never saw in England.

Studley had also had the satisfaction of seeing Julines Hering's enforced departure from Shrewsbury early in 1635. The Drapers asked him to return to preach the word of God in the town, but he could not. (After a time spent in Cheshire he became pastor at the English church in Amsterdam, where he died in 1645.)⁷

Another episode in 1635 would have interested Brereton as it would Mackworth and other radical lawyers. In April, at the Shrewsbury quarter sessions, the grand jury condemned the levying of charges to pay the county's muster-master as a 'greate greevance and oppression'. They were supported by the JP Sir John Corbet of Adderley who got the clerk to read out the Petition of Right from the Statute Book. This measure had been exacted by the Commons from a reluctant Charles in 1628, reasserting civil liberties in face of the actions of a king they did not trust; after that he ruled without parliament for eleven years. Sir John Corbet was imprisoned in the Fleet for several months, a punishment which was attributed to Laud at his own trial, and which was condemned by the Long Parliament. Other sufferers at the hands of the archbishop included William Prynne whose savage punishment made of him a martyr. When he was taken to prison at Caernarfon in 1637 he was greeted by supporters at Chester; among them was Thomas Hunt. Archbishop Neile of York wrote to Laud that he had censured and fined Hunt and others - censured without being heard, as Prynne later reminded the Commons.⁸

The years 1636 to 1638 brought the puritans of Shrewsbury into direct conflict with Laud and the king over three interrelated issues - the appointment of a new headmaster, the petition of Thomas Nicholls for a new charter for the town, and the choice of a curate for St Chad's when Studley was presented to a Shropshire country living. In the first affair Laud supported the master of St John's against the town, then issued a quo warranto against Shrewsbury 'to question all their liberties'. In the matter of the charter he inserted clauses which puritan members of the council objected to - this was another charge against Laud at his trial. It was the third affair which provides the clearest insight into conflict in the town. In the absence of the puritan bailiff Thomas Nicholls, the town clerk Thomas Owen (leader of the opposing 'party' in Shrewsbury) got the other bailiff to call a meeting of the council and to elect a man named Richard Poole

(holder of two small nearby livings and probably a friend of Studley). This was done in a riotous manner with much drinking afterwards and jeering at the puritans. A petition was drawn up, by Humphrey Mackworth, arguing that the election had been irregular, that Poole was unfit, and that a minister from a remote Shropshire parish, George Lawson, would be better qualified, partly because of his scholarship. Lawson, Emmanuel-educated, was a member of a godly network in Shropshire, but the remoteness of the area evidently protected him from being known to Laud. The king ordered that Lawson should replace Poole. Then Thomas Owen put in a counter-petition, pointing out that Mackworth had led the king into error. Poole was in fact reinstated, but the episode must have rankled with both the king and the archbishop.⁹

By 1640 differences between parliament and king, and puritans and the archbishop, had reached a critical point. New canons were brought out by the Convocation which met that year; these included a requirement that clergy should swear not to alter the government of the church 'by archbishops, bishops, deans and archdeacons etc'. This Etcetera oath was much debated; ministers around Bridgnorth met to discuss it, as we know from Richard Baxter. Baxter had been befriended by William Rowley, through whom he had met his first nonconformists, in Shrewsbury in the mid-1630s (some were ejected from Wales). Now Rowley sent him books (in Latin) on church government, to convince Baxter that episcopal government would never bring reform in religion. By the time that the Long Parliament met, petitions against episcopacy were being organised in various areas. It seems that a petition from Shropshire was drawn up by Mackworth, for the wife of his kinsman Sir Robert Harley referred in one letter to Mr Mackworth's instructions against the bishops. Harley, the leading puritan in Herefordshire, was a member of parliament for that county. One of the members for Shropshire in the Long Parliament was Sir John Corbet of Adderley, upholder of the Petition of Right; he would later be a member of the Shropshire Parliamentary Committee, with Humphrey Mackworth.¹⁰

So, before the civil war, Humphrey Mackworth had been active in the puritan cause. He was clearly on the side of parliament against the king. It so happened that in 1642 Shrewsbury was closely involved in the outbreak of war, and musters had already been made on both sides, according to parliament's Militia Act on the one hand, and the king's commissions of array on the other. The volunteers for parliament were being trained by Thomas Hunt; his cousin Thomas Nicholls, as sheriff of Montgomeryshire, was probably absent from Shrewsbury; Mackworth kept in touch from London. In September he wrote to John Prowde, sending the letter by a private messenger, a Mr Walsh. Prowde replied that

this had been wise since the official post was being stopped at the town gate and letters were being examined in the town hall. Walsh had gone on to Stafford to find out how the king was progressing since leaving Nottingham, support so far having been disappointing. The latest news (on 17 September) was that the king would set up his standard at Shrewsbury. He was looking to the west for recruits and had been assured by the young royalists of Shropshire that the town would be for him. The arrival of the king and his army was a powerful persuasion; Charles held court in the town from 20 September to 12 October, with visits to Chester and Wrexham. On 14 October, at Bridgnorth, Charles declared Thomas Hunt, Thomas Nicholls and Humphrey Mackworth guilty of high treason; others such as Prowde and Rowley were said to be disaffected and were ordered to be removed from the borough assembly. Shrewsbury remained divided.¹¹

A Parliamentary Committee for Shropshire was set up in February 1643; the puritan leaders in Shrewsbury were named, along with the MPs Sir John Corbet, William Pierrepoint and John Corbet of Halston near Shrewsbury, a Gray's Inn lawyer (not related to Sir John Corbet). Mackworth was also a member of the Warwickshire Committee and steward of Coventry, but in the event it was the Cheshire troops under Sir William Brereton who were of more help to the Shropshire puritan-parliamentarians. Mackworth's second marriage, in 1638, to Mary Venables of Kinderton allied him with the old Cheshire gentry, and Brereton already knew some of his Shropshire fellow puritans, having been a contemporary at Gray's Inn. Mackworth was with the Shropshire troops who left London at the beginning of September 1643, ahead of the Earl of Denbigh. With Brereton's help, a base was secured in their own county in mid-September, at the small market town of Wem, with Shrewsbury as the further objective. Colonel Thomas Mytton of Halston, near Oswestry, was associated with Mackworth by this time but he was something of a cuckoo in the Shropshire Committee's nest, presumably using the influence of his brother-in-law Sir Thomas Middleton of Chirk in Denbighshire who shared command with Brereton. Mytton was made governor of Wem but Mackworth and other active members of the Salop Committee were also at Wem. In the autumn of 1643 Hunt and Mackworth met Richard Baxter in Coventry, and attended his sermons; they were 'earnest' with him to go to Wem as preacher. He agreed to go for a short period but a permanent preacher was sent from London, Andrew Parsons, who was to be long associated with Wem. Some thirty of Baxter's neighbours went with him to join 'Colonel Mackworth's Troop'. In December 1643 Mackworth, Mytton and Hunt were active in north Shropshire, seizing the property of the absent Henry Vernon of Hodnet and placing the puritan preacher William Peartree of Cheshire in the parish; he had worked with Julines

Hering when he stayed in Cheshire and had been preacher to various Cheshire garrisons.¹²

Something of Mackworth's progress from the end of 1643 can be traced in his letters to the Earl of Denbigh (commander of parliament's troops in the north-west midlands), and in letters from his colleagues to him when he was in Coventry or London. On 21 December 1643 two of the Wem captains begged him to represent their forlorn condition to parliament 'for whom we have desperately engaged our estates and lives'. Money was furnished and arms delivered to Mrs Mackworth for her husband through one of Brereton's Staffordshire officers. Mackworth had been in London soliciting for help and making depositions (in January) for Laud's trial. During January 1644 Nantwich was under siege for two weeks. The force at Wem helped this Cheshire garrison against Lord Byron's attacks; the main victory was achieved by Fairfax and Brereton. After Byron's defeat, Prince Rupert was sent to take charge of Shropshire and adjoining areas. He doubted Shrewsbury's security and loyalty. For his part, Mackworth feared Rupert's activities, as he warned Denbigh on 4 February, writing from Coventry. On 27 March Mackworth wrote again to Denbigh from Coventry saying that Shropshire, in a 'bleeding condition', required help. Wem had lost its governor, Mytton having retreated to London; Thomas Hunt, always closer to the men (and later governor) probably took charge. Mackworth also spent time in London during the spring when he represented Shrewsbury at Laud's trial; he gave evidence in mid-April.¹³

Humphrey Mackworth was clearly an important figure in Shropshire's puritan campaign even though he was not always in the county; but his work at Coventry (he was on the Committee there) and in London must have contributed to success. Indeed, the Committee of Both Kingdoms (on which William Pierrepont, MP for Wenlock, sat) recognised his worth when on 17 September 1644 it wrote to him:

The importance of your presence in those parts is such that we desire your stay in Shropshire, notwithstanding your stewardship at Coventry or your attendance upon it.

Despite the defeat of Rupert at Marston Moor in July the situation in the Marches was dangerous, Rupert and his broken forces having fled west. In such circumstances we should recall Mackworth's personal position: he had four or five children from his first marriage, the eldest (Thomas) aged seventeen; his wife Mary also had her youngest child to care for - Mary, born in 1641. Mrs Mackworth's brother Peter Venables (once MP for Cheshire with Brereton) was on the side of the king, so the home at Kinderton was closed to her. She seems to have helped her husband in

practical ways and probably spent this period in Coventry. Later she would move to London with him, when he was a member of the Council of State. The only other reference to her in the Denbigh papers is in October 1645 in a letter from William Crowne, formerly the Earl's secretary but now assisting his brother-in-law Mackworth in Shrewsbury. He sent Lord Denbigh two boxes of Shrewsbury cakes as a token of esteem from Mrs Mackworth.¹⁴

The family were back in Shrewsbury because the town had been retaken, with Brereton's help, during the night of 21-22 February 1645. There was no siege, no battle, but a skilfully planned operation under the direction of the Dutch professional soldier with the garrison at Wem, William Reinking. Mackworth is not mentioned among the officers who gave authority to Reinking during the operation but he was the choice of his fellow members of the Salop Committee as governor of Shrewsbury. Thomas Hunt and others made their decision known to Speaker Lenthall on 24 March:

wee have upon serious consideration made choyce of Collonell Humfrey Mackworth a member of this Committee, one of known care and fidelity...a gentleman of a fayre estate, of singular parts, and one who hath engaged himself and his estate as farr as any in this Countrey to further the Publique services.

So Mackworth was now governor of the castle garrison. He was also made the town's recorder, and he was recorder of Bridgnorth. Rowland Hunt, his fellow barrister, became town clerk. Thomas Nicholls was elected mayor for an extended term, until Michaelmas 1646. In November 1645 Thomas Hunt was chosen as MP for the borough in place of Francis Newport, but he continued to play a part in capturing royalist garrisons in Shropshire; he also helped Brereton at the siege of Chester, acting as one of the commissioners for accepting the surrender of the city.¹⁵

In addition to his duties as governor of Shrewsbury, Mackworth was to take a legal role on a larger stage. Along with the Cheshire lawyer John Bradshaw, Thomas Fell and others, Mackworth was raised to the rank of Ancient of Gray's Inn in November 1645. In that year his son Thomas, after some time at Cambridge, entered the same Inn. In 1646, at the request of the bailiffs of Ludlow, Thomas Mackworth (still under age) became MP for that town. Mackworth assured the bailiffs of his son's worth: 'I have ever dedicated him in my thoughts to the service of the Commonwealth.' Parliament reposed confidence in Mackworth, accepting his advice to disgorge Oswestry (in September 1646) and deploy its governor (the troublesome Thomas Mytton) in north Wales; in July 1649 they accepted

his advice to maintain Montgomery Castle and to appoint his colleague Colonel Samuel More as governor. In June 1649 Bradshaw was made Chief Justice of Chester with Mackworth as his Deputy; the circuit included north and mid Wales. By this time Bradshaw had come into the spotlight as president of the court which tried and sentenced Charles I. His deputy had argued the necessity for that procedure.¹⁶

Following the surrender of the king to the Scots in 1646 a handful of Mackworth's letters show how he responded to the changing political situation. In 1647 he was troubled by the news that an army troop had taken the king from Holdenby Hall; this happened on 4 June. By 9 o'clock next morning Mackworth was writing to other members of the Salop Committee suggesting defensive measures for the county and declaring, 'if the parliament of England bee like to suffer violence, I thinke our lives and estates are not to deere to spende in that quarrel'. By January 1648, writing to Lord General Fairfax about a trusted captain, he expressed confidence in the army:

he was the only man I trusted with my secrets, and I did employ him to beget a right understanding amongst my officers and soldiers concerning your Excellency's and the Army's proceedings which accordingly he effected, and was the only man next myself threatened for his affection to your proceedings.

On 5 August he wrote to the MP William Pierrepont with an account of a royalist plot to take Shrewsbury, which had been thwarted: 'Thus God by his Providence made the Discovery and succeeded our Endeavours and that in a Moment. We are at Peace for the present again'. The series of risings constituting the 'second civil war' was about to be ended by Cromwell's victory near Preston on 17 August; the General wrote to the Commons three days later to express the hope that they would have the courage to do the work of God, who had given them victory. However, there were renewed negotiations with the king, now on the Isle of Wight.¹⁷

The situation grew more acute in December when Colonel Pride 'purged' the Long Parliament of those members who had voted for a treaty with the king. The Shropshire MPs who accepted the revolution were John Corbet the lawyer, Thomas Mackworth, William Masham (member for Shrewsbury, a kinsman and associate of Cromwell), and the regicide, Humphrey Edwardes of Shrewsbury, member for the shire. It was now possible to secure a vote in favour of putting the king on trial. On 26 December the Commons ordered that a committee be appointed to proceed against the king and other capital offenders. A letter was read out

in the Commons that day, from Humphrey Mackworth to General Fairfax, advocating the sternest measures:

praying the General to continue to represent to the Commons these desires of their friends...and to make a present settlement without any more addresses to the King. And that his Excellency would endeavour that justice may be done upon the Authors of our troubles and bloodshed in the three Kingdoms in some exemplary way, suitable to their crimes, and without respect of persons.

Mackworth was resolved to pursue 'so great a work, through a sea of blood'. In this he was supported by his minister at St Chad's in Shrewsbury, Thomas Paget, a doyen among presbyterians. In 1649 Paget published a treatise defending the purge and the regicide; he compared the punishment of a blood-guilty King with that ordered by Joshua against Achan, stoned to death at Achor: 'The valley of Achor is given for a door of hope'.¹⁸

The government tried to secure adherence by devising and imposing an oath of engagement to the Commonwealth 'without a King or a House of Lords'. This aroused resentment in many who had supported parliament before the regicide. On 2 February the Council of State included in its proceedings the decision to write to Colonel Mackworth to use his judgement about opening packets entering Shrewsbury that might contain matters prejudicial to the Commonwealth. In fact, Mackworth was close at hand that month. On 10 February at the Pension in Gray's Inn it was ordered

that Mr Humphrey Mackworth deputy Chief Justice of Chester and Vice-Chamberlain of Chester be called to the Bench and read in his course before Mr Fell... Mr Fell, one of the Judges of Chester, be called to the Bench and read after Mr Lovelace.

The readings - expositions of statutes - were central to legal training at the Inns. As Fletcher points out:

Hence the importance attached to a good choice of Readers. Hence the concession to the selected Ancient, while he was performing his initiatory exercise of the Reader's craft, of precedence and privilege.

Now Mackworth had a voice in Pension. As judges of the Chester circuit, he and Fell must have been informed by John Bradshaw, a fellow Bencher, that his brother Richard had written on 2 March from Chester that no justices of the peace there, nor the mayor or recorder, 'or other, except Mr Aldersey and myself, [had] taken the engagement, or given countenance to

them that have'; the commonalty had not yet subscribed, influenced by the preaching of 'the rigid Presbyterians' who saw subscription to the engagement as breaking the covenant. There was the same situation in Lancashire.¹⁹

Mackworth faced similar problems in Shropshire. He was sent various orders to examine clergymen about their views on the engagement. Only two presented a serious challenge: Thomas Blake of Alkmund's and Samuel Fisher of St Mary's. Thomas Paget, although a 'rigid Presbyterian', supported the government. The lawyer-MP Bulstrode Whitelocke recorded news of demonstrations in various towns and cities. In Shrewsbury:

the ministers preach much against the present Government, and to encourage the People to sedition, and to rise for their King...at the day of the publike Fast kept in one of their Churches [Chad's], there was another mock fast kept in the other two Churches by agreement of the Ministers, and two Sermons preached in them purposely to disturb the Fast enjoined by Authority.

Despite their defiance, Blake and Fisher were allowed to continue their work during the summer when the town suffered plague, but they were later dismissed (they went to Middle, not far from Shrewsbury). Mackworth was also instructed by the Council of State to refuse the request of his kinsman Sir Robert Harley to live in Shrewsbury. He had at first been inclined to give permission but he wrote to Harley on 8 May:

I am now entrusted by the Parliament for the security of this garrison, and in pursuance of some private instructions I have received I shall desire that if you be not fully 'satisfied to the subscribing of the engagement', that you will at present rather forbear than retain your intention of coming to reside here.

This reply had been approved by the Council of State. In another message to Harley, Mackworth explained that Shrewsbury was a divided place and the presence of so eminent a refuser would encourage dissenters. He himself was resolved to adhere to the present government.²⁰

As the danger from royalists increased, Mackworth was involved in his legal role. In March 1651, while presiding at the court at Welshpool, he was informed of a 'grand design' by the enemy, 'a conjunction of old and new malignants' in north Wales and from the Isle of Man; he was to prevent this. In May the Council of State appointed him and Thomas Fell, with four Cheshire justices, to examine captured suspects at Chester. On 12 July, according to a report from Shrewsbury,

the Governor, and many other Christians, kept a fast to seek the Lord for a blessing upon our armies and soldiers by sea and land. We found much of God in carrying on the duty of the day.

By this time Fairfax had resigned (in 1650) and Cromwell was commander-in-chief of the army, campaigning in Scotland. Both he and Mackworth were involved when Charles Stuart invaded England with a Scottish army. The young man who had been crowned Charles II in Scotland wrote to Mackworth from his camp at Tong in Shropshire on 20 August, addressing him as 'a gentleman of an ancient house' and asking him to deliver up the town and castle of Shrewsbury. Mackworth's reply was addressed to 'the Commander-in-chief of the Scottish army':

I resolve to be found irremoveable the faithful servant of the Commonwealth of England; and if you believe me to be a gentleman, you may believe I will be faithful to my trust.

Charles went on to Worcester and defeat by Cromwell on 3 September - a 'crowning mercy' of God's will. On 1 October Mackworth presided at the trial of the Earl of Derby and others who had assisted Charles; Mackworth reported the resolutions of the court martial at Chester to the Commons in a letter received on 7 October. The Earl was beheaded at Bolton on 15 October (to expiate for a massacre there some years earlier, for which Derby denied responsibility).²¹

Although there is no evidence of contact between Mackworth and Cromwell, they were like-minded in their reading of Providence and their fidelity to the cause for which they had worked and fought. They may have met in London where they had associates in common - Pierrepoint and Masham, for example, or Bradshaw. In February 1653, on the anniversary of the taking of Shrewsbury, Mackworth and the 'wel-affected' of the place took part in the thanksgiving and put in petitions

to strengthen the resolutions of those whom God hath made instrumentall for his glory and the propagation of the Gospel, that they may be carried on for the welfare of them that are faithful in and to the Commonwealth.

On 20 April Cromwell famously dismissed the Rump Parliament and responded to appeals for a godly government by setting up the Nominated Assembly. When this body delivered back power into the hands of Lord General Cromwell on 12 December the stage was set for the Protectorate,

established on 16 December. Twelve days later he was proclaimed in Shrewsbury with great rejoicing - at least by some.²²

Having now traced Mackworth's training and career over three decades, and identified him at last as a Cromwellian, we may find it easier to understand why he was chosen as a member of the Council of State in February 1654, when he was fifty-one years old. He served on numerous committees (dealing with religion, legal matters and finance) and attended most meetings of the Council (145 out of 164 between March and December). He also continued to have a care for Shrewsbury, where one of his sons may have deputised for him, with the help of his uncle Colonel William Crowne. Mackworth and his wife had official news lodgings at Whitehall. The elder Humphrey was a Member of Parliament for Shropshire, and the younger Humphrey for the borough of Shrewsbury; Crowne was returned for Bridgnorth. Mackworth's advice on the situation in the Marches would have been valued by Cromwell. The King's Lynn MP Guibon Goddard recorded the answers of His Highness to the committee appointed to consider garrisons. His decision on Shrewsbury on 23 November probably echoes Mackworth's view:

For Shrewsbury, which indeed was not positively resolved upon by the Committee, he was of opinion that it was a place of strength: that if any enemy should get into it, and possess it, all the forces of England and Scotland could not be able to force them out that it might be kept with small charge, and therefore this also was fit for further consideration.

Having spent so many years defending puritanism, parliament and republic, and his home town, Humphrey Mackworth had made a last contribution to this cause.²³

His busy and dedicated career was brought to a premature end with his death late in 1654. He was buried at night on 26 December, £300 having been authorised towards the cost of his funeral (some £19,000 in modern terms). His death was presumably sudden since he died intestate (a fact mentioned when his daughter, Anne, petitioned in 1658 for an allowance; she was granted a pension of £160 a year). Richard Gough of Middle, a man of royalist sympathies, recalled Judge Mackworth 'who as is reported was one of Oliver Cromwell's creatures'. This is hardly fair. Mackworth was long dedicated to the puritan cause (before Cromwell emerged into public life), and supported parliament from the outset, before the beginning of the civil war. A successful lawyer, he took on other duties as required. His fellow members of the Salop Committee were quick to choose him as governor of Shrewsbury; he must, however, have been at odds with some of these men over the role of the army and the execution of the king. On

this issue and that of the engagement he remained firm in his adherence to the Commonwealth - as his reply to Charles Stuart made clear - and he was ready, unlike John Bradshaw, to accept Cromwell as Protector. As governor of Shrewsbury, as Member of Parliament, and finally as Councillor of State, his tireless work may have contributed to his death. At the Restoration he, like other republicans, was disinterred, his body being thrown into an anonymous pit. At least we can try to resurrect his career from obscurity.²⁴

1. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* [hereafter CSPD] 1653-54, pp. 382, 391, 398; *Dictionary of National Biography* [hereafter DNB]. *Missing Persons* (Oxford, 1993), p. 431, entry by Peter Gaunt.
2. 'Betton Strange', *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 2nd series, 1 (1889), pp. 386-93; G W Fisher, *Annals of Shrewsbury School* (London, 1899), pp. 14-15, 92-3.
3. B Coulton, 'The establishment of puritanism in Shrewsbury', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 27 (1996), pp. 307-35; Shropshire Records and Research Centre [hereafter SRRC], 6001/290, copy of the borough assembly book, unpaginated; DNB, 'Heylyn'; J & J A Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (10 vols, Cambridge, 1922-54); Samuel Clarke, 'Life of Julines Herring', in Clarke, *A Generall Martyrologie* (1651), pp. 462-4.
4. Thomas Ball, 'The Life of Doctor Preston', in Clarke, *Martyrologie*; Venn, *Alumni Cantab*; DNB, 'Dod', 'Hildersam', 'Preston', 'Sibbes'; Christopher Hill, 'The political sermons of John Preston', *Puritanism and Revolution* (Harmondsworth, 1990); J H Baker, *The Legal Profession and the Common Law* (London, 1986), pp. 245-6, 253-6.
5. R J Fletcher, *The Pension Book of Gray's Inn 1569-1669* (London, 1901), pp. 308-9; Baker, *Legal Profession*, pp. 450, 453; SRRC, 3365/1842, box 4; SRRC, 6001/290, borough assembly book, *passim*.
6. SRRC, 1831/6, drapers' minute books, f. 29r; SRRC, 1831/8, apprentices; Isabel Calder, *The Activities of the Puritan Faction in the Church of England* (London, 1957), DNB, 'Peter Heylyn', 'Rowland Heylyn'.
7. Peter Studley, *The Looking-Glasse of Schisme* (1634), pp. 196-7; Lichfield Joint Record Office, B/V/1/48, f. 18; Lichfield Joint Record Office, B/V/1/53, f. 9; William Brereton, *Travels in Holland, the United Provinces, England, Scotland and Ireland*, Edward Hawkins (ed), Chetham Society, 1st series, 1 (1844), pp. 186-7; SRRC, 1831/6, ff. 51, 52; Clarke, *Martyrologie*, p. 474; Alice C Carter, *The English Reformed Church in Amsterdam in the Seventeenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1964), p. 94 n. 16.

8. E S Cope, 'Politics without parliament: the dispute...in Shropshire', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 45 (1982), pp. 271-81; R A Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts* (London, 1960), p. 54 n. 5.
9. Public Record Office, London, SP 16/386/86, calendared in *CSPD 1637-8*.
10. R Baxter, *Reliquianae Baxterianae* (London, 1696), pp. 14-20; *Letters of Lady Brilliana Harley*, Camden Society, 58 (1854), p. 114; *DNB*, 'Sir Robert Harley'.
11. *Historical Manuscripts Commission* [hereafter *HMC*], *Fifth Report* (London, 1876), pp. 30, 38, 49; H Owen & J B Blakeway, *History of Shrewsbury* (2 vols, London, 1825), I, 419-31; SRRC, 6001/290, 17 October 1642.
12. W J Farrow, *The Great Civil War in Shropshire* (Shrewsbury, 1926), p. 131; R L Greaves & R Zaller (eds), *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century* (3 vols, Brighton, 1982-4), 'Brereton', 'Corbet', 'Pierrepont'; *HMC, Fifth Report*, p. 104; *HMC, Thirteenth Report. Portland MSS I* (London, 1891), pp. 141-3, 158-61; Baxter, *Reliquianae Baxterianae*, pp. 43-5; *CSPD 1641-43*, pp. 503-5; *Shropshire Parish Registers. Hodnet*, x.
13. *HMC, Fourth Report* (London, 1873), pp. 263-5; *CSPD 1644*, p. 2; T Malbon, *Memorials of the Civil War in Cheshire*, J Hall (ed), Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 19 (1889), pp. 123-4, 131; W Laud, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud*, W Scott & J Bliss (eds), (7 vols, Oxford, 1847-60), IV, 163-4.
14. *CSPD 1644*, p. 514; *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 2nd series, 1 (1889), pp. 392-3; *Cheshire Sheaf*, 3 (1883-86), pp. 20, 24; *HMC, Fourth Report*, p. 273.
15. Lt Col William Reinking, *A More Exact and Particular Relation of the Taking of Shrewsbury* (1645), British Library, London, Thomason Tract E 282 (15); Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tanner Ms 60, f. 11; 'Recorders of Bridgnorth', *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 54 (1939), pp. 190-1; Owen & Blakeway, *Shrewsbury*, I, 449-59; R N Dore (ed), *The Letters Books of Sir William Brereton, Volume I*, Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 123 (1984), *passim*.
16. W R Williams, *The History of the Great Sessions in Wales, 1542-1830* (Brecknock, 1899), pp. 36-8; 'MPs for Ludlow', *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 2nd series, 7 (1895), p. 28; *CSPD 1645-7*, p. 470; *CSPD 1648-9*, pp. 232, 236.
17. Owen & Blakeway, *Shrewsbury*, I, 461-4; *CSPD 1648-9*, pp. 11-12; J E Auden, 'Shropshire and the royalist conspiracies', *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series, 10 (1910), pp. 99-103; Peter Gaunt, *Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 96-99.
18. David Underdown, *Pride's Purge* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 208-20; *Journal of the House of Commons*, VI (London, n.d.), p. 104; Auden, 'Royalist

- conspiracies', pp. 109-10; 'Theophilus Philopatris' [Thomas Paget], *A Religious Scrutiny* (1649), pp. 37-44.
19. *CSPD 1649-50*, p. 503; Fletcher, *Pension Book of Gray's Inn*, xliii-xliv, p. 380; *CSPD 1650*, x-xi, pp. 20-21.
20. Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (London, 1732), p. 444; Richard Gough, *History of Myddle* (Harmondsworth, 1981), p. 269; *DNB*, 'Blake', 'Fisher'; *HMC, Fourteenth Report. Portland MSS III* (London, 1894), pp. 186-8.
21. *CSPD 1651*, pp. 89, 192, 373; Owen & Blakeway, *Shrewsbury*, I, 467-8; Gaunt, *Cromwell*, pp. 132-4; *Journal of the House of Commons*, VII (London, n.d.), p. 25.
22. Owen & Blakeway, *Shrewsbury*, I, 470-1; Gough, *Myddle*, p. 160.
23. *CSPD*, volumes for 1649-60, *passim*; J T Rutt (ed), *Diary of Thomas Burton, Esq* (4 vols, London, 1828), I, xcii.
24. W C Abbott (ed), *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (4 vols, Cambridge, Mass, 1937-47), III, p. 558n; *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series, 10 (1910), p. 137.

Barbara Coulton is an Honorary Research Fellow at Lancaster University. She is working on several aspects of Shropshire and Shrewsbury in the early modern period, including research on the fourth Shropshire classis.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES III THE SIEGE OF CROWLAND, 1643

by Peter Gaunt

During 1643 the royalist cause was in the ascendant in the east Midlands. From bases at Newark, Belvoir and elsewhere, the king's men swept east and south through Lincolnshire, eventually over-running most of the county and threatening to push south into the parliamentary heartlands of East Anglia. For their part, the parliamentarians, largely on the defensive, sought to hold the lines of the Nene and Welland valleys and the adjoining fenland, and thus to prevent the royalists from pushing into Cambridgeshire and north-east Northamptonshire. Most of Oliver Cromwell's military service during 1643 was focused upon strengthening the defences of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire and attempting to hold the northern frontier of parliamentarian East Anglia. His action at Crowland in late April 1643, part of this essentially defensive campaign, saw him crush a royalist rising which had begun a month before and so end a particularly unpleasant confrontation. It is also the earliest action in Cromwell's military career which might justly be termed a 'siege'.

The settlement of Crowland or 'Croyland' had sprung up around the great abbey, originally founded in the eighth century but partly or wholly rebuilt several times thereafter. Following the Dissolution, much of the abbey church had been retained to serve as the parish church, though other monastic buildings seem to have been abandoned and quickly fell ruinous. The settlement was surrounded by fenland, giving rise to the suggestion that it was an island. In reality it lay at the north-east end of a low gravel promontory; the River Welland flowed through the village. The physical isolation and desolation of Crowland was noted by various early modern commentators, who wrote of 'ague stricken fen men with lustreless, opium bleared eyes', of 'foule and flabby quagmires, yea and most troublesome Fennes, which the very inhabitants themselves, for all their stilts, cannot stalke through', and of 'this so famous monastery lying amongst the deepest fens and waters stagnating off muddy lands'.¹

The topography of the area has changed greatly since the time of the civil war. The rivers have been artificially channelled and re-routed and have been supplemented by other man-made drains or ditches as part of the process of draining and reclaiming the fens which was underway on a small scale during the medieval period but which greatly expanded during the seventeenth century. But at the time of the civil war, Crowland was largely surrounded by fens. It could be approached from the west, along the gravel

promontory, and less easily from the north and south along raised banks. To the east lay an inaccessible area of fen called 'Great Porsand'. The nature of the topography and the potential it gave the Crowlanders for resistance is brought out in a parliamentary ordinance of September 1644, passed in response to another pro-royalist rising. The ordinance noted that 'by reason of the unseasonableness of the weather' Crowland was virtually inaccessible and could not be attacked. Instead, parliament ordered the construction of three new 'forts', to the north-east, south-east and west, to surround and isolate the royalist base, each to be garrisoned by fifty men and equipped with a boat. Even then, parliament feared that 'by reason of divers and various creeks and dranes in the severall Fens' the Crowlanders might issue out in small boats to attack the 'towns and villages adjacent' and the ordinance therefore also directed the stationing nearby of two additional mobile forces, each of 120 horse and foot, to counter the threat.²

The surviving printed accounts, all of which were written from a parliamentary perspective, give a detailed account of the royalist activity in Crowland during the opening months of 1643. The fullest, *Divers Remarkable Passages of Gods Good Providence*, recounts how in late March the Crowlanders, led by a handful of local active royalists, including a 'Captain Cromwell' (one of Oliver's royalist cousins), attacked Spalding and carried off prisoners or hostages. These were then used as 'human shields' during a vigorous but ultimately unsuccessful parliamentary counter-attack of mid-April. This account, together with briefer reports in the newspapers, relate how Cromwell then led a three-day operation against the Crowland royalists from Tuesday 25 to Thursday 27 April, which culminated in the collapse of royalist resistance and so allowed the parliamentary forces to enter the town unopposed on the morning of 28 April.

Several important points emerge. Although there is no surviving letter by Cromwell himself giving an account of this operation, he is accorded full and laudatory coverage in the newspaper reports; indeed, although a couple of other colonels may have been present, the newspapers suggest that Cromwell led and commanded the operation. *Remarkable Passages of Gods Good Providence* lays much less stress on Cromwell's own role. These pro-parliamentary publications also emphasise the unpleasant and dishonourable nature of the Crowland royalists, apparently both soldiers and civilians, stirred up by zealous ministers - their use of human shields, their breach of the rules of war in shooting at, seizing and imprisoning a 'drum' who had been dispatched with a summons, and their use of 'champt' bullets, that is bullets whose surface had been roughened by biting or scoring in order to cause a large and dirty wound which would be more liable to infection. But perhaps most importantly, the action at Crowland in late April and the surviving accounts we possess of it throw light on Cromwell at this very

early stage in his military career, showing him to be a determined and resolute commander, learning the skills of besieging and successfully capturing a fortified town, and in consequence finding himself described in one newspaper as 'the Heroicke and valiant Colonell Cromwell', a man of growing stature and reputation.

Divers Remarkable Passages of Gods Good Providence in the Wonderful preservation and deliverance of John Harrington Esqu, Mr Robert Ram Minister, Mr William Sclater, and Serjeant Horne all of Spalding in the County of Lincoln who were taken prisoners by the Cavaliers of Croyland and kept there the space of five weekes. But are now lately rescued by the Parliaments forces, the Town taken with little losse, the forenamed prisoners set at liberty and many of their adversaries taken in the same Net they layd for others. Whereunto is annexed a copy of a letter sent by Mr Ram to Croyland, which they pretended to be the cause of that their madnesse against him.³

Upon Saturday the 25 of March being Lady day early in the morning Captain Tho Stiles and Captaine Cromwell, Mr Wil Styles the Minister of Croyland with about 80 or 90 men came to the Town of Spalding, which at that time was utterly unfurnished of men and Armes, whereof they had intelligence the evening before, by some of our malignant and treacherous neighbours. Neer brake of day they beset the house of Mr Ram, Minister of the Town, where they took J Harrington Esq and the said Mr Ram and in a violent and uncivill manner carried them away to Croyland, at the entering whereof all the people of the town generally were gathered together to see and triumph over their prisoners, which put us in mind of Sampsons entertainment when he was taken by the Philistims. Some others of our town they took the same time, but released all save Edw Horne one of Capt Escorts Serjeants, so we three were kept together under strong guard, and about ten daies after one Wil Slater of Spalding a man of 66 years of age was taken by some of their Scouts and made prisoner with us; our usage for dyet and lodging was indifferent good at the time of our imprisonment, which was five weeks, but some insolencies we were forced now and then to endure. Capt Styles one day quarrelled with us for praying together and forbad us to do so, saying we should pray every man for himselfe threatening to take away the Bible from us, saying it was not fit for Traytors to have the Bible, and by no means would permit us to have Pen, Inke or Paper, though Mr Ram did earnestly sue to him for them, and protested that he would write nothing but what they should see or heare if they pleased.

After we had continued there neere 3 weeks on Thursday the 13 of April some companies of our friends advanced towards our reliefe, whereupon about 8 a clocke that night we were carried down to the Bulwark on the North side of the Town where we continued amongst the rude souldiers and townsmen till after midnight; but by reason our Forces fell not on that night, we were carried into an Alehouse where we continued till day light, and then were had to our lodgings. But when our Companies approached neerer the Town, then we were brought forth againe and another prisoner one Daniel Pegg of Deeping added to us and carried to that part of the Town where the first onset was given, being all of us fast pynioned and made to stand in an open place where the Cannon began to play. But before the assault a drummer was sent with a summons to the Town, at whom they shot divers times before his entrance, whom they also deteined and kept a prisoner till the Town was taken, contrary to the law of Armes. A while after we were all five of us set upon the top of the Brestworke (according as we had often been threatened before) where we stood by the space of three houres, our friends shooting fiercely at us for a great part of that time, before they knew us. Cap Harrington tooke one of his souldiers muskets, charging it with Pistoll powder and himself made three shots at his own father, he and all the rest of the souldiers on that side supposing we had been Croylanders that stood there to brave them; when our friends perceived who we were, they left firing upon us and began to play more to the right hand of us, whither Mr Ram and Serjeant Horne were presently removed, which caused our party to hold their hands, so that little more was done on that side of the Town that day. Indeede their works were very strong and well-lined with Musketiers who were backed with store of Hassock knives, long sithes and such like fennish weapons, and besides without their works was a great water, both broad and deep, which encompassed all that side of the Town by reason whereof our small Forces could doe no good at that time, neither could they approach neerer without great hazard and losse. The Minister of the Town Mr Styles was very active all the time of the fight on the West side, where he commanded in chiefe, running from place to place and if fearefull oathes be the character of a good souldier, he may wel passe Muster, which made us not so much marvell at the abhominable swearing which we continually heard almost from every mouth, yea, even when the Bullets flew thickest. But as the fury of the assault began to abate in those parts, so did it increase on the North side, whither presently Mr Ram and Serjeant Horne were posted, and there set upon the Bulwarks for our friends on that side to play upon, who plied us with great and small shot for a great while, supposing Mr Ram had been the vapouring Parson of the Town. Many of our deare and worthy friends have since told us how many times they shot at us with their own hands and how heartily they desired to dispatch us, but the Lord of Hosts that numbereth the hairs of our heads so guided the bullets that of the multitudes that flew

about our eares and many of them within half a musket-shot, not one of them had power to touch us, blessed be the Name of our God. After we had continued 3 houres more upon the North-work our forces began to retreat, and then were we taken down and guarded to our lodging. Mr Harrington also and the two other prisoners which had continued all the while upon the West-work were bringing up to us, but the Forces on the north side began to fire again, where upon they were carried back by a base fellow of the Town to those works, and then our forces on both sides retreated.

Upon this great Victory, as the Croylanders vaunted, one Mr Jackson a Minister of the Town drew all the people into the Church where he read certain collects by way of thankfulness for their good successe. The most part of the night following was spent in drinking, revelling, and rayling upon the Parliament and round-heads, as if they had offered some extraordinary Sacrifice to Bacchus, in so much that there was scarce a sober man to be found amongst them. And since we are fallen into the mention of Mr Jackson, we cannot well omit some passages of his: he was formerly a great incendiary in another place some ten miles from Croyland, where he stirred up the people in a dangerous and rebellious manner to take up Armes against the Parliament, and drew many of good estates into action under the command of Captain Welby, but God was pleased to rout that company without much losse of blood; upon the defeat there, Mr Jackson and others sheltered themselves at Croyland, where what by preaching and what by private perswading, he was a chiefe instrument in stirring up the people of Croyland to take up Armes and commit such outrages as they did. The last Sabbath that we were prisoners there he preached and in his Sermon did mightily encourage the people to play the men, commending them highly for their courage and valour in the former incounter, and perswading them by many arguments to goe on in their resolution, saying that the cause was Gods and that hee had fought for them and would doe so still and that all the good people of the land prayed for them; he said also that these holy stones pray for you, these holy Books pray for you, which your enemies teare in pieces to light Tobacco withall, the holy Vestments pray for you, that holy Table prayes for you, which they in many places make an hors-rack, yea the Saints in Heaven pray for you; but of this enough, and too much.

To proceed with our relation, we heard no more of our friends comming to relieve us till Tuesday the 25 of April, and then the Towne was assaulted on three sides by part of the Regiments of those noble Gentlemen Colonell Sir Miles Hobart, Colonel Sir Anthony Irby and Colonell Cromwell. When the Forces advanced somewhat neer the Towne, Master Ram was again called for and brought out of his lodging and carried with all speed to the North Bulwark and there being very straitly pinioned, he was laid within the Work

upon the wet ground, where he lay for the space of five hours, often intreating that he might be set upon the Bulwark by reason of the extream numnesse of his limbs and his extraordinary weariness with lying so long in that posture. But they would not suffer him, the with [sic] reason we conceive was for that our friends threatened [not] to give quarter if any of us were again set upon the Bulwarks. That Tuesday proved a very wet and windy day, and so continued till Thursday morning, that most of our Companies were forced to quit their moorish rotten quarters and retreat, onely some small parties on the West and South held them in exercise day and night most part of that time, though the weather was very extream and they had no shelter to defend themselves from it. On Thursday in the afternoon all the Companies were drawne down upon the three approaches or banks by which the Town only is accessible by land, who so plyed the Croylanders upon every quarter that their hearts began to faile, divers of them stealing away into the Coverts and moorish grounds on the east side of the Town, which they call Porson, so famous for fish and fowl, and many more that night followed their fellows. On Friday morning those few that remained set the best face they could on so bad a businesse and seemed as if they would fight it out to a man, but before daylight they moved for a Treaty which being granted them they sent their unreasonable Propositions, which being torn asunder and scorned, our men advanced and entered the Town without any opposition.

Some of the chiefe Actors got away, yet some were taken in the Towne and many more since in many places of the Country about: Captain Styles, Lieutenant Anburne of Lyn, Thomas Bowre a Scrivener of London, Master Jackson the Minister of Fleete, Master William Balder, and some three or foure more are now prisoners at Colchester and Ipswich. Some are committed to the provost Marshall at Spalding. Of Coyland, onely one was slain and one hurt. Of our men were killed five and some eighteen or twenty wounded, whereof some are since dead, their wounds being incurable by reason of their poisoned Bullets. Ten champst Bullets were found in one mans pocket, some of their Muskets being drawn by our men had such Bullets in them, and abundance of the same sort found by our souldiers. The principall man we lost was Master Nicholas Norwood a gentleman exceeding active and zealous in this and other services; he died of a shot in the shoulder some five or six dayes after, was much lamented by all that knew him and his forwardnesse in the publike cause.

Thus it pleased the Lord to deliver us out of our imprisonment and miraculously to preserve those that were appointed to die for which we desire to blesse his Name for ever, and blessed be the Lord for raising up so many noble Gentlemen and worthy friends not onely of our Neighbours in the Counties round about us but of other parts far distant from us, who

with wonderfull courage and resolution ingaged themselves to relieve us, or to die in the place.

John Harrington Robert Ram William Slater Edward Herne

Appended to this account is a copy of a letter by Robert Ram to the people of Crowland, dated 31 January, in which he warns them of the dangerous course they were taking - 'doe you thinke that to take up Armes, to make Bulworks and Fortifications without commission, to disobey all Warrants and Commands, are not very high Contempts?' - and of the counter-measures which would follow - 'surely your numbers and your preparations are not so great but that a small power may prevaile against you; neither is your Towne so inaccessible but that it may be approached many wayes; a piece of Ordnance will soon command and batter down your houses at two or three miles distance, besides it is possible in a very short time to famnish your Towne by cutting off all supplies of Corne and other provision'. Ram closes by calling on the Crowlanders to 'lay down your Armes and submit your selves', warning them, 'Good Neighbours, think seriously on these things and do not desperately ruine yourselves and your posterity, but hearken wisely to the Counsell of Peace. I know your plea is that you stand but upon your owne guard and defence of yourselves and estates; so pleaded C.W., so pleaded G. and so plead all that stand out against the Parliament; but the Parliament allows not of such a plea, neither will it endure to be so contemned'.

Other, briefer reports appeared in several newspapers of the day, most of them focusing more sharply upon Cromwell's role and leadership.

Speciall Passages 37, 18-25 April⁴

Colonell Cromwell is at Huntingdon himself, part of his Forces are at Peterborough, he is not full 1000 horse and foot in all. He hath no great encouragement to advance into Lincolnshire unlesse things stood in a better posture. He intends to trie Crowland once more, the first attempt not taking because they that went there employed in that service, perceiving their enemies place a Minister and divers other friends in that place where they were to shoot, did at first forbear to shoot; but after consult, they resolved to do it, and when they gave fire to the Canon it brake; then they resolved not to attempt that way, but to trie some other way; but that not being agreed to, they came back.

Certain Informations 16, 1-8 May⁵

Out of Lincolnshire it is informed that at Crowland in that County one Captaine Welby a pernicious Malevolent and a former mover of Sedition and Rebellion in those parts had so far inveigled the Queenes Tenants in and about the said Towne of Crowland that he got them to adhere unto him and to declare themselves against the Parliament and to fortifie their Towne with Breast-workes and Trenches, which being effected he sallied out of his defences and seized upon the person of Mr Harrington an honest and peaceable Gentleman and to vent his despight against the True Protestant Religion he also apprehended Mr Ram an Orthodoxe and pious Minister there. Whereof the honest inhabitants of Spalding in the same Island receiving notice, they made out to Crowland to relieve those worthy persons, at whose approach Captaine Welby placed the said Mr Harrington and Mr Ram upon his Trenches to be shot at, which indignity so much incensed the Spaldingians, that they told the Captaine they would put every man of his to the Sword if he did not remove the said Persons from his Trenches, which for feare he did, but the Spalding men could then doe no good upon Crowland, because they wanted Ordnance to force it; yet since the Heroicke and valiant Colonell Cromwell passing that way from Peterborough hath regained the Towne of Crowland, driven the said Captaine Welby and his wicked Impes from thence and reduced those parts to their former peace and tranquility.

Speciall Passages 39, 2-9 May⁶

From Peterborow it is informed that Crowland men when they could no longer hold out left the Towne and betooke themselves to their little Boats, yet that shift but little furthered their escape for the Countrey-men (to whom they have done so much mischief) are resolved to cut them in pieces if they can meet with them, and the other way they cannot passe; about nine or ten of them are already taken.

1. P P Hayes & T W Lane, *The Fenland Project Number 5: Lincolnshire Survey, The South-West Fens* (Sleaford, 1992), pp. 203-4. Chapter 18, on Crowland parish, examines the pre-medieval and medieval topography.
2. British Library, Thomason Tract [hereafter BL, TT] E16 (12).
3. BL, TT E104 (34). 4. BL, TT E91 (21).
5. BL, TT E101 (2). 6. BL, TT E101 (6).

Dr Peter Gaunt is Chairman of The Cromwell Association. This paper springs from a lecture on Cromwell's early sieges given at a dayschool on 'His Own Fields: Cromwell and East Anglia' held at Huntingdon in May 1999, organised by John Sutton and run by Anglia Polytechnic University in conjunction with the Cromwell Museum and The Cromwell Association.

CAVALRY OF THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR

by Alison West

The cavalry of the English civil wars consisted of the 'Great Horse' and the dragoons. The tactics they adopted answered the necessity to shatter strong pikemen and musketeer formations, to wage mobile battles in the open and to facilitate the development of continental-style cavalry warfare. Changes included a reduction in armour worn by troopers, shallower formation operations, engaging the enemy at a steady trot as opposed to an uncontrollable gallop and holding fire until the enemy was engaged.

The 'Great Horse' were mainly soldiers called 'harquebusiers' or 'carbineers'. They were organised into troops of about seventy-strong, plus NCOs and officers, who were then grouped five or six together under a colonel. They rode horses that were large and sturdy, similar to modern day hunters.

Troopers often purchased their own uniforms. The well-equipped donned a highly-prized, expensive leather buff coat; lightweight, convenient and offering excellent protection, it was strong enough to turn a sword cut. Worn with or without sleeves, with buttons or laces or costly decorations such as thin leather sleeves with bullion lacing, it could be worn under a cuirass or without additional protection. Troopers were armed with broadswords, pistols and sometimes a carbine and short pole axe. They often wore iron or steel back and breast plates, sometimes they wore a gorget to protect the neck, and their legs were protected by thigh-length 'bucket-top' leather boots with rather nasty spurs. Their iron pot helmets had peaks to which were attached three connecting bars or a single sliding bar to protect the face.

'Cuirassiers' were equipped in three-quarter pistol-proof armour reaching from head to knee. If worn with an over-breast plate called a lacket it could be musket-proof. Unfortunately this armour was heavy, expensive and uncomfortable. The horses needed to carry such weight were scarce, so such equipment was usually worn by the general officer's lifeguards.

A parliamentary officer is quoted as saying that they found it a 'great inconvenience upon service, we cannot know one another from the enemy'. The opposing armies did tend to dress and equip identically, which on occasion caused major confusion, sometimes disaster. To counteract the problem, parliamentarians began to wear a tawny orange sash around their waists, the royalists a red one.

Dragoons were actually mounted infantry and usually fought on foot. Although classed as part of the horse, their main roles were to provide firepower to exposed bodies of the Great Horse and to defend lines of communications. They were armed as the musketeers and, in some cases, as the pikemen. Their most convenient weapon was regarded as the firelock musket though, due to lack of resources, royalist dragoons tended to be armed with matchlocks. They were organised like the infantry into companies supposed to be one hundred strong - in reality the company was usually well below strength. Dragoons' horses were of inferior quality in comparison to the rest of the cavalry; nevertheless, mounted charges were conducted against the enemy by dragoons.

All troops of horse and companies of dragoons carried their own cornets, or colours, which were smaller than the infantry colours. Cavalry cornets were unique to their troop because of the diversity of designs, ranging from plain, one-colour silk to the more elaborate 'imprese' of a particular captain, with multicoloured fringes representing other troops' colours in the regiment. Although dragoons' colours were fringed, they were elongated with two swallow tails, whereas the cornets were square.

Dragoons and infantry companies had two drummers, used to transmit their commanders' orders. All indications are that all the drummers wore identical dress to NCOs in the company and were equipped with identical drums to the infantry. The two trumpeters in each troop of horse were set apart from their comrades in the sense that they wore splendid uniforms which their captains paid for. They had two roles: the sounding of calls at their officer's command and acting as messenger for their captain, rather like the medieval herald. Their trumpets were long and unvalved, sporting a banner on which would be emblazoned the personal coat of arms of their captain. The senior member was called the trumpet major.

The pay for a trumpeter was the same as for an NCO, whilst the trooper's pay was the highest of all, estimated at fourteen shillings per week. However, troopers had to provide the food for their horses out of this. Pay was also in arrears, which meant that pillaging and 'stormpay' were common occurrences. In the practice known as quartering, civilians volunteered - sometimes reluctantly - to feed and house soldiers; the taking of free quarter caused much annoyance to the families who had to cut back themselves as a result of the wars. At the end of the civil war grants of land were distributed to many soldiers, though they were frequently sold for a pittance.

Alison West joined the Association in 1994 and is married to a fellow-member. Originally from the North-West, she now lives in East Anglia.

OLIVER CROMWELL, KINGSHIP AND THE HUMBLE PETITION AND ADVICE

by Roy Sherwood

On 31 March 1657 Oliver Cromwell was formally presented with the Humble Petition and Advice of the knights, citizens and burgesses now assembled in Parliament 'that your Highness will be pleased to assume the name, style, title, dignity and office of King of England, Scotland and Ireland and the respective Dominions and Territories thereunto belonging; and to exercise the same according to the laws of these nations'.¹ The presentation ceremony took place in the Banqueting House at the Palace of Whitehall.

There followed six weeks of agonising and debate until 8 May when Protector and Parliament assembled again in the Banqueting House for Oliver's final answer.* In his speech to Parliament the Protector re-addressed a doubt he had already expressed concerning the offer of the crown. In essence this was that while he had no objection to occupying the office of King he saw no reason why he could not do so with his existing title. Why, he effectively asked, should the person in whom the supreme authority resides be any less a King simply because his title is spelled P-r-o-t-e-c-t-o-r? 'Signification goes to the thing, certainly it does, and not to the name.' Surely, the Protector argued, as the office in question was being offered to him by Parliament it was therefore Parliament's to dispose of. Consequently Parliament had a perfect right to change the name of the kingly dignity to anything it wished without changing the nature of the office. This alone would make the title of Protector as conformable to the law as that of King had been.²

Returning to this issue in the speech which many had hoped would be Cromwell's formal acceptance of the crown, the Protector spoke to the assembled Members of Parliament of the unhappiness he had experienced 'not to be convinced of the necessity of that thing that hath been so often insisted upon by you, to wit, the title of King'. But he still could not see why the kingly title was 'in itself so necessary as it seems to be apprehended by yourselves'. And he did so 'with all honour and respect to the judgement of Parliament'. He therefore concluded that Parliament's Humble Petition and Advice 'doth consist of very excellent parts in all but that one thing, the title as to me.... I cannot undertake this government with the title of a King, and this is mine answer to this great and weighty business'.³

Accordingly, it was ordered that the title of King be replaced in the Humble Petition and Advice by Cromwell's existing title of Lord Protector and a parliamentary committee was delegated to consider how this replacement title 'may be bounded, limited and circumstantiated'.⁴ A thumbnail sketch of the committee's deliberations bequeathed to us by Secretary of State John Thurloe in one of his many missives to Henry Cromwell in Ireland⁵ records that it was initially proposed that 'the power of the Protector should be referred to that of the King, expressing it, that he should exercise the same powers, and no other, that any King of England might lawfully do'. The argument in favour of this proposal was that once the title had been altered from King to Lord Protector in the Humble Petition and Advice there really was no other way of setting limits to the Protector's authority. Otherwise the Protector would be looked upon only as a military officer without any bounds and limits with all the privileges of a King but able to avoid all that which the law imposed on a King regarding the liberty of the people.

At first, Thurloe tells us, it was thought that the formulation of the Protector's authority in terms of regal powers was by general agreement. Such explicit reference to the kingly dignity did not, however, please those members of the committee who were opposed to kingship. Their answer to the argument that there was no other way of limiting the Protector's authority was that the Protectorship should be somehow circumscribed in such a way as to make it a new office altogether. But this idea, 'appearing to be an endless business', was abandoned even by those who proposed it and some of their number returned to the initial proposal but expressed in such a way as to avoid specific mention of the kingly office by name. Even so this did not meet with universal approval among the military men on the committee, Protectoral Privy Councillors General John Lambert (one of the principal opponents of the offer of the crown to Cromwell) and Colonel William Sydenham and others speaking, according to Thurloe, 'very earnestly against it and very few of the soldiers pleased with it so far as could be perceived'. Nevertheless kingship in relation to the office of Protector was implicit in the amended Article 1 of the Humble Petition and Advice submitted by the committee to Parliament. The revised Article, to which Parliament gave its assent, read:

That your Highness will be pleased, by and under the name and style of Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland and the Dominions and Territories thereunto belonging, to hold and exercise the office of chief magistrate of these nations, and to govern according to this Petition and Advice in all things according to the laws of these nations.⁶

It should be noted that Oliver is not described as head of state, as Lord Protector, of a Commonwealth but as holding and exercising the 'office of chief magistrate of these nations', which was how former sovereigns had been known, 'by and under the name and style of Lord Protector of the Commonwealth'. The distinction is subtle but important because this was, as had been intended, kingship in all but name. As reported in a newsletter among the papers of Army Secretary William Clarke:

The fundamental laws of the nation shall run in their direct and proper channel, and be construed, deemed and taken to have full force, effect and virtue to all intents and purposes under the title of Protector as supreme magistrate as under the title of King, and that his Highness's power and authority shall be equivalent.⁷

'And so at length his Highness and Parliament agreed upon a government.'⁸ Apart from the change to the title, the government agreed upon, and to which Cromwell formally gave his assent on 25 May 1657, was the Humble Petition and Advice as originally submitted to him. In fact Cromwell had been required to consent to the Humble Petition and Advice in its *entirety* with the title only altered:

Mr Speaker acquainted his Highness that the Parliament had commanded him to acquaint his Highness with the alteration in the Petition and Advice and to desire his consent to the whole, *mutato nomine tantum*, and his Highness presently gave his consent.⁹

Thus, king-like, as chief magistrate with the title of Lord Protector, Cromwell would govern with the *advice* of his Privy Council and be *pleased* to call Parliaments (consisting of two Houses), whereas under the Instrument of Government, by which Cromwell became Lord Protector in 1653, Oliver had governed with the *assistance* of a Council, and a single chamber Parliament *had* to be summoned on a date specified.¹⁰

Indeed at this point the Humble Petition and Advice was so unchanged from its original form with the title of King that one of its clauses still retained an actual reference to both the title and the office of King. This was Article 15 which declared that:

All acts which have passed, or shall pass, this Parliament, shall have the force and effect of acts of Parliament, whether your Highness's assent thereunto hath been, or shall be, given by the name, style, title and office of Lord Protector, or by the name, style, title and office of King.

This Article had originally been included to ensure that legislation passed in the name of the Lord Protector during the current Parliament should still 'stand good' after Cromwell's title had been changed to that of King.¹¹

Now that Cromwell had refused the title of King the continued existence of this clause in the Humble Petition and Advice was clearly anomalous. This did not go unnoticed. During the parliamentary debate on Cromwell's speech accepting the Humble Petition and Advice, which took place on 27 May, two days after that acceptance, Protectoral Privy Councillor Colonel William Sydenham pointed out:

Something in the 15th Article is scarcely sense, that about laws being of force whether under the title of King or Protector, for in the beginning you say the title of Protector shall be the title.

Sydenham's point was, however, ignored and the debate continued as though he had never spoken. Undaunted Sydenham returned to the matter:

There is something in the Petition and Advice which needs not only some explanation but an expunging. You say that in the 15th Article all acts shall be valid under what title soever they pass, either as Protector or King, and surely you will not make laws in both names and leave the nation at a loss which you do adhere to.

This finally brought a response from George Downing, who had been one of the prime movers in Parliament's offer of the crown to Cromwell. Downing retorted that the alteration of the title of King to Lord Protector in the Humble Petition and Advice 'was only in compliance with his Highness's conscience. I would have it [Article 15] stand as it does. It may be that his conscience may receive conviction.' In other words, there was a possibility that the Protector could yet change his mind and accept the title of King.

In what could be interpreted as an attempt to draw attention away from the vexed question of Article 15 Lord Chief Justice John Glynne, another of the prime movers in Parliament's offer of the crown to Cromwell, interjected with a proposal that the House should return to one of the points raised earlier on in the debate before any new motions were introduced. But Captain Henry Hatsell would have none of it. 'The usual way to thrust out one motion is to make another', he countered. Hatsell went on to echo Colonel Sydenham's sentiments regarding the anomalous nature of Article 15 and expressed concern over the uncertainty engendered by the continued existence of the title of King in this clause. In view of this he recommended that the nation be left in no doubt that Parliament was agreed on the

alteration of Cromwell's title in the Humble Petition and Advice from King to Lord Protector. To which Major-General William Jephson, said to be the originator of the first definite proposal to make Cromwell King, replied wryly: 'There are some so out of love with those four letters [K-i-n-g] that we must, I think, have an act to expunge them out of the alphabet. And that is my humble motion.' In the end this and other matters arising from the debate were referred to a committee which when it proposed a month later that the Humble Petition and Advice should be printed, also proposed that this should be with the omission of Article 15.¹² The contemporary printed version of the Humble Petition and Advice therefore has no Article 15. The articles run consecutively from 1 to 14 and then from 16 to 18, leading some historians, including S.R. Gardiner and J.P. Kenyon, as well as the editor of *The Diary of Thomas Burton*, to make the incorrect assumption that the articles had simply been misnumbered.

What makes Article 15 so interesting is that it was still part of the Humble Petition and Advice when Cromwell accepted it and there was obviously a desire in certain quarters for Article 15 to remain in the hope that the Protector would yet change his mind and accept the title of King. Clearly, there being no alteration in Cromwell's title, legislation already passed would not be affected and so Article 15 became redundant.

But if Cromwell's title had not changed, the nature of the office under that title, as we have seen, had. Parliament, opined Lady Conway, had 'settled the government which they proffered under the style of kingship to one as absolutely regal and hereditary, only altering the name to Protector'.¹³ This generally held view of the Humble Petition and Advice as representing the assimilation of the office of Protector to the kingly dignity was shared by the Venetian envoy in London, Francesco Giavarina:

Besides the resolution confirming Cromwell's title as Protector, Parliament has passed another by unanimous vote which appropriates to that dignity all the articles previously granted in the event of his Highness accepting the crown. Thus, by consent of the three kingdoms, Cromwell will enjoy all the privileges, prerogatives and possessions of the former Kings exactly as if he had the royal title, so that he holds the supreme power as if he actually was a King.... They are now arranging a bill to substitute the title of Protector or Highness for King or Majesty in all the laws wherever these occur, leaving all the rest in force.¹⁴

This is what Cromwell had in effect asked for - to rule as King but with the title of Lord Protector. All that was required was a formal ceremony of recognition of that very fact. Which is why Cromwell's second investiture

as Lord Protector in historic Westminster Hall on 26 June 1657 was to all intents and purposes a king-making ceremony, a coronation without a crown. It even included the administration of an oath 'according to the usage of former chief magistrates', that is to say, a monarch's traditional coronation oath. As one Member of Parliament had pointed out during the debate on what form this ceremony should take:

You are making his Highness a great Prince, a King indeed, so far as he is Protector. Ceremonies signify much of the substance in such cases, as a shell preserves the kernel or a casket a jewel.¹⁵

Accordingly Cromwell now began exercising prerogatives which the Humble Petition and Advice did not specifically confer upon him but which were automatically available to those occupying the office of King. Not least among these was the creation of hereditary peers. The letters patent for a Cromwellian ennoblement depict the Protector wearing royal robes and holding a sceptre and declare regally that: 'Amongst other of the prerogatives which adorn the imperial crown of these nations none is of greater excellency or doth more amplify our favours than to be the fountain of honour.'¹⁶

Even so, and notwithstanding its acceptance by Cromwell's own contemporaries, some modern-day historians would argue against the regal interpretation of the Cromwellian regime under the Humble Petition and Advice. They cite a biblical allusion made by Oliver in a speech during the kingship debate: 'I will not seek to set up that which Providence hath destroyed and laid in the dust, and I would not build Jericho again.' This is taken to imply that Cromwell would never accept either the title or the office of King because both had been providentially 'blotted out' by God with the execution of Charles I. But Oliver was only referring to the *title*, not the office: 'Truly the prudence of God hath laid aside this title.' The 'name or title' had been eradicated, Cromwell argued. God had 'blasted the title'. Indeed it was in this very same speech that Cromwell had asked, in essence, why could he not occupy the office of King but with the title of Protector, signification going to the thing and not to the name.¹⁷

The kingly dignity that Cromwell exercised as Protector Royal, as some contemporaries called him, for the last fifteen months of his life was in any case not the monarchy of Charles I. Oliver had not built Jericho again. His was a reformed New Model Monarchy, a parliamentary monarchy in accordance with the Humble Petition and Advice of the knights, citizens and burgesses now assembled in the Parliament of this Commonwealth. Which is why the officiator at Cromwell's second investiture was the

Speaker of the House of Commons. 'The occasion of this great convocation and intercourse', Mr Speaker solemnly affirmed at this glittering ceremony,

is to give an investiture to your Highness in that eminent place of Lord Protector, a name you had before but it is now settled by the full and unanimous consent of the people of these three nations assembled in Parliament.¹⁸

In its offer of the crown to Oliver, which evolved into kingship without the royal title, Parliament too had invoked divine providence: 'God who puts down and sets up another, and gives the kingdoms of the world to whomsoever he pleaseth' has 'by a series of Providence[s] raised you [Cromwell] to be a deliverer of these nations and made you more able to govern us in peace and prosperity than any other whatsoever.'¹⁹

The effective assimilation of the Cromwellian Protectorship to the office of King (but with the Protector owing his title to Parliament) was accomplished in spite of the hostility to kingship within the army. Giavarina, the Venetian envoy, gives a very succinct interpretation of how he thought this had been achieved:

The simple soldiers seem quite quiet and satisfied with the refusal of the title [of King] not realising that even without it the Protector has all the powers of a King. But the officers who desire a disturbance and who do not want his Highness to have so much authority labour to impress the truth upon them, though so far without the least success. The soldiers will not listen to what they say, their objection and aversion being for the title alone and for the rest they care nothing, being content with the surface of things without piercing the marrow.²⁰

Giavarina, like many others, also regarded Cromwell ruling under the Humble Petition and Advice with the title of Protector as a purely interim measure pending the Protector's ultimate assumption of the title of King. Giavarina describes the prorogation of the second Protectorate Parliament on 26 June 1657, the day of Cromwell's second investiture, as a decision taken by the government 'so they might labour in the interval to remove the obstacles against the royal title'.²¹ And in his report of the investiture itself the Venetian envoy opined that the Protector 'lacked nothing but the crown to appear a veritable King, and no doubt if he lives it will be placed on his head'.²² By implication Secretary of State John Thurloe seems to have shared Giavarina's view of Cromwell's new status as a purely interim measure. In his previously referred to letter to Henry Cromwell in Ireland Thurloe described the accepted version of the Humble Petition and Advice

as 'this step made towards the freedom of this nation, although all that might be wished cannot be arrived at at one time'.²³ It was a sentiment with which Henry Cromwell fully concurred. In his reply to Thurloe Henry confessed that he liked 'gradual proceedings best'. He was content that a final settlement be deferred 'till a competent trial hath been made of the present way' before at last returning 'to that very form which was of old',²⁴ which was his father ruling as King in name as well as in fact.

A return to that very form which was of old, but this time under Parliament, looked a real possibility at almost any time over the next year or so. This is evidenced by the large number of people, from the Quaker George Fox to the French ambassador, Antoine de Bordeaux, and the Venetian envoy, who recorded persistently voiced speculation to the effect that Cromwell was about to adopt the title of King.²⁵ There was even a motion during the short-lived re-convened second Protectorate Parliament of late January/early February 1658 that 'now we are a free Parliament' a bill should be drawn up investing the Protector with the kingly title, 'Providence having cast it upon him'.²⁶ While only a few months before Cromwell's death on 3 September 1658, it was reported that two crimson and velvet caps of state worn by Kings as badges of rank in place of a crown were being made up on the orders of the Protectoral Master of the Wardrobe in obvious anticipation of the Protector's adoption of the royal title.²⁷

If Oliver had lived to adopt the royal title then it would have been no more than a consummative formalisation of the Protector's already regal status which had remained implicit in Parliament's Humble Petition and Advice even after the title had been changed from King to Lord Protector. The Humble Petition and Advice having remained the same with the title Lord Protector as it had been under the title of King all that would have been required was a reversion to 'the name, style, title, dignity and office of King' in place of 'the office of chief magistrate', held and exercised under the name and style of Lord Protector of the Commonwealth, in Article 1, and the reinsertion in its vacant place of Article 15 declaring the continuing validity of laws made under the title of Lord Protector.

- * For a full discussion of Parliament's formal offer of the crown to Cromwell and the ensuing kingship debate see my book *Oliver Cromwell King In All But Name 1653-1658* (Sutton Publishing, 1997).
1. *Journal of the House of Commons, Volume VII* (London n.d.), pp. 511, 516; *Mercurius Politicus*, 26 March-2 April 1657.
 2. *Monarchy Asserted to be the best, most Ancient and legal form of Government, in a conference had at Whitehall with Oliver, late Lord*

- Protector, & a Committee of Parliament*, attrib. Bulstrode Whitelocke (London, 1660), pp. 28-33; Roy Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell King In All But Name 1653-1658* (Stroud, 1997), p.84.
3. *Monarchy Asserted*, pp. 111-12.
 4. *Commons Journal*, VII, p. 535.
 5. T Birch (ed), *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esquire* [hereafter TSP] (7 vols, London, 1742), VI, 310-11.
 6. *Commons Journal*, VII, p. 537.
 7. C H Firth (ed), *Selections from the Papers of William Clarke* (4 vols, London, 1891-1901), III, 109.
 8. TSP, VI, 311.
 9. *Commons Journal*, VII, pp.538-9; J T Rutt (ed), *Diary of Thomas Burton, Esquire* (4 vols, London, 1828), II, 123-4.
 10. *The Humble Petition and Advice, etc.* (London, 1657), pp. 3, 11; J P Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary* (2nd edn, Cambridge, 1986), pp. 308, 309.
 11. *Commons Journal*, VII, pp. 511, 512.
 12. Rutt, *Burton's Diary*, II, 135-41, 302; *Commons Journal*, VII, p. 540.
 13. Public Record Office, London, SP 18/113, f. 220.
 14. A B Hinds (ed), *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts...in the Archives and Collections of Venice...*, 1657-9 (London, 1931), pp. 61, 63.
 15. Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell King In All But Name*, Chapter 8; Rutt, *Burton's Diary*, II, 303.
 16. Mark Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell* (2 vols, Birmingham, 1787), II; Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell King In All But Name*, pp. 97, 105-6.
 17. *Monarchy Asserted*, pp. 41-2.
 18. Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell King In All But Name*, p. 96.
 19. Firth, *Papers of William Clarke*, III, 94.
 20. Hinds, *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1657-9*, p. 71.
 21. *Ibid.* 22. *Ibid.*, p. 82.
 23. TSP, VI, 311. 24. *Ibid.*, VI, 330.
 25. Hinds, *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1657-9*, pp. 89, 149, 155-6, 167, 176, 189, 226, 228; Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell King In All But Name*, pp. 130-4.
 26. Rutt, *Burton's Diary*, II, 424.
 27. Firth, *Papers of William Clarke*, III, 150.

© Roy Sherwood, 1999

Roy Sherwood, author and historian, is well known for his work on the regal aspects of the Cromwellian Protectorate. His books include: *The Court of Oliver Cromwell* (Willingham Press) and, most recently, *Oliver Cromwell King In All But Name 1653-1658* (Sutton Publishing).

'THE FLANDRIC SHORE': CROMWELLIAN DUNKIRK

by Thomas Fegan

Cromwellian Dunkirk (Dunkerque) is an oft neglected site. The town did not remain in English hands very long and its history is, of course, overshadowed by the more recent events of 1940 when British and French troops were evacuated from the beach of Malo-les-Bains in Operation Dynamo. In the late 1650s, however, the Battle of the Dunes and the capture of Dunkirk were of the utmost significance. The destruction of Charles Stuart's force and the setbacks accorded the Spanish removed the threats of royalist invasion and continental support for royalist risings in Britain. Further, England's power and influence in Europe were greatly enhanced - enhanced out of all proportion to the tiny foothold arms had won. Today, although little remains from the seventeenth century in what is now an important industrial centre, with travel to the continent easier than ever before since the Channel Tunnel opened nearby, Dunkirk is worth at least a detour if only to reflect on the renown achieved there all that time ago, as well as to think of it as a little bit of Cromwellian here over there.

There are several reasons why Cromwell set his sights on Spanish controlled Dunkirk in the 1650s. One was to combat the pirates there who were a constant menace to English shipping. But it was the soldiers Charles Stuart was recruiting in Flanders who posed a greater threat. Expelled from France after the Anglo-French treaty of 1655, Charles had sought support from Spain. Philip IV promised him 6,000 men to assist his restoration in the event of establishing a foothold in England, and allowed Charles himself to raise six regiments.¹ Taking Dunkirk, therefore, would deny Charles and the Spanish a prime staging post for a royalist invasion of England. And taking Dunkirk as part of an alliance with France would also allow Cromwell to take advantage of French aggression in Flanders.² Mazarin had offered Dunkirk to England as the basis of an alliance as early as 1651 (while it was still in French hands) but nothing substantial came of the idea until the later 1650s after the French had suffered military reverses against the Spanish and the English feared France and Spain would make peace. A new Anglo-French treaty was therefore sought out of necessity by both sides, although Cromwell did have Sir William Lockhart, his ambassador (and husband of his niece, Robina Sewster), insinuate that France was an ally 'not out of necessity, but choice'.³ With the pretence of genuine goodwill, then, the details were signed in March 1657, determining that France would provide 20,000 men, and England 6,000 men and her

fleet for a campaign in Flanders. England would receive Dunkirk and nearby Mardyke in return for its assistance, and France would pay for the English troops during their service.

Those English troops were now raised. Their commander was Sir John Reynolds, Commissary-General of Horse in Ireland and a siege expert related to Cromwell by marriage. His second in command was the Welshman, Sir Thomas Morgan, a soldier who had fought in the Low Countries and Germany, was a veteran of the civil wars and had assisted Monck in Scotland. He was an unusual character - apparently very short with the voice of a eunuch - and as the supposed author of *A True and Just Relation of...Sir Thomas Morgan's Progress in France and Flanders*, we will return to him in due course.⁴ The men serving under him and Reynolds were all infantry as the French were weak in foot, and instead of the usual ratio of 2:1 for muskets and pike, there were equal numbers of each, again to redress French weaknesses. Some were veterans but most were volunteers - although many of those volunteers were men of military experience and not raw recruits. Their officers, however, seem to have been less experienced. When this English contingent was ready, the men were sent off encouraged by a sermon from Hugh Peters, and having 'declared themselves with alacrity to hold up the honor and renown of England abroad', embarked for Boulogne.⁵ When they arrived, 'The French declared much joy and satisfaction upon their landing' and Turenne, the allied commander, described the English as 'the finest troops that could be seen'.⁶ Lockhart noted the 'extraordinary kindness' shown by the French, but he was suspicious of it. The soldiers themselves grumbled about brown bread, which they were unaccustomed to, and a lack of cheese (not what we would expect today). They also felt their French pay was less than they received back home. But they were consoled by liberal amounts of wine and beer, and on the ground the allies got on well for the most part. It was at a higher level that major problems arose, once the campaign was under way.

This was because instead of immediately proceeding against Dunkirk or Mardyke, once the English troops had rendezvoused with the French at St. Quentin in early June, Turenne pushed inland in order to draw the Spanish away from the coast. Montmedy in the Duchy of Luxembourg was besieged and captured, followed by St. Venant where the English esteemed themselves. Despite these successes, Cromwell was dissatisfied that no proceedings were being undertaken against Dunkirk and was afraid the French had no intention of allowing England a foothold on the coast. He had a stormy interview with Bordeaux, the French ambassador, and urged Lockhart to remonstrate with Mazarin, threatening to withdraw the English contingent altogether. Duly, fighting inland came to a close and

the army moved to besiege Mardyke. With the assistance of the English fleet, the town fell in early October in a matter of days and was handed over to the English. But although it had been relatively easily won, defending it proved a burden. There was room only for 5-600 troops and it was counter-attacked. In November a Spanish force under Don Juan, and including Charles Stuart and the Duke of York, assailed it. They were beaten off for now, but as the main Anglo-French army would soon have to withdraw to winter quarters, Turenne suggested that Mardyke should be razed to prevent it falling back into enemy hands. As the English would have none of this, Turenne remained nearby as long as he could, and when he did withdraw to Guisnes and Ardres in mid-November he left considerable troops near Calais and Boulogne who could relieve Mardyke within twenty-four hours if necessary. Further to placate the English, Mazarin sent some of his own Guard as well as the King's musketeers to help garrison the town, as well as engineers (the English soldiers there were reluctant to dig even if it was to defend themselves).

During the winter the English suffered terribly - not at the hands of the Spanish, though, but due to their appalling living conditions. Already within three months of their landing on the continent, they had lost a third of their men to the rigours of campaigning so that an extra 2,000 had had to be sent over. Thereafter, provisions such as tents - essential where there was little wood for huts - failed to materialise. In worsening weather, those quartered at Mardyke, at neighbouring Bourbourg or with the French faced further losses from sickness so that by the end of January 1658 the English contingent was halved from 6,000 to 3,000 men, making a total loss of 5,000 since arriving in Flanders (and a third of those surviving were unfit for duty, while others began to desert).⁷ Part of the reason for the neglect of the men by the English government was that they were regarded as being a French responsibility, but more importantly the inexperienced English officers were simply unaccustomed to looking after their men. In December 1657 Reynolds set off for England to express his concerns and answer accusations of treason but his ship was lost at sea.⁸ Lockhart succeeded him as general.

With Dunkirk still in Spanish hands, during the winter there were fears of a royalist invasion as a blockade of the Flemish ports could not be maintained in that season. A 'general peace' was also feared, and as Cromwell told parliament in January 1658, if France and Spain made peace 'then England will be the general object of all the fury and wrath of all the enemies of God and religion in the world'.⁹ So despite English financial problems plans for a new offensive continued. On the French side, there was disquiet about the passing of anti-Catholic measures in England and concerns about the quality of the English troops and the effect on public

opinion of their occupation of Catholic towns in Flanders, but a new secret treaty was finally signed in March.¹⁰ It reaffirmed that no separate treaties would be made with Spain for a year as well as the security of Catholics in captured towns, but a new clause promised an attack on Dunkirk before anything else. In May another 3,000 men, of whom a third were old soldiers, were despatched to Flanders to supplement English numbers. Following the fall of the French fortress at Hesdin in Artois to the Spanish, Mazarin pleaded for a campaign to retake it, but Lockhart insisted that Dunkirk take precedence. Mazarin agreed, though to mislead the Spanish it was given out that Hesdin would have priority. Turenne assembled the army at Amiens and, accompanied by Louis XIV, marched towards Hesdin hoping to intimidate it into surrender. It did not surrender, so the army marched on to Socx near Bergues. The Spanish having opened the sluices and inundated the land around Dunkirk, the only remaining roads lay along the canals. Turenne captured several forts guarding these and repaired breaches in the canals before advancing along the Bergues-Dunkirk canal to join up with the Marquis de Castelnau who brought up the contingent from Mardyke. Finally, on 25 May 1658, the army was before Dunkirk.

Dunkirk was a formidable town. In 1640 a second wall of circumvallation of raised earth, bastions, demi-lunes and a deep ditch had been built to cope with population expansion, and the nature of the surrounding terrain was favourable to defence, besiegers finding firewood and forage hard to come by. However, the garrison was poorly provisioned and numbered only 2,200 foot and 800 horse. The governor, the Marquis de Lede, had warned the Spanish authorities at Brussels about these deficiencies, but they had ignored him, wrongly thinking that Turenne meant to go against Cambrai. While they reflected on their mistake, the 25,000 men under Turenne raised two lines of entrenchments about Dunkirk and barred the beach with chains and stakes, while the English fleet kept the sea. Most of the English foot was stationed between the sea and an unfinished canal to the west of Dunkirk, the rest interspersed with the French between that canal and Fort Royal to the south of the town. Although not as experienced in siege warfare as the French, the English regiments made up for it in enthusiasm - there were even disputes over who should go first in the assaults.¹¹ Lieutenant-Colonel Richard Hughes wrote that the behaviour of the English

gained a general applause from all the grandees of the army; the French horse, who formerly hated us, are become very civil, and had rather engage with us than with their own foot.¹²

Although Lockhart said the French were not apt to flatter the English efforts, Turenne's letters were full of praise for them. And well they earned those praises because the garrison, not content to hide behind their walls, made several sorties which the English were instrumental in repulsing.

The Spanish, meanwhile, were moving to relieve the siege. At the beginning of June, Don Juan mustered a force at Ypres. By the 9th he was encamped at Nieuport and by the 12th there had been a skirmish between the Spanish and French horse. On the 13th the whole Spanish army took up position in the sand-hills east of Dunkirk. It was 14,000 strong but beset with weaknesses. It was demoralised by lack of pay, its composition was heterogeneous and it lacked artillery and powder.¹³ On the evening of the 13th an escaped prisoner brought news of the Spanish army to Turenne, and without calling a council of war the Marshal resolved to engage the enemy the next day. He sent a messenger to Lockhart to explain his reasons but Lockhart famously replied that he had every confidence in the Marshal and would inquire his reasons after the battle. Lockhart, who was ill, left fourteen companies to guard his lines and set off in his coach with the rest of the English to join Turenne early next morning. At 8 am on 14 June the French and English marched to meet the Spanish whose foot were drawn up on a crescent-shaped range of dunes, their horse under Don Juan behind, and more horse under the Prince de Conde on their left between the sand-hills and the meadows by the Canal de Furnes.¹⁴ The Duke of York (Charles Stuart was not present) could see the redcoats of the advancing English and informed Don Juan of Turenne's intention to give battle. Don Juan did not believe it, and when Conde confirmed the report and the Spanish generals still did not react, he turned to the Duke of Gloucester and asked if he had ever seen a battle. The answer no, Conde told him that 'In half an hour you shall see how we shall lose one.'

Turenne tried to move forward cautiously and not attack until he had discerned weak points in the enemy line, but the English who were on his left wing hampered his efforts. Their seven battalions, representing each of the English regiments serving in Flanders, were keen to come to blows. On first seeing the enemy,

the whole Brigade of English gave a Shout of Rejoycing, that made a roaring Echo betwixt the Sea and the Canal. Thereupon the Marechal Turenne came up with above a hundred Noble-men, to know what was the matter and reason of that great Shout. Major-General Morgan told him, 'Twas an usual Custom of the Redcoats, when they saw the Enemy, to Rejoyce'.¹⁵

Opposing the redcoats, on the highest sand-hill, which was inaccessible on two sides and formed the key point of the Spanish line, stood a Spanish veteran regiment under Don Gaspar Boniface. Advancing towards them, the English once more gave a shout and 'cast up their Caps into the Air, saying, "They would have better Hats before Night".' Turenne bade them keep in line 'But when the French came to a halt, it so happened, that the English pressed upon their Leading-Officers, so that they came up under the Shot of the Enemies'. Morgan himself 'was resolved he would not lose one Foot of Ground he had advanced, but would hold it as long as he could'. His men were so near the enemy that 'the Soldiers fell into great Friendship, one asking, is such an Officer in your Army; another, is such a Soldier in yours; and this passed on both sides'. Morgan let this go on for a little while, then asked how long this friendship would persist 'for any thing they knew, they would be cutting one anothers Throats, within a minute of an hour'.¹⁶ Friendship broken off, Morgan claimed he sent for orders from Turenne but none were forthcoming. Seeing the Spanish infantry preparing to let their cavalry through to charge, Morgan and his officers resolved to charge first.

Lockhart's regiment went ahead, led by Lieutenant-Colonel Fenwick who paused with his troops at the bottom of the steep hill to catch their breath ready for the ascent.

While they were thus preparing themselves, their forlorn hope opening to the right and left, to make room for them to mount the sand-hill, made an un-intermitted fire upon Boniface; and the moment that the regiment moved to the attack they gave a great shout.¹⁷

After Fenwick fell, Major Hinton led them on, not stopping till they were within a pike's length,

and notwithstanding the vigorous resistance of the Spaniards, who had the advantage of the upper ground, and were fresh, whereas the English were fatigued and almost out of breath with climbing the sand-hills, Boniface was driven down

with heavy losses. The Duke of York charged the Cromwellian English with his horse guards but was repulsed and

all those at the head of his troop, were either killed or wounded; and had it not been for the goodness of his armour which saved him, he had been left dead on the place.¹⁸

Morgan now ordered the remaining English regiments forward,

But when they came within ten Pikes length, the Enemy perceiving they were not able to endure our Charge, Shak'd their Hats, held up their Handkerchiefs, and called for Quarter; but the Redcoats cry'd aloud, they had no leisure for Quarter. Whereupon the Enemy fac'd about, and would not endure our Charge, but fell to run, having the English Colours over their Heads, and the strongest Soldiers and Officers Clubbing them down.¹⁹

The Duke of York managed to rally some of his guards to countercharge, and this time pierced the English ranks doing 'a great deal of execution among them', but before long he too was forced to retreat.²⁰

The whole of the Spanish army collapsed when it saw its right wing routed, and Morgan knew whom to give the credit to.

The Six Thousand English carried all the Spanish Army, as far as Westminster-Abby to Paul's Church-yard, before ever a French-man came in, on either Wing of us

and when they did, although they came on with gallantry, they struck no-one and 'only carried Prisoners back to the Camp.'²¹ Other English accounts concur. One anonymous account said the 'English acted miracles' in the battle, Morgan's men coming on 'a good trot...faster than Monsieur's gallop', and assisting Turenne when he was in disorder.²² According to Morgan, after the battle Turenne and a hundred of his officers came up to the English,

quitted their Horses, embrac'd the Officers, and said, They never saw a more Glorious Action in their Lives, and that they were so transported with the Sight of it, that they had no Power to move, or to do anything. And this high Complement we had for our Pains. In a word, the French Army did not strike one Stroke in the Battle of Dunkirk, only the Six Thousand English.²³

This was, of course, an exaggeration. The French horse under the Marquis de Castelnau had advanced along the strand to attack the flank of the Spanish right wing, and Turenne in the centre had forced back the opposing Walloon and German regiments. The French right wing of horse under the Duc de Crequy fought vigorously with Conde's cavalry, and Conde himself gives the lie to the Spanish army being a pushover.

Conde had first checked the Duc de Crequy's advance, then countercharged. He might have forced his way through the French line if Turenne had not intervened, and he personally fought bravely if in vain, having a horse killed under him before managing to escape. But those in the Spanish lines who were singled out for praise by the Duke of York were, unsurprisingly, the royalist English. These stood their ground longer than their Spanish comrades, and for that matter, the Irish Royalists.²⁴ But even the Duke of York reserved most admiration for the Cromwellians. Reflecting on his melee with them, he thought it

a remarkable thing that when the English battalion was broke, not a man of 'em ask'd quarter or threw down his arms, each defended himself to the last, and we were in as great a danger from the but-ends of their muskets, as we had been from their fire

(one of the Cromwellians having nearly killed him in the struggle).²⁵ However, he did point out that in their original, precipitate advance, the English had 'left the French a good way behind, and might have paid dearly for their temerity, if a right use had been made of their imprudence'.²⁶ The English may have been lucky to get away with this (if they had not, the outcome of the battle would have been very different) but one cannot deny that they fairly fought and beat the best the Spanish had to offer. After the Battle of the Dunes it was deservedly said 'The Englishes have such reputacion in this army that nothing can bee more'.²⁷ It was achieved at a cost - the English bore the brunt of allied losses - but with the virtual annihilation of the royalist force, prospects of a royalist expedition to England were ended.

The victorious army now returned to the siege of Dunkirk. Fort Leon on the English side and a wooden fort guarding the harbour were taken and English mortars were erected to fire on the town. Lede was killed during a struggle for the counterscarp and his successor, M. de Bassecourt, considered further resistance futile. Dunkirk capitulated on 24 June and on the 25th the 1,500 remaining of the garrison were allowed to march for St. Omer. Louis XIV entered at midday, and in the evening he handed Dunkirk over to the English, giving Lockhart the keys to the town with his own hands, 'so that by a singular combination of circumstances, Dunkirk belonged in the same day, at different times, to the three greatest powers in Europe'.²⁸

Ceding Dunkirk to Cromwell understandably aroused ill feeling in France. While Louis XIV thought the cession a 'cruel necessity' but outwardly remained on the best of terms with England, Cardinal de Retz openly stated the anti-English feelings of the clergy.²⁹ Lockhart noted that the 'the

generality of the [French] court and armes are even mad to see themselves part with what they call *un si bon morceau*, or so delicat a bit', and French public opinion was also unhappy about the handover, as expressed in a French lament by Dunkirk:

And gallant France consents, - can it be true?
Though gaining nothing by the wanton deed,
To sacrifice me to Britannia's greed.³⁰

But in England, of course, there was much satisfaction. A public thanksgiving was ordered throughout England on 21 July, and Cromwell spoke of victory, honour and the port 'which we beg we use to the glory of God, and the good of the Christian cause'.³¹ As Thurloe saw it, Cromwell now 'carried the keys of the continent at his girdle, and was able to make invasions thereupon, and let in armies and forces upon it at his pleasure'. Dunkirk would bestow greater influence over the French, and would act as 'a bridle to the Dutch'.³² At Dunkirk itself, its new governor was quite taken with the place - 'indeed it is a much better place than I could have imagined: blessed be God for this great mercy'. It was 'a very gallant towne'.³³

Happily, the inhabitants of Dunkirk were not adverse to their new masters. Lockhart described them as 'douce and tractable' and most were willing to take the oath of allegiance, to be faithful to the Protector and his successors and to reveal any conspiracies.³⁴ The terms granted the citizens guaranteed their property, privileges, Catholic religion and churches. The matter of religion was to prove most sensitive, but the only trouble from the Catholics seems to have been from the friars who quibbled about whether or not they had to reveal any plots that came to them via the confessional. On the English side, however, Lockhart had 'much adoe to keep our soldiers out of the churches, and from committing some little abuses'.³⁵ A week into the English occupation,

it was openly discussed amongst them [the soldiers], that it was fit to pillage the place, and especially the churches, where their was much riches: and their insolence went to that hight, that one of them lighted his pype of tobacco at one of the wax lights on the altar, where a priest was saying masse.

Lockhart was sent for in haste. When he arrived he commanded the soldiers to arms

and told them it was ill done to come into the Romish churches, and if they needs would satisfy their curiosity, it was fitt to come so

as they should not give disturbance to others in that, which they imagined to be their devotione.

As he considered, 'the giver of tolleratione must be greater then that which is tolerated'.³⁶ He hoped the soldiery would soon calm down, and to their credit they did. But there were still plenty of Protestant zealots back home and visiting who were willing to cause antagonism.

Lockhart wished to settle Protestants in Dunkirk and was keen for Protestant chaplains to be sent over. He enforced the Sabbath and abolished penalties for the non-observance of saints' days, and punished any soldiers who attended mass. He was never naive about the genuine feelings of the Catholic clergy in Dunkirk, commenting that although they found

so little of that ill treatment from us, which the Spanyards threatened them with, as they pretend to be well satisfied with us; and say wee use them better than either the Spanish or French did, which probably is true...all that's done for them is lyke washing of the Black-moore, for their hearts cannot be gained.³⁷

And when Lockhart was warned of Spanish plots to seduce Catholic priests away from Dunkirk, he even prayed that 'the Spanish plotts...may prosper'.³⁸ But despite all this, because, among other things, Lockhart did not confiscate the Catholic church in Dunkirk - which was anyway protected by the terms of the treaty - and used the town hall for Protestant worship instead, he was criticised for being pro-Catholic.³⁹

The governor, therefore, had a very fine balance to keep between pleasing anti-Catholics at home and ensuring that Dunkirk's inhabitants were not alienated. When Hugh Peters spent several weeks at Dunkirk after its fall, he thought of settling there, and some of the officers wanted him to. But although Peters 'laid himself forth in great charity and goodnesse' and acquainted the soldiers with 'their obligations to His Highness' government and affection to his person', Lockhart found him too much of a busybody. If 'it were possible to gett him to mynd preaching, and to forbear the trubling of himself with other things, he would certainly prove a very fitt minister for soldiers', but instead he 'hath undertaken every man's businesse'. Lockhart was obliged to tell him 'that the greatest service he can doe us is to goe to England'.⁴⁰ He went, but others came. The Quakers Edward Burrough and Samuel Fisher arrived only to be told to depart before they cause division. They left but not before trying to show the Catholics the error of their ways and exhorting the army to do God's will by taking Rome and destroying tyranny.⁴¹ Later, when

objections were raised because a fish market was tolerated on a Sunday, Colonel Alsop (in charge while Lockhart was away) was unimpressed. He replied 'thatt the trade of the towne must nott bee spoyled. And if hee or any man else in this place were soe strait laced that they could nott endure such thinges, they might depart the towne'.⁴² This moderate approach to the religion and affairs of the Dunkirkers did not just make life there more tolerable but helped the security of the town, an argument ably put by Lockhart when he was first pressed upon to commandeer the Catholic church there:

as Rome was not built in one day, so it will not be pulled downe...and as things stand, the towne not being furnished with anything fitt for its defence, and two Roman catholic armies neare, I leave it to Yowr highnesse to judge, whether it be a seasonable tyme to turn the inhabitants owt of their parish church.⁴³

Fortunately, Cromwell concurred. For whatever might be the long-term aims of the occupation of Dunkirk in fostering Protestantism in the region, the first and paramount concern was to secure the place.

Lockhart made an impressive start, quickly establishing hospitals to nurse back to fitness the large proportion of the garrison who were sick and wounded (luckily while the garrison was deficient, Turenne's continued successes on campaign kept Spanish attention away from Dunkirk). Refortification began to repair what been badly damaged during the siege, and new works were begun. A tower was added to Fort Leon, and Fort Oliver was built a mile south of Dunkirk which, Lockhart hoped, 'shall be one of the most regular pieces in Flanders'.⁴⁴ Plans were drawn up for outworks and houses for the garrison to be constructed after the magazines, bastions, draw-bridges and sally-ports were completed, and plans too for a stone fort at the end of the pier. This all required money, of course, and Lockhart was hopeful that the conquest of Dunkirk would 'not only be honourable, but profitable'.⁴⁵ But it was not to be. It was impossible to exact contributions from the surrounding area because of its poverty, and Dunkirk's revenues were constantly outstripped by the cost of maintaining it.⁴⁶ Lockhart began writing begging letters for everything from muskets, pikes and bandoliers, to beds and linen. However, following Cromwell's death only three months after Dunkirk's capture, and the abdication of Richard Cromwell in 1659, the government in England was less inclined to furnish the wherewithal for Dunkirk than it was to pry into the moral, religious and political attitudes of the officers and garrison.

Officially, at least, those stationed at Dunkirk were amenable to the changes taking place back across the Channel. In May 1659, Lockhart

informs us that 'at a full meeting of the officers, faithfulness to the present government, and obedience to all their commands, was unanimously resolved upon'.⁴⁷ As Lockhart told the garrison and citizens, 'although the government were altered, the nation is still the same, and the concernment of the public is also the same'.⁴⁸ But in spite of these proclamations of loyalty, in the middle of the year parliamentary commissioners came to inspect things for themselves. Their subsequent report was unfavourable, and they wrote indignantly to Fleetwood that 'profaneness and wickedness (which do sadly abound in this place) will do more to the loss and prejudice thereof, than all other enemies'.⁴⁹ Colonels Alsop and Lillingston protested to the Council of State, defending themselves and their officers traduced by the commissioners, but still several officers were ousted. No wonder Dunkirk was called 'Fort Loggerhead'.⁵⁰

Despite all this, Lockhart continued to declare the fidelity of those in Flanders - we find him at the end of this tempestuous year writing yet another letter of support and loyalty to the latest parliament, and sounding the guns at Dunkirk to 'Proclaim our Exaltation'.⁵¹ When Lockhart was not writing assurances, he (or Alsop and Lillingston when he was absent on diplomatic duty) found time to continue improving Dunkirk's defences. Work progressed at Fort Oliver and Fort Manning - the latter half way between Fort Oliver and Dunkirk - and around the town in general. But sometimes there was so little money that the workmen went on strike. As the economic situation deteriorated, Lillingston and Alsop sent a host of letters requesting coal, candles, arms, ammunitions, cannon and money and provisions in general. They described themselves as being at their 'wits end' for cash.⁵² The size of the garrison was already being reduced in 1659, but this was now exacerbated by the lack of pay. When Cochrane, Morgan and Clarke's regiments were recalled to England in response to Sir George Booth's rising, other troops who were keen to go home disguised themselves in their cloaks and sailed with them. Worse, mutiny threatened as the soldiers began to 'make money their cause'.⁵³ In June there was a plot to plunder the town caused by 'want of pay, and some pretences of their not being in the same capacity as to pay with the soldiery of England'.⁵⁴ There was no hint of political disaffection or support for Charles Stuart, however. The majority of officers and soldiers remained 'courageous, notwithstanding the want of money', and were eager not to 'lose this town unhandsomely, that hath been so famous in our thoughts, before we had it'. But as Alsop commented, 'without money it is impossible to live here [in Dunkirk]'.⁵⁵ He was right. Lack of money ultimately proved more fatal to Dunkirk than either Spanish or royalist arms.

In Dunkirk in 1660 the Restoration was broadly accepted. Lillingston declared the troops' acquiescence and loyalty, soldiers even drank the King's health and there were festivities for his coronation. Alsop and Lillingston retained their commands for the time being but unfortunately for Lockhart, Charles II immediately replaced him with Colonel Edward Harley.⁵⁶ The garrison escaped the general disbanding of the army in late 1660 and parliament considered fixing its number at 3,300 foot and 400 horse. But Charles II had in Flanders not only the Cromwellian regiments but also their earlier foes, the survivors of the royalist force defeated with the Spanish at the Battle of the Dunes. These royalists now made their way to Dunkirk and most of them were incorporated into the garrison where they seem to have got along fine with those already there.

Meanwhile, there were negotiations between the English and French for the sale of Dunkirk. The main reason for this, of course, was sheer financial necessity on Charles II's part, but it must also be recognised that Dunkirk's prime strategic importance - as a bulwark against royalist invasion - had completely vanished. The English negotiator, Clarendon, the Lord Chancellor, tried to obtain a good price, but Count d'Estrades, his counterpart, drove a hard bargain, refusing to increase his offer in response to bogus bids from the Spanish and Dutch. The English settled for what they could and on 27 October 1662 the treaty of sale was signed and sealed. D'Estrades took over as governor of Dunkirk and the English soldiers who had risked their lives in Flanders were disbanded, some being sent to Tangiers.⁵⁷ Reaction in England to Dunkirk's sale was hostile, and it was generally held that Clarendon had corruptly benefited from the treaty and his new stately home near St. James Palace was called 'Dunkirk-House' in reproach.

Hindsight about Cromwell's acquisition of Dunkirk (and its subsequent loss) has swung between criticism and praise. In the 1660s people looked back nostalgically to Cromwell's strong foreign policy, but critics of the next generation argued that Cromwell had left the way open for subsequent French aggression. Swaine, writing nearly a century ago, claimed Dunkirk's acquisition 'was a striking display of Cromwell's sagacity and patriotism, as well as of the valour of his troops', but more recent commentators have been much less effusive.⁵⁸ Not surprisingly, fair judgement lies between cynicism and applause. However, if we consider that Cromwell's main aims in the Flanders campaign were to weaken the royalist force there and prevent Charles using the area as a staging point for invasion, and to take advantage of French advances, we must acknowledge that in these he was eminently successful. England's renown and influence were increased, and although the cost of holding Dunkirk was a heavy burden, it had been hoped that the town would pay for itself. How

financially naive that was open to dispute. But what remains undeniable, in Marvell's lines, is that Cromwell was he

Who once more joined us to the continent;
Who planted England on the Flandric shore...⁵⁹

1. Though Charles probably raised no more than 3,000. See C H Firth, 'Royalist and Cromwellian armies in Flanders, 1657-1662', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 17 (1903), pp. 67ff. on the English, Irish and Scottish composition of this force and its indiscipline.
2. T Venning, *Cromwellian Foreign Policy* (Basingstoke, 1995), p. 151.
3. C H Firth, 'Cromwell's instructions to Colonel Lockhart in 1656', *English Historical Review*, 21 (1906).
4. Although Morgan's account is suspect it still gives a great flavour of the battle.
5. *Mercurius Politicus*, 30 April-7 May 1657.
6. *Mercurius Politicus*, 14-21 May 1657. C H Firth, *The Last Years of the Protectorate 1656-1658* (2 vols, London, 1909), I, 276.
7. Firth, 'Armies in Flanders', p. 83.
8. See Firth, *Last Years*, I, 296f. Reynolds had met, accidentally or not, with the Duke of York in the sand-hills between Dunkirk and Mardyke.
9. Venning, *Cromwellian Foreign Policy*, p. 145.
10. *Ibid*, p. 146.
11. Public Record Office, London, 31/3/102, f. 224, Lockhart to du Bosc, 5 June 1658.
12. C H Firth (ed), *Selections from the Papers of William Clarke* [hereafter *Clarke Papers*] (4 vols, London, 1891-1901), III, 151-3, 2 June 1658.
13. Firth, *Last Years*, II, 193-5. Spanish, English, Scots, Irish, Germans, Walloons and some French of Conde's were all present.
14. It seems their right wing of horse had been forced away from the shore by fire from the English men-of-war. The Spanish army consisted of 8,000 horse and less than 7,000 foot. Turenne's numbers about 6,000 horse and 9,000 foot.
15. Sir Thomas Morgan, *A True and Just Relation of... Sir Thomas Morgan's Progress in France and Flanders, with the Six Thousand English* (London, 1699), p. 6.
16. *Ibid*, p. 7.
17. James II, *The Memoirs of the Duke of York, afterwards King James II of Great Britain* (London, 1735), p. 501.
18. *Ibid*, pp. 501-2.
19. Morgan, *True and Just Relation*, p. 9.
20. James II, *Memoirs*, p. 503.

21. Morgan, *True and Just Relation*, p. 9. He was equally disparaging about Lockhart's role in battle, saying he was nowhere to be seen. Lockhart, writing to Thurloe on 4/14 June 1658, naturally gave himself a more prominent role, T Birch (ed), *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esquire* [hereafter *TSP*] (7 vols, London, 1742), VII, 155-6.
22. *TSP*, VII, 156.
23. Morgan, *True and Just Relation*, p. 10.
24. James II, *Memoirs*, pp. 503-8. On the Cromwellian side, Richard Hughes, in a letter of 6/16 June 1658, said the English royalists put up more of a fight than the Scots or Irish, *Clarke Papers*, III, 156-8.
25. James II, *Memoirs*, p. 503.
26. *Ibid*, p. 500.
27. Colonel Drummond to Monck, 5/15 June 1658, *Clarke Papers*, III, 153-6.
28. H E Diot, *An Historical Description of Dunkirk* (London, 1794), p. 18. The English garrisoned Dunkirk, of course, but Morgan kept the field with four of the English regiments under Turenne. Subsequently, Turenne successfully besieged Bergues, Furnes, Dixmunde, Gravelines, Oudenard, Menin and lastly Ypres, which surrendered on 26 September 1658.
29. Firth, *Last Years*, II, 201-3. Mazarin, however, remained steady in his alliance with England.
30. Letter to Thurloe, 24 June 1658, *TSP*, VII, 173-4. S A Swaine, 'The English acquisition and loss of Dunkirk', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1 (1884), p. 113.
31. Firth, *Last Years*, II, 206.
32. *Ibid*, 218-19.
33. Lockhart to Thurloe, 24 June 1658, and Montagu to Thurloe, 17 June 1658, *TSP*, VII, 173-4, 180.
34. Letter to Thurloe, 9 July 1658, *TSP*, VII, 214-16.
35. Lockhart to Thurloe, 17/27 June 1658, *TSP*, VII, 178-9.
36. Letter to Cromwell, 3 July 1658, *TSP*, VII, 197-8.
37. Lockhart to Thurloe, 17/27 June 1658, *TSP*, VII, 178-9.
38. Lockhart to Thurloe, 6 July 1658, *TSP*, VII, 206-9.
39. For Lockhart's anxiety as to Cromwell's feelings about whether he was pro-Catholic or not, see his letter to Thurloe, 6 July 1658, *TSP*, VII, 206-9.
40. Lockhart to Thurloe, 8/18 July 1658, *TSP*, VII, 249-51.
41. Edward Burrough, *A Visitation and Warning Proclaimed* (London, 1659).
42. *A True Accounte of the Officers of Dunkirke* (1659). See Firth, 'Armies in Flanders', appendix A.
43. Letter to Thurloe, 3 July 1658, *TSP*, VII, 197-8.
44. Letter to Thurloe, 17 August 1658, *TSP*, VII, 319-20.

45. Letter to Thurloe, 20/30 June 1658, *TSP*, VII, 185-7.
46. cf. Venning, *Cromwellian Foreign Policy*, p. 151. In the first year of occupation, about £80,000 was spent on Dunkirk against an income of £20,000.
47. Letter to the Committee of Safety, 17 May 1659, *TSP*, VII, 670-1.
48. Colonel Alsop to Fleetwood, mid May 1659, *TSP*, VII, 671.
49. July 1659, *TSP*, VII, 712-13.
50. Theophilus Verax, *Serious Sober State-Considerations, Relating to the Government of England and the Garrison of Dunkirk in Flanders* (London, 1660).
51. Lockhart's letter to parliament, Firth, 'Armies in Flanders', appendix B.
52. Letter to the Council of State, 4 August 1659, *TSP*, VII, 720-21.
53. Lillingston and Alsop to the Council of State, 23 August 1659, *TSP*, VII, 732.
54. Report of Ashfield, Packer and Pearson concerning Dunkirk, end of July 1659, *TSP*, VII, 712-14.
55. Alsop to Fleetwood, 6 May 1659, *TSP*, VII, 668-9.
56. Harley himself was replaced by Lord Rutherford in May 1661.
57. See Firth, 'Armies in Flanders', pp. 104ff. for what befell the various regiments.
58. Swaine, 'Acquisition and loss of Dunkirk', p. 118. R Hutton, *The British Republic* (Basingstoke, 1990), p. 112, for example, does not even credit the acquisition with popular support.
59. 'A Poem upon the Death of His Late Highness the Lord Protector', ll. 172-3.

Thomas Fegan is currently working as a volunteer at the London Film Archive. He is starting an MA in heritage interpretation in the autumn.

OLIVER CROMWELL

by the Rt Hon Frank Dobson MP

Oliver Cromwell is a dominant figure in the history of our country. That is why, four hundred years after he was born and 341 after he died we don't just discuss what he was and what he did - we take sides. From an early age we line up either with the cavaliers or with the roundheads. We choose between King and Parliament, between divine right and democracy. We throw in our lot with King Charles or with Oliver Cromwell.

That's certainly what I did. I was for the roundheads, for Parliament, for democracy, for Oliver Cromwell. That was the stand I took as a child. When I became a man, I put away childish things. I learnt that the seventeenth century world was more complicated than I had understood. That Parliament and the roundheads were not necessarily one and the same. That democracy and Oliver Cromwell were not always in harness together. I recognised the barbarities perpetrated in Ireland. I sympathised with the democratic yearnings voiced in the Putney debates in contradiction of Oliver Cromwell's views.

And yet, and yet I remain loyal to his memory. And I am proud to have been invited to address the Cromwell Association, in the town where he was born, as you mark the fourth centenary of his birth and celebrate his life and work and his contribution to the history of our country and of the whole of the English speaking world.

Many of you who have studied his life and times know so much more about him than I do. You will be immersed in your understanding of the religious, mercantile, social, military and philosophical forces at work during Cromwell's lifetime. You will understand what he drew from those forces then at work and what he contributed to them. You will have your own explanations of why you celebrate his name.

In the end, for me it boils down to this. Oliver Cromwell was on the right side in the English civil war and because of him the right side won. And so he changed the course of English history. And he changed it for the better. After Cromwell things were never the same again.

The civil war and its outcome was the biggest single step on the road to democracy in our country. It didn't immediately achieve democracy or anything like it. That would take another 250 years or more. But after

Parliament raised an army, defeated the King and then openly tried and executed the King, the forces of democracy were off on their long march.

And those who now take the side of the King tend to fight shy of the hard questions - what if the King had won? What would the consequences have been? Would British democracy have developed the way it did? How long would the country have had to wait for a constitutional monarchy? How much religious tolerance would there have been? What harm would have been done to the cause of democracy world-wide? And in my view we shouldn't underestimate the world-wide impact of the civil war, Commonwealth and Protectorate. In my view the answers scarcely bear thinking about.

Of course, before I can claim for Cromwell a full measure of the credit for the benefits which flowed from the right side winning the civil war, I have to show that his contribution was vital. Of that, there can be no doubt.

It's my belief that he made a threefold contribution to Parliament's victory. Firstly he set about recruiting and training an army that could more than hold its own against the best that the King could throw against it. His personal contribution was to recruit, train and equip troops steadfast under fire and well capable of exploiting enemy weaknesses which opened up in the course of the fighting. The New Model Army that won the war was largely his creation. Secondly, though with no military training, perhaps because of it, he was a courageous leader, quick to spot a tactical opportunity and bold enough to take it. Time and again in battle he first saved the day and then carried the day. Thirdly he could do what every military leader would like to do. He inspired his own side and frightened the other side. His most talented military adversary, Prince Rupert, referred to him as 'Old Ironsides'. Just think how that must have raised the morale of Cromwell's troops. If you were picking sides you'd want to have somebody nicknamed 'Old Ironsides' on your side.

In short, in times of war what you want is a winner. Cromwell was a winner and all the rest flows from that. He was a complex man but he had a flair for reducing things to the bare simplicities. That was a top talent in a general. It can be useful in peacetime too, but governing a country is a much more long term, complex and less straightforward matter than winning a battle. That's one reason why he was less successful as a peacetime ruler than he was as a general.

In his sonnet 'To the Lord General Cromwell', Milton says '...peace hath her victories/ No less renowned than war.' When it comes to renown that is a dubious proposition at the best of times. Success or failure in peace is

harder to judge than success or failure in war. Most battles are either won or lost - the outcome is clear. The outcome of peacetime activity is usually more debatable. And that is certainly true in the case of Oliver Cromwell.

Trying to get at the truth about Cromwell's non-military successes and failures is much harder than finding out about his battles. The fog of war may partly obscure our view of Marston Moor, Naseby, Dunbar or Worcester, but it is nothing like so impenetrable as the mythology and royalist propaganda that envelops the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. And the same factors also tend to cover up the extent to which future monarchs and their courts restrained their behaviour because they feared a repeat of what Cromwell had helped bring about. He didn't need to establish a full-blown democratic republic in order to clip the wings of future kings and queens.

Having gone to war for Parliament against the King, Cromwell found himself ruling without Parliament and exercising powers the King he defeated had never had. He could do that because unlike Charles, he had a victorious army behind him. And he made sure they stayed behind him. It seems to me that the majority of the troops believed that he was theirs. That he understood their needs. Recognised what they had sacrificed and what their sacrifices had achieved. He was swift to put down mutiny in the ranks, and what he interpreted as mutiny. That was because he needed the army in his struggle with the other powers in the land. He was able to take such action with the mutineers because most of the troops were prepared to believe that when it came down to it he was on their side. From time to time he might be a hard man but he was their hard man.

Cromwell had lived and worked and fought as a Parliamentarian. So ruling without a Parliament was not what he wanted. His problem was that his Parliaments were a very mixed bag. They contained contending forces, some of whom were willing to sacrifice the whole for the sake of their sectional interest. Some had been lukewarm for the war. Others had been against it. And Parliament wasn't representative.

It represented only the better off and not even all of them. It represented some of the powers in the land. It wasn't just that the Commons wasn't elected by a universal franchise. It didn't even meet the requirement of a partial democracy. It represented some powerful forces but not others. It didn't represent the army. From Cromwell's point of view it didn't give proper weight to the views and needs of the army which had borne the heat and burden of the day. It wasn't just that the Parliaments in his time were not under his control and caused him trouble. To his mind they

behaved unfairly, their factional behaviour was undisciplined, and could undermine the stability of the fledgling state.

The legitimacy of a Parliament springs from its representative capacity and its accountability. With anything less than a universal suffrage its legitimacy is open to challenge and so Cromwell could have concluded that the army was as representative or even more representative than the Parliament. It covered a far broader spectrum of the population. It was a stakeholder whose members had literally staked their lives for the cause. On the other hand when Cromwell considered some of the MPs in his Parliaments he would have felt them adequately covered by Stanley Baldwin's description of the Tory Benches in 1918 - a lot of hard faced men who looked as if they had done very well out of the war.

So while Oliver Cromwell manifestly didn't establish a system of government in which Parliament reigned supreme, the circumstances that prevailed after the civil war made that task well nigh impossible. Nor did he widen the franchise significantly, still less did he introduce universal suffrage or even universal male suffrage.

It can't be said in his favour that the idea of universal suffrage was unknown. It was being formulated and advocated by radicals both inside and outside the army. Ideas which are now the commonplace of democracy were first put into words in Cromwell's time. But not by him. He never subscribed to them. Some accuse him of betraying the cause - but he didn't. You can't betray a cause you have never subscribed to.

Nor is it clear that he could have enfranchised the common man even if he had wanted to. The idea was novel and therefore untried. Powerful forces would have resisted the idea. Many of the radicals themselves wanted to draw a line somewhere. Often they favoured the franchise being extended down the social scale just sufficiently to include them and then no further. The Levellers didn't support the Diggers. All the people involved had been brought up to believe that a hierarchy was the natural order. Some still do. To move from divine right to electoral democracy in one step was something few had ever contemplated.

But whatever happened to Parliament during the Commonwealth and Protectorate, the overall effect of the civil war and its aftermath was to strengthen the position of Parliament and shift power from the monarchy.

What then of the question of religious freedom? First we must recognise that in seventeenth century England most people took religion very seriously. The debate was dominated by fundamentalists on all sides. And

it wasn't just that religious beliefs were deeply held. Religious loyalties often carried with them political allegiances. So religion was far more important to them than it is to us now.

Oliver Cromwell himself was a deeply religious man. His religion gave him great inner strength but it also meant that when he wrestled with his conscience it often involved protracted and furious bouts. However it seems to me very clear that he was well ahead of his time when it came to 'liberty for tender consciences'. Like most of us he sometimes shared Milton's objections to those who 'still revolt when truth would set them free, / Licence they mean when they cry libertie'. Cromwell would have recognised Milton's precondition that those who love liberty 'must first be wise and good'. But compared with many he was easy going in his attitude to the religious convictions of others. I think he was honestly expressing his views when he said 'To be a seeker is to be of the best sect after that of a finder and so shall all humble seekers be in the end'.

History shows that after a revolution the rulers of a country tolerate little dissent because they fear it will lead to rebellion, rejuvenate the defeated and encourage other countries to intervene. Yet under Cromwell penal laws against dissenters or Catholics were less harsh than under monarchs both before and after him. And they were generally less harshly enforced. The pressure for such measures and their enforcement didn't come from Cromwell. Indeed he resisted such pressures from lesser men with fiercer views. When we consider the troubled times and the depth of religious feeling, the Commonwealth and Protectorate under Cromwell come out pretty well on the scale of religious tolerance. And that is before we recognise that it was because of Cromwell's personal commitment in the face of the religious bigotry of others, that Jews were invited back to England after being outlawed in 1290 - something the Kings and Queens of England who preceded him had never done. Here again the long term effect of Cromwell's rule was to undermine religious intolerance and to strengthen objections to the state interfering in matters of religion.

What else did he do for the country? For a start he brought it peace. From the end of the first civil war whenever war arose Cromwell's aim was to end it as soon as possible - and he did. And it is clear that it was the King's willingness to resort to arms for a second time that led Cromwell and others to decide to try the King and execute him.

In terms of its impact on the public at the time the decision to try the King and execute him was a mistake. It created sympathy for the royalist cause and turned the King into a martyr. But its long term impact was enormous. For the people (however defined) to rise up, defeat a monarch

CROMWELLIAN BRITAIN XII ISLINGTON, LONDON

by Jane A Mills

Islington is just under six square miles and is one of the smallest of the thirteen inner London boroughs. It is situated on the north side of the Thames, surrounded by Stoke Newington, Camden, Hackney, Haringey and the City.

In the Anglo-Saxon charter of AD 1000 it is referred to as 'Gislandune' and later in the Domesday Book as 'Isendone' and 'Iseldone', which probably means the lower town or fort. It was made up of four manors - Barnsbury, Canonbury, Prebend and Highbury. There is evidence that prehistoric man had settlements in the area, and the Romans had a summer camp in Highbury. For a time it was believed that the main Roman road from London to the north (Ermine Street) was situated along Highbury Grove, Highbury Park and part of Blackstock Road. This however has been disproved through archaeological research and there is a strong belief that Kingsland Road, Stoke Newington Road and Stamford Hill in the borough of Hackney are the site.

Several of the major roads running through Islington were important routes out of London originating as early as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. By the seventeenth century all the roads were in a state of disrepair and, as they were a vital link for the City, the Company of Clothworkers gave money annually for their repair; gradually a series of turnpikes were set up. In 1756 the New Road was built, later to become Marylebone, Euston and Pentonville Roads. It was a forty feet wide road, the earliest by-pass linking Paddington Green and Islington (north-west London) to the City.

Islington has been a popular site for country houses because of its close location to the City of London; Sir Walter Raleigh, the Earl of Leicester and the Earl of Essex all had residences here. During the seventeenth century Clerkenwell Green was a popular location for the nobles and affluent. Izaak Walton lived just off the Green and it was here that he wrote his famous book *The Compleat Angler* published in 1653. Nearby in Charterhouse Square lived Catherine Parr, Richard Baxter and William Davenant; references to Islington and Finsbury can be found in Davenant's poetry.

in war, publicly try him and execute him was a signal to all peoples and all monarchs. Sudden death was no novelty to the Stuart dynasty - but it had usually come in private, often at the hand of a relative. What happened to Charles I was something new. It put monarchy on a new and conditional footing. In England that turned out to be a safer footing. After centuries of being murdered in dynastic quarrels no English monarch after Charles I died other than by accident or natural causes. Quite a thought really - Oliver Cromwell making England safe for monarchy.

I could now take up a lot more of your precious time by rebutting a lot of the sneers and lies about Cromwell's habits of speech or dress, the activities of his family. I could go through the usual routine putting the record straight about how life in England really was under Cromwell, but it's a process which usually sounds far too apologetic.

Perhaps the shortest and most telling point to make is in response to the impressions created by the Restoration spin doctors, that, no sooner was Cromwell dead, than the English people rose up as one and carried Charles II shoulder high back onto the throne. Not so. Twenty-one long months passed between Cromwell's death and the return of Charles II. Negotiations took place. Terms were laid down which the King in name had to meet if he wanted to become King in fact.

Oliver Cromwell died on 3 September 1658. Yet it was not until 26 May 1660 that the restored King arrived in England from Holland aboard the vessel the Royal Charles. And as Pepys records, that selfsame ship had sailed out as the Naseby and its name was only changed after the King had confirmed his acceptance of the conditions laid down for his return. A conditional monarch on a recycled ship - all because of Oliver Cromwell.

We celebrate his birth and life because of his achievements. In war and in peace his actions helped to shape our history. Cromwell made a crucial contribution to this defining point in our history and in the history of the development of democracy world-wide. Over the centuries, people in the rest of Europe and in North America drew inspiration from Oliver Cromwell. Kipling's poem *Edghill Fight* ends with the words: 'The first dry rattle of new drawn steel/ Changes the world today.' It did. It changed it for the better. And that is why we rightly mark the 400th Anniversary of the birth of the man who did most to change it - Oliver Cromwell.

The Rt Hon Frank Dobson has been an MP since 1979 and Secretary of State for Health since May 1997. This is the text of a speech he gave at Huntingdon on 24 April 1999, as part of the quatercentenary week-end.

It was the dairy district for supplying the City and it was also the route for over 300,000 animals passing through the Islington turnpike on their way to Smithfield for sale and slaughter. The inns were popular with the drovers and stagecoaches; there are still many inns and pubs in Upper Street and Essex Road today. It was an area where Dick Turpin used to ply his trade and then use the back lanes of Holloway and Islington as a means of escape. In Upper Holloway the well-known coaching inn 'The Crown' marks the site of an old house where Oliver Cromwell supposedly stayed.

One of the oldest surviving buildings in Islington is Canonbury Tower, built sometime between 1509 and 1532. In 1253 Ralph de Berners granted the lands and rents to the Canons of St Bartholomew's Priory; it was excellent dairy land and not far from their priory. But it was not until William Bolton, Henry VIII's Master of Works for the chapel in Westminster Abbey, became the Prior that the land was built on. He decided to build himself a mansion with a tower to take advantage of the view. Two properties nearby at no. 6 Canonbury Place and no. 4 Alwyne Villas still display Bolton's Rebus of a bolt (arrow) passing through a tun (barrel). The work was completed in the same year as Bolton's death, 1532.

In 1535 Thomas Cromwell took up residence at Canonbury Tower and from this location organised the dissolution of the monasteries and their transfer into royal ownership. In 1539 on the completion of the dissolution, Henry VIII gave the Canonbury Manor to Cromwell, presumably as a thank you for the £900,000 a year Henry had made out of the transfers. Sadly Cromwell was only to live there another year, for he was executed on trumped up charges of treason in 1540. Henry then used money from the Manor to pay Anne of Cleves's divorce settlement.

In 1547 it was given to John Dudley, Earl of Warwick by Edward VI. Dudley later became Earl of Northumberland and, after successfully overthrowing Somerset, he virtually ruled due to Edward's ill health. He persuaded the king to name his cousin, Lady Jane Grey, as his successor; the fact that she had been married off to Dudley's fourth son was important to Dudley's plans. He was executed in 1553 and the following year his son and daughter-in-law joined him.

In 1594 it became the property of Sir John Spencer, Lord Mayor of London, and later passed to his son-in-law, the Earl of Northampton. The Northamptons have leased the property out for various uses including rented accommodation; Sir Francis Bacon, Arthur Onslow (Speaker of House of Commons), Oliver Goldsmith and Washington Irving have all lived there. In 1952 it became the residence of the Tavistock Repertory Company and is now known as the Tower Theatre.

Sir Hugh Myddelton, a Welsh goldsmith and philanthropist, was responsible for bringing London its first clean water supplies. The four thousand members of the Company of Water-Tankard Bearers protested against the scheme, fearing it would put them out of business. Nevertheless, the scheme went ahead in 1609. Myddelton together with twenty-eight merchant adventurers built a canal from the Hertfordshire rivers of Chadwell and Amwell, forty miles to the New River Head reservoir at Amwell Street in Clerkenwell.

The project bankrupted Myddelton and as the canal passed through the grounds of Theobalds Palace, James I helped him by paying for half and in return received half of the profits. It was completed in 1613. The second phase of the scheme was to distribute the water from the Islington reservoir to the households in the City. Hollowed out elm trunks were used with a life expectancy of between four and seven years; therefore the project needed high maintenance. There was no water pressure and the supply was inconsistent so only ground floor premises were supplied at a quarterly rental of 5s or 6/8d. There was a concern about the freshness of the water; customers and profits were slow to materialise. In 1631 Charles I sold his shares in despair. Eventually after improvements, such as a windmill to pump water from the reservoir and replacing the elm trunks with iron, it proved to be a success.

The New River Company later became part of the Metropolitan Water Board and it was not until 1990 that the New River stopped supplying North London and was replaced by deep mains. The river flowed down the centre of the present day Petherton Road; in 1946 the supply was terminated at Stoke Newington and Petherton Road was filled in and in more recent years grassed over. Part of the New River can still be seen off Canonbury Road and it is now an ornamental walk.

Islington has been famous for its springs and spas. Thomas Sadler's well was advertised by building a 'Musick house' in 1683. After a series of theatres and music halls were created on the site, eventually Lilian Baylis raised funds and commissioned a theatre in 1931 which became famous for creating the Royal Ballet and the Royal Opera Company.

The Charterhouse Monastery used the spring at Clerkenwell and later in 1641 it was enclosed with an arched structure of flint and brick known as White Conduit. It was much later, in 1730, that a pleasure gardens and tearooms opened called the White Conduit; this resort was patronised by the genteel together with their servants into the 1820s. It provided entertainment such as balloon flights, fireworks, singing and dancing. It had a cricket ground where Thomas Lord, of Lord's cricket ground fame,

was groundsman. This was why during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Islington was considered an invigorating pleasure resort.

During the civil war in 1643 the Common Council passed an act for the defence of the City; this was to take the form of a line of redoubts and fortifications. In reality the fortifications were simply small redoubts and bastions at certain fixed points. At Islington's windmill a battery and breastwork and at the Pound a small redoubt were positioned.

During the Great Plague and fire Islington again played its part as a safe haven for those in peril. John Evelyn writes in his diary on 7 September 1666 about visiting the City and seeing the damage caused by the fire. He goes on to say:

I then went towards Islington and Highgate, where one might have seen 200,000 people of all ranks and degrees dispersed, and lying along by their heaps of what they could save from the fire, deploring their loss; and, though ready to perish for hunger and destitution, yet not asking one penny for relief, which to me appeared a stranger sight than any I had yet beheld...

The extent of the damage and the plight of the people obviously moved him and on 13 September 1666 he presented Charles II with a survey of the ruins and a scheme for the re-building of the City.

Islington has become an important location over the centuries for writers, religious and political dissenters and refugees. Thomas Paine lodged at the Angel Inn and wrote *Rights of Man* while living in Clerkenwell. Mazzini, Garibaldi, Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin all lived and worked in the area.

Bunhill Fields were first used as the dissenters' burial ground in 1665 and by the time it closed in 1852 it had received over 12,000 bodies. Several famous people are buried there - Daniel Defoe, William Blake, John Bunyan, Susannah Wesley mother of Samuel, John and Charles Wesley, as well as some of Oliver Cromwell's descendants.

Bunhill Row, which was originally Artillery Walk, was where John Milton finished *Paradise Regained*; he lived there from 1663 until his death in 1674 and is buried in St Giles Cripplegate beside his father.

In May 1654 Peter Vowell, a schoolmaster from Islington, was arrested for his part in Henshaw and Gerard's scheme to assassinate Oliver Cromwell. Vowell was supposedly to provide arms and help seize the troopers' horses while they grazed in Islington fields. Luckily the Council received

intelligence of the plot and arrests were made. After questioning and in-depth inquiries three of those arrested were selected for trial. On 30 June they were found guilty of treason and on 10 July Gerard was beheaded at the Tower and Vowell hanged at Charing Cross. Fox was transported to Barbados the following year as he confessed. The investigation of the plot led to the Catholics being blamed and hostility towards France. An angry Cromwell ordered Baas to leave the country for his alleged part in stirring up trouble to incite a rebellion and assassination.

Newington Green has had quite a chequered history. During the fifteenth century there were prosperous Londoners owning copyhold property (land tenure where the owner had a copy of the record entered in the manorial role). In the sixteenth century Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland (Ann Boleyn's boyfriend before she married Henry VIII) had a house on the north side of the Green (which is now part of Stoke Newington). This was Brook House but known as the Bishop's Palace up until the eighteenth century when it was tenements for the poor. This property together with a house on the south side were used by Henry VIII as a resort for hunting wild boars, stags and wild bulls which were plentiful in the surrounding forest. Today there are several streets near here with names such as King Henry's Walk, Boleyn Road (formally Ann Boleyn's Walk) and Queen Elizabeth's Walk.

Sir Henry Mildmay served as MP for Maldon in Essex during the Short and Long Parliaments and was Master of the Jewel House for Charles I. His grandfather, Sir Walter Mildmay, had been Chancellor of the Exchequer for Elizabeth I and founder of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where Henry had been educated. Henry married Ann Haliday, daughter and heiress of Alderman William Haliday, who had a house and forty-four acres of land on the south side of Newington Green. Mildmay served as a member of the Council of State from 1649 until 1652 and was Revenue Commissioner from 1645 until 1652. In 1648 he took part in the trial of Captain Burley, and in 1649 he was one of the judges at the trial of Charles I, but he declined to sign the death warrant. He was one of the Councillors responsible for the inventory and appraisal of the personal effects of the King, Queen and the Prince of Wales. His brother, Anthony Mildmay, Gentleman Usher and Carver to the King, conveyed the body of Charles I to Windsor and was responsible for Henry, Duke of Gloucester and Princess Elizabeth at Carisbrooke while they awaited their departure abroad. In 1661, on the anniversary of Charles I's execution, Sir Henry Mildmay together with Munson and Wallop were transported to Tyburn on sledges as a humiliation. As they had been spared under the Act of Indemnity, they were then taken back to the Tower and confined there;

Mildmay died in 1664. There are now several thoroughfares on the site of Haliday's property named after Mildmay.

Newington Green became the home of non-conformists during the seventeenth century and the centre for non-conformist education. One of these academies, Charles Morton's, educated Daniel Defoe and Samuel Wesley. Samuel Wesley was the father of Samuel, John and Charles Wesley and son-in-law of Dr Samuel Annesley, vicar of St Giles Cripplegate. He had been appointed to the living by Lord Protector Richard Cromwell, but had to leave the living in 1662 because of the Act of Uniformity.

On 11 April 1691 Mary Cromwell, great grand-daughter of Oliver Cromwell, was born at Newington Green; she died unmarried in 1731 and is buried in Bunhill Fields.

In 1708 the Unitarian chapel was built on the north side of the Green and was later enlarged in 1860. It had some very prominent members and ministers, including Minister Godwin, philosopher and political economist, whose wife, Mary Wollstonecraft, was a feminist writer who ran a girls school there. Their daughter was Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, the writer of *Frankenstein*. In 1839 Thomas Cromwell became Minister and served until 1864; he was a descendant of Oliver Cromwell. Before becoming a Minister he had worked in the literary department at Longmans the publishers. He was a writer and among his works are 'Walks Through Islington' (1835), a play which was produced twice at Drury Lane, and *Oliver Cromwell and his Times* which ran to eight volumes (1821, 2nd edition 1822).

The oldest terrace in London is situated at numbers 52-55 Newington Green. It dates from 1658; this date is cut into the brickwork of number 54. It is amazing that it has survived considering the amount of V2 devastation in the area during World War II. At some point in their history, these terraced properties were converted to shops and in recent years English Heritage has advised on the work to transform numbers 53-55 back as houses. The leases were sold and they now are private residences again. Sadly number 52 is in a very poor state and trading as a shoe repair shop.

Jane Mills, MISM, was brought up in Islington (her parents still live there), though she notes that researching this paper has greatly increased her knowledge of the area. A member of The Cromwell Association and its council, she has been a regular contributor to *Cromwelliana*, *English Civil War Notes & Queries* and other historical journals.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PUBLICATIONS

I. BOOKS.

- J Adair, *Puritans. Religion and Politics in Seventeenth Century England and America* (Sutton, 1998).
- M Atkin, *Cromwell's Crowning Mercy. The Battle of Worcester, 1651* (Sutton, 1998).
- S Barber, *Regicide and Republicanism. Politics and Ethics in the English Revolution* (Edinburgh UP, 1998).
- P Beal, *In Praise of Scribes. Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth Century Britain* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- M Bennett, *The Civil Wars, 1637-53* (Sutton, 1998).
- J Besse, *Sufferings of Early Quakers. Yorkshire 1652-90* (reissued, Sessions Press, 1998).
- L Brace, *The Idea of Property in Seventeenth Century England* (Manchester UP, 1998).
- A Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility. Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- A H Burne & P Young, *The Great Civil War. A Military History* (reissued, Windrush Press, 1998).
- N Carlin, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Blackwell, 1998).
- I Carrier, *James VI and I* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- J T Cliffe, *The World of the Country House in Seventeenth Century England* (Yale UP, 1999).
- P Collinson & J Craig (eds), *Reformation in English Towns, 1500-1640* (Macmillan, 1998).
- J Cooper, *Oliver the First. Contemporary Images of Oliver Cromwell* (National Portrait Gallery, 1999).
- P Davidson (ed), *Poetry and Revolution* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- D G Disbury, *Beef, Bacon and Bag Pudding. Old Berkshire in the Civil War* (Timescape, 1998).
- G P de Divitiis, *English Merchants in Seventeenth Century Italy* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- P Earle, *Sailors. English Merchant Seamen, 1650-1775* (Methuen, 1998).
- G Edwards, *The Last Days of Charles I* (Sutton, 1999).
- L A Ferrell, *Government by Polemic. James I, the King's Preachers and the Rhetoric of Conformity, 1603-25* (Stanford UP, 1998).
- A Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (Yale UP, 1999).
- C Galley, *Demography of Early Modern Towns. York in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Liverpool UP, 1998).

- I Gentles, J Morrill & B Worden (eds), *Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- D Goffman, *Britons in the Ottoman Empire, 1642-60* (Washington UP, 1998).
- N Goose & J Cooper, *Tudor and Stuart Colchester* (I Henry, 1998).
- P Gouk, *Music, Science and Natural Magic in Seventeenth Century England* (Yale UP, 1999).
- S Griffin, *Aylesbury in the English Civil War* (Stuart Press, 1998).
- R Hainsworth & C Churches, *The Anglo-Dutch Naval Wars, 1652-74* (Sutton, 1998).
- P D Halliday, *Dismembering the Body Politic. Partisan Politics in England's Towns, 1650-1730* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- T Healy (ed), *Andrew Marvell* (Longman, 1998).
- D Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603-60. Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth* (Arnold, 1999).
- P Holbrook (ed), *Politics of the Stuart Court Masque* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- P Hooper, 'Our Island' in *War and Commonwealth. The Isle of Wight 1640-60* (Cross Publishing, 1998).
- R Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion and the Family in England, 1480-1750* (Clarendon, 1998).
- S Howard, *The Politics of Courtly Dancing in Early Modern England* (Massachusetts UP, 1998).
- A Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (2nd edn, Macmillan, 1998).
- R F Hunnisett (ed), *Sussex Coroners' Inquests, 1603-88* (PRO, 1998).
- M Hunter (ed), *Archives of the Scientific Revolution. The Formation and Exchange of Ideas in Seventeenth Century Europe* (Boydell, 1998).
- H M Jewell, *Education in Early Modern England* (Macmillan, 1998).
- J G Jones, *The Welsh Gentry, 1536-1640* (Wales UP, 1998).
- K Lindley, *The English Civil War and Revolution: A Sourcebook* (Routledge, 1998).
- R Lockyer, *The Early Stuarts. A Political History of England, 1603-42* (2nd edn, Longman, 1998).
- R Lockyer, *James VI and I* (Longman, 1998).
- J Lynch, *For King and Parliament. Bristol and the Civil War* (Sutton, 1999).
- J McCavill, *Sir Arthur Chichester, Lord Deputy of Ireland 1605-16* (Queens UP, 1998).
- A R MacDonald, *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625* (Ashgate, 1998).
- A MacFarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England* (2nd edn, Routledge, 1999).
- J Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- M Matchinske, *Writing, Gender and the State in Early Modern England* (Cambridge UP, 1998).

- J Morrill, *Revolt in the Provinces. The People of England and the Tragedies of War, 1630-48* (Longman, 1998).
- C Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation. The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Macmillan, 1998).
- P R Newman, *Atlas of the English Civil War* (reissued, Routledge, 1998).
- D Newton, *Papists, Protestants and Puritans, 1559-1714* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- A D Nicholls, *Jacobean Union. A Reconsideration of British Civil Policies under the Early Stuarts* (Greenwood Press, 1998).
- D Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- J H Ohlmeyer & J P Kenyon (eds), *The Civil Wars. A Military History of England, Scotland and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- D Oldridge, *Religion and Society in Early Stuart England* (Scolar Press, 1998).
- R B Partridge, 'O Horrible Murder'. *The Trial, Execution and Burial of Charles I* (Rubicon, 1998).
- R C Paterson, *Lands Afflicted. Scotland and the Covenanter Wars 1638-90* (J Donald, 1998).
- M Pelling, *The Common Lot. Sickness, Medical Occupation and the Urban Poor in Early Modern England* (Longman, 1998).
- R Poole, *Time's Alteration. Calendar Reform in Early Modern England* (University College London Press, 1998).
- T K Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman. Sir Edwin Sandys* (Princeton UP, 1998).
- J Raymond, *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* (Frank Cass, 1999).
- S Reid, *All the King's Armies. A Military History of the English Civil War, 1642-51* (Spellmount, 1998).
- T Reilly, *Cromwell. An Honourable Enemy* (Brandon, 1999).
- R G Rice (ed), *West Sussex Protestation Returns, 1641-2* (Sussex Record Society, 1998).
- R C Richardson (ed), *Debate on the English Revolution* (3rd edn, Manchester UP, 1998).
- J Roberts & J Marsden, *The King's Head. Charles I, King and Martyr* (Royal Collection, 1999).
- J L Roberts, *Feuds, Forays and Rebellions. A History of the Highland Clans, 1475-1625* (Edinburgh UP, 1999).
- I Roots (ed), 'Into Another Mould'. *Aspects of the Interregnum* (Exeter UP, 1998).
- I Sellers, *Early Modern Warrington, 1520-1847* (E Mellen Press, 1998).
- J A Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750* (2nd edn, Longman, 1998).
- L M E Shaw, *The Anglo-Portuguese Alliance and the English Merchants of Portugal 1654-1810* (Ashgate, 1998).

- A Shifflett, *Stoicism, Politics and Literature in the Age of Milton* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- M O Siochru, *Confederate Ireland, 1642-49* (Four Courts, 1999).
- R Slack, *Man at War. John Gell in his Troubled Times* (R Slack, 1997).
- D L Smith, *The Stuart Parliaments, 1603-89* (Arnold, 1998).
- S Snyder, *Pastrol Process. Spenser, Marvell, Milton* (Stanford UP, 1998).
- L Spring, *Regiments of the Eastern Association* (2 vols, Stuart Press, 1998).
- J Spurr, *English Puritanism* (Macmillan, 1998).
- R Tittler, *Reformation and the Towns in England. Politics and Political Culture, c1540-1640* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- V Treadwell, *Buckingham and Ireland, 1616-28* (Four Courts, 1998).
- D Webb, *The Battle of St Fagans, 1648* (Stuart Press, 1998).
- M Wiggins, *Four Jacobean Sex Tragedies* (Oxford UP, 1998).
- S Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
- P Zagorin, *The English Revolution: Politics, Events, Ideas* (Valorium, 1998).

II. ARTICLES.

- anon, 'Glenochar', *Current Archaeology* 156 (March 1998).
- J Adamson, 'The English context of the British Civil Wars', *History Today* 48 (November 1998).
- M Airs & J Broad, 'The management of rural building in seventeenth century Buckinghamshire', *Vernacular Architecture* 29 (1998).
- G E Aylmer, 'Slavery under Charles II: the Mediterranean and Tangier', *English Historical Review* 114 (1999).
- M Bennett, S Jennings & M Whyld, 'Two military account books for the civil war in Nottinghamshire', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 100 (1996).
- M Bennett, 'Damnified villagers: taxation in Wales during the first civil war', *Welsh History Review* 19 (1998).
- C M K Bowden, 'The Abbess and Mrs Brown: Lady Mary Knatchbull and royalist politics in Flanders in the late 1650s', *Recusant History* 24 (1998-9).
- M G Brennan, 'The Book of Hours of the Bradyll family of Whalley Abbey', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* 146 (1997).
- A Brown, '"Truth is a thing desirable": propaganda and Nottinghamshire during the English civil war', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 100 (1996).
- V Burke, 'Women and early seventeenth century manuscript culture: four miscellanies', *The Seventeenth Century* 12 (1997).

- B Capp, 'The double standard revisited: plebeian women and male sexual reputation in early modern England', *Past & Present* 162 (February 1999).
- C Churches, 'False friends, spiteful enemies: a community at law in early modern England', *Historical Research* 71 (1998).
- R Cust, 'Catholicism, antiquarianism and gentry honour: the writings of Sir Thomas Shirley', *Midland History* 23 (1998).
- H de Quehen, 'Politics and scholarship in the Ignatian controversy', *The Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998).
- K de Vries, 'Gunpowder weaponry and the rise of the early modern state', *War in History* 5 (1998).
- J R Dickinson & J A Sharpe, 'Courts, crime and litigation in the Isle of Man, 1580-1700', *Historical Research* 72 (1999).
- D R Dickson, 'The alchemical wife: the identity of Thomas Vaughan's "Rebecca"', *The Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998).
- C S Eglhoff, 'The search for a Cromwellian settlement: exclusion from the Second Protectorate Parliament. Part I: the process and its architects', *Parliamentary History* 17 (1998).
- C S Eglhoff, 'The search for a Cromwellian settlement: exclusion from the Second Protectorate Parliament. Part II: the excluded members and the reactions to the exclusion', *Parliamentary History* 17 (1998).
- D Farr, 'Oliver Cromwell and a 1647 case in Chancery', *Historical Research* 71 (1998).
- N R R Fisher, 'Colonel Edward Cooke of Highnam (c1622-84) and Henry Somerset, First Duke of Beaufort: client and patron', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 115 (1997).
- A Fitzmaurice, 'The civic solution to the crisis of English colonization, 1609-25', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1999).
- M Gaskill, 'The Devil in the shape of a man: witchcraft, conflict and belief in Jacobean England', *Historical Research* 71 (1998).
- M Gibson, 'Devilish sin and desperate deaths: Northamptonshire witches in print and manuscript', *Northamptonshire Past & Present* 51 (1998).
- C D Gilbert, 'Magistracy and ministry in Cromwellian England: the case of King's Norton, Worcestershire', *Midland History* 23 (1998).
- C D Gilbert, 'The Worcestershire Clubmen of 1645', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society* 3rd series 15 (1996).
- J Goodare, 'Women and the witch-hunt in Scotland', *Social History* 23 (1998).
- R Grassby, 'Love, property and kinship: the courtship of Philip Williams, Levant merchant, 1617-50', *English Historical Review* 113 (1998).
- A Green, 'Tudhoe Hall and Byers Green Hall, Co Durham: seventeenth and early eighteenth century social change in houses', *Vernacular Architecture* 29 (1998).

- E Griffiths, 'Sir Henry Hobart: a new hero of Norfolk agriculture?', *Agricultural History Review* 46 (1998).
- P D Halliday, 'A clashing of jurisdictions': commissions of association in Restoration corporations', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- B A Hanawalt, 'Good governance' in the medieval and early modern context', *Journal of British Studies* 37 (1998).
- A S Hankinson, 'Dr John Collinges of Norwich, 1623-90', *Norfolk Archaeology* 42 (1997).
- D Harley, 'James Hart of Northampton and the Calvinist critique of priest-physicians: an unpublished polemic of the early 1620s', *Medical History* 42 (1998).
- R H Helmholz, 'Harbouring sexual offenders: ecclesiastical courts and controlling misbehaviour', *Journal of British Studies* 37 (1998).
- S Hindle, 'The problem of pauper marriage in seventeenth century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6th series 8 (1998).
- A Hunt, 'The Lord's supper in early modern England', *Past & Present* 161 (November 1998).
- R Hutton, 'Charles II's only battle', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society* 3rd series 15 (1996).
- S Kelsey, 'The trial of Charles I: a new perspective', *History Today* 49 (January 1999).
- J Kerrigan, 'Revenge tragedy revisited: politics, providence and drama, 1649-1683', *The Seventeenth Century* 12 (1997).
- M Kishlansky, 'Tyranny denied: Charles I, Attorney General Heath and the Five Knights Case', *The Historical Journal* 42 (1999).
- C R Kyle, 'Prince Charles in the parliaments of 1621 and 1624', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- P Lake, 'Periodization, politics and "the social"', *Journal of British Studies* 37 (1998).
- H Langeluddecke, '"Patchy and spasmodic"?: the response of JPs to Charles I's Book of Orders', *English Historical Review* 113 (1998).
- J Lynch, 'Bristol shipping and royalist naval power during the English civil war', *The Mariner's Mirror* 84 (1998).
- P McCullough, 'Making dead men speak: Laudianism, print and the works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626-42', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- N McDowell, 'A Ranter reconsidered: Abiezer Coppe and civil war stereotypes', *The Seventeenth Century* 12 (1997).
- J L Malcolm, 'Doing no wrong: law, liberty and the constraint of kings', *Journal of British Studies* 38 (1999).
- T Marshall, 'The Tempest and the British imperium in 1611', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- T Marshall, '"That's the misery of peace": representations of martialism in the Jacobean public theatre, 1608-14', *The Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998).

- M Mason, 'Manchester in 1645: the effects and social consequences of plague', *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society* 94 (1998).
- A Milton, 'Licensing, censorship and religious orthodoxy in early Stuart England', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- J Morrill, 'Through a Venetian glass, darkly', *Parliamentary History* 17 (1998).
- R Munden, 'George More, 1553-1632, county governor, man of business and central government office-holder', *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 83 (1996).
- D Nuttall, 'Cheshire duck decoys', *Cheshire History* 38 (1998-99).
- J Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', *History Today* 48 (November 1998).
- A Parkin, 'Hobbism in the late 1660s: Daniel Scargill and Samuel Parker', *The Historical Journal* 42 (1999).
- E Parry, 'Charles I in South Wales, August-September 1645', *Brycheiniog* 29 (1996-7).
- J T Peacey, 'Seasonable treatises: a godly project of the 1630s', *English Historical Review* 113 (1998).
- A J Petford, 'Matthew Broadley's benefactions of 1648 and the origins of the grammar school at Hipperholme', *Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society* new series 6 (1998).
- F Pogson, 'Wentworth and the northern recusancy commission', *Recusant History* 24 (1998-9).
- F Pogson, 'Making and maintaining political allegiances during the Personal Rule of Charles I: Wentworth's associations with Laud and Cottington', *History* 84 (1999).
- S Porter, 'Order and disorder in the early modern almshouse: the Charterhouse example', *The London Journal* 23 (1998).
- C Powell, 'The papers of Edward Montagu, 1st Earl of Sandwich', *The Mariner's Mirror* 84 (1998).
- J Rattue, 'The downland parish: Gussage All Saints in the seventeenth century', *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Society* 119 (1997).
- J Raymond, 'John Streater and *The Grand Politick Informer*', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- M B Rowlands, '"Rome's Snaky Brood": Catholic yeomen, craftsmen and townsmen in the West Midlands, 1640-41', *Recusant History* 24 (1998-9).
- P Sanz, 'England and Spanish foreign policy during the 1640s', *European History Quarterly* 28 (1998).
- J Scott, 'The Kendal tenant right dispute, 1619-26', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 98 (1998).

- W J Sheils, 'Catholics and their neighbours in a rural community: Egton chapelry 1590-1780', *Northern History* 34 (1998).
- K Staniland, 'The king on the scaffold', *History Today* 49 (January 1999).
- D Stevenson, 'John Spalding's unknown fate', *Scottish Historical Review* 77 (1998).
- A B Thompson, 'Licensing the press: the career of G R Weckherlin during the Personal Rule of Charles I', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998).
- P Tomlinson, 'Dryden's *All for Love* and Jean Mairet's *Le Marc-Antoine ou la Cléopâtre*: parallels in a European dramatic tradition', *The Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998).
- D Turner, 'Roger L'Estrange's deferential politics in the public sphere', *The Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998).
- J Virgoe, 'The impact of the civil war on the common people of south-west Lancashire', *Lancashire Local Historian* 12 (1997).
- A Walsham, 'The parochial roots of Laudianism revisited: Catholics, anti-Calvinists and "Parish Anglicans" in early Stuart England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49 (1998).
- A White, 'Thomas Browne, William Wright and the Slingsby monuments at Knaresborough', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 69 (1997).
- F M Willmoth, 'Dugdale's *History of Imbanking and Drayning*: a "royalist" writer in the 1650s', *Historical Research* 71 (1998).
- J Wilson, 'The Countess's pillar, Westmorland', *History Today* 48 (July 1998).
- J Wilson, 'Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*: its purpose and political significance', *The Historian* 59 (autumn 1998).
- T Yoshinaka, '"Perhaps" in Marvell's "Bermudas"', *The Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998).

BOOK REVIEWS

Born in 1599, Oliver Cromwell was a Jacobean, open in his youth to the influences of both Elizabeth I - 'that lady of famous memory', he would later call her - and of her contrasting Scots successor. Relevant to the child that became the man are several additions to the notable 'Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History'. *Sermons at Court* by Peter McCullough (Cambridge UP, 1998, £35) tackles an important aspect of religion - preaching before the sovereign at the very heart of political and cultural power. Right up to date, the text is supplemented by 'a diskette containing a definitive calendar of court sermons'. All this and heaven, too. That religion played only a minor role in court life is shown to be a misconception. Rather, divines there made a signal contribution to 'the

greatest preaching age in England'. If in the later years of Elizabeth, texts and expositions pressed for the settled church polity adumbrated by Hookes and Whitgift, culminating in the orotund cadences of Lancelot Andrewes, James was inclined to forgo in mid-passage divine service in favour of meaty harangues - a practice that Laud ended immediately he became Dean of the Chapel Royal when Charles I took the throne. McCullough shows that the pulpit could steer the hearts and minds of people in high places as well as in the parish pews. Potentially dangerous, perhaps.

Over much the same period Julia Maltby explores the relations of *Prayer Book and People* (Cambridge UP, 1998, £40). She begins by quoting a somewhat quizzical contemporary view: 'this book is good at all assaies [on every occasion]; it is the only book in the world', regarded by some too lightly as even superior to the Bible itself. She argues that those who did conform to common prayer and whose conformity 'grew beyond mere obedience to princes' formed an attachment that grew into love. The content of the book made an impact just by its literary merit - which folk of many religious persuasions and of none could and can appreciate - but also because 'it provided a framework of words and actions to address a whole range of human needs while providing for the worship of God'. For some self-discipline is not enough. In 'a shared experience' across social, gender and age distinctions mouths could express both heart and soul. From a pursuit of what the book said and what was said about it, Maltby concludes with some conviction that the godly, lay and clerical, sadly underestimated the quality of the religious lives lived by many of their conforming neighbours. Familiarity with a text - a set prayer or whatever - need not breed empty routine devotion; rather, it may encourage a genuine commitment. Like stained glass, for some a barrier, for others the Book of Common Prayer was a vital link between the world and the spirit. Read George Herbert.

Julia Maltby brings women prominently into her evaluation of their times. Tom Stretton concentrates on another female activity, standing up for themselves, specifically *Waging Law in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge UP, 1998, £35), 'waging' here used in a popular sense of 'going to'. Married, widowed, single, women went on their own account, independently of men, to whom, of course, it is well-known they were legally inferior. Historians are now going beyond the letter, even the spirit, of law - and the imperatives of the behaviour manuals - to pick upon women refusing to be 'the passive victims' of the system, in business (as brewers, booksellers, money-lenders), in domestic economy and running estates (the civil wars would give them golden opportunities as husbands were away in arms), in writing and whatever. There were peculiarly female

spheres of activity, too - child-birth and rearing. Stretton's women, living in a litigious age, put themselves forward as plaintiffs or by no means supine defendants in various courts, notably those of equity, Chancery or Requests, often enough emerging victorious. Equity conveniently relaxed the enervating grip of the much vaunted common law. Conventionally weak but often strong in will and intelligence, women could glimpse possibilities for themselves. The initiative showed in 'the regiment' of their tough Queen can be found in the following century. Lady Fairfax, Mrs Monck and Mrs Richard Cromwell were no more than prime examples of females, none too feminine, identifying themselves in their male-dominated society.

'Cambridge Topics in History' are directed chiefly at students, but have much to offer the intelligent 'general reader'. Irene Carrier, *James VI and I. King of Great Britain* (Cambridge UP, 1998, £9.95 paperback) presents a thoughtful selection of sources, arranged topically, each with an introduction, accompanied with illustrations, all pointed towards feasible examination questions. James's physical and mental characteristics - the former curious in an actor of majesty - are sketched in. A 1652 commentator cites them as 'the fountain of all our late afflictions and miseries' - unlikely to convince revisionists. James's ambition is stressed - to create Great Britain, uniting two kingdoms through two crowns. As king of Ireland he could have brought in a triple diadem, or since the claim to France was not formally dropped until George III, a quadruple. It was left to Cromwell to force 'the kingdoms old/ Into another mould'. James's relations with parliaments bring out the significance of minor and private legislation for MPs - there were 105 introduced and lost in the Addled of 1614. (The second Protectorate Parliament was more successful in this area.) Finance, foreign policy and religion - James's upbringing, hardly a happy one, both brought him to Calvinism and repelled it. At the end we ask was he 'a bad thing'? Perhaps not. A susceptibility for pretty faces, feeding his 'eating canker of want' by feckless generosity, and wiping his nose on his sleeve did not mean he left his fastidious son an impossible legacy.

James comes out handsomely from W B Patterson's *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge UP, 1998, £40), which shows him working tirelessly not only for the union of a couple of kingdoms north-west of Continental Europe but as the advocate for bringing together protestants, papists and the orthodox into a genuine Christendom at peace with itself, a grandiose vision at a time of war, religious disputes and ethnic animosities. He wished to bring them all to 'meet in the middle which is the centre of perfection of all things'. James's combination of optimism and seriousness earned him the admiration of many European

intellectuals, who recognised in him one of their own, who visited and discussed with him. His call for an 'oecumenical council' fell flatter with those with spiritual and political power. Even a simple 'Great Britain' was too much for his English subjects. But Patterson shows him from start to finish dreaming his dream of reconciliation in religion. There is something admirable about this anointed oddity. In the middle of the Commonwealth, someone noted how he had 'lived in peace, died in peace, and left all his kingdoms in a peaceable condition'. That is true.

Another Cambridge series is providing a wealth of material on the early modern period. Alongside Hobbes's *Leviathan* we now find his *On the Citizen (De Cive)*, edited by R Tuck and M Silverthorne, who has made a fresh translation (Cambridge UP, 1998, £12.95 paperback). Predecessor to *Leviathan*, written before the civil war, circulated in manuscript from 1641 and printed in Amsterdam in 1647, *De Cive* covers much of the same ground and reveals similar attitudes. On the Continent it was for a couple of centuries more influential than what was quickly recognised in England as Hobbes's masterpiece, *Leviathan*, which was not translated into French until this century. Tuck points out that, though Hobbes took pride in being 'of Malmesbury', for most of his long life he lived in noble households or on the Continent, mingling with the rich and mighty, contemplating (at least their) 'human nature', planning ambitious works of philosophy and political theory, and observing 'physical force, experience, reason and passion', the lot! All this produced *De Cive* in which, as in *Leviathan*, Hobbes elaborates 'a state of nature' in which men are in conflict, each determined to defend his 'property and liberty' - as so often in historical discourse, siamese twins. Self-preservation calls for a sovereign to force citizens into an alignment one with the other. Hobbes assumes that we all really want to be citizens living in a stable environment. While Hobbes could envisage some limitations upon the sovereign, 'there was never any suggestion' that he might be 'under conventional constraints'. This made him a sort of royalist in 1641 before there were cavaliers and roundheads - though it would be hard to imagine this twin brother of fear taking to arms, anyway. As in *Leviathan*, he could envisage a non-monarchical sovereign, though monarchy might have fewer disadvantages. If *Leviathan* is the complete and powerful exposition of Hobbesianism, *De Cive* deserves close attention in its own right.

In the same series Andrew Sharpe has made a careful concise selection of documents setting out some of the ideas of *The English Levellers* (Cambridge UP, 1998, £13.95 paperback) as they expressed them in a variety of genres between 1645-49. In a succinct introduction the editor asserts that the Leveller 'movement' - the term is perhaps too precise: the Levellers were a mixed batch - was a direct product of 'the breakdown of

authority in the English church-state' - a somewhat dubious characterisation of the England of Charles I. Certainly by 1645-6 there were some recognisable individuals - John Lilburne, Richard Overton and William Walwyn - supporting each other in ways that suggest concerted action, in touch with 'the more radical London politicians' to defend an eclectic non-conformity against rigid presbyterian *mores*. Contacts with the rank and file followed when the New Model Army became politicised as its professional grievances proliferated. These developments are demonstrated in the texts, mostly familiar, though number 1, extracted from John Lilburne's 'On the 150th Page' (August 1645) is fresh. Lilburne was, it is true, a stentorian egoist but his vigour and vividness could support a substantial selection of his writings on the lines of the McMichael and Taft *Works of William Walwyn* (1989). Sharpe offers a clear account of the rise and fall of the Levellers, expounding their reforming ideas and identifying the sort of interests to which they may have appealed. 'No historian has really believed that [they] ever stood a chance of success' - yet they have been discussed as if they were 'in a way victorious', as anticipating later developments, liberal, radical, democratic. This seems true enough and justifies our concern for them. 'They exemplify the difficulty of being democrats in impossible circumstances.' Ephemeral though the Levellers were, they effectively demonstrated the potential of print, associated with the spoken word, and backed with organised action. Today no doubt Walwyn, Overton and Lilburne would each of them have a web site.

In 1642 the London theatres were closed, it is commonly asserted, 'by the Puritans' - a diverse lot, actually. In 1660 they opened up again. In between there was, it seems, a dramatic desert. Susan Wiseman in *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge UP, 1998, £35) depicts something different. She points out that the ordinance banning stage plays (*inter alia*) during 'this time of public calamities' - the coming of civil war - offers suggestion of something temporary. In the event, because of the troubles and righteous attitudinising, it became part of a permanent moral campaign. Even so, acting, 'playing', went on informally, even formally, throughout the 1640s and during the 1650s there were plenty of performances, including the beginning of English opera. Wiseman suggests that the effect of the decades between 1620 and 1660 was to make drama self-consciously politicised. *Pace* revisionists, she sees a potentiality for serious political comment before the civil war, with plays alongside tracts, petitions, libels, broadsheets - some of them in dramatic form - putting politics into 'culture'. Drama was never monolithically royalist and aristocratic, but could respond to the nuances of popular opinion. This continued into the war, with print taking the place of performances. But not of all. She brings evidence of shows, tragi-comedies, plays - all manner

of dramatic genres - inhibited perhaps by the closures but not entirely suppressed. The funerals of Essex, Lockyer and Rainborough were spectacles, theatre in the round. The Putney Debates, a happening then, have become a drama today. The trial and execution of Charles I was recognised at once by Andrew Marvell as a splendid piece of political theatre. Even the Quaker James Naylor thought it apt to re-enact at Bristol the entry of Christ into Jerusalem. Too many oases for a desert.

Keith Lindley's documentary collection covers a broader spectrum - *The English Civil War and Revolution: A Source Book* (Routledge, 1998, £12.99 paperback). Here again the familiar mingles with the lesser known (including at least one item from unpublished manuscripts) and there are appropriate pictorial embellishments. The substantial introduction offers a clear account of twentieth century historiography now drawing to a close in the spate of anniversaries of 1999. Lindley stresses consensus across the country on the eve of conflict. Yet is has been not only the revisionists who have reflected on the notion of civil war as *inevitable*, both in the British and Irish situations. All historians of this intractable period - the complexity of which is well brought out in Lindley's thoughtful selection - should think it possible they themselves might be mistaken, as certainly their 'opponents' must be. Lindley is particularly stimulating in arranging his material to work towards answering a succession of large questions - e.g. why did Charles I's government collapse in his three kingdoms? what determined allegiance in 1642 and beyond? (not the same question as the perennially fascinating - or is it perhaps becoming a bore? - what were the causes of the civil war?) He goes back to ask why did the revolution, whatever it was, take the form (or forms) historians think it does? We end with the Diggers, which in this year of 350th anniversaries seems appropriate enough. But just as it is unhelpful to snap the backbone of the seventeenth century at 1660, so it seems desirable to go beyond 1649 to take in the after-comment on the 1640s that the 1650s make so plangently. There is a wealth of material for it. If Lindley has a volume two in production, it will be welcomed.

The Royal Historical Society's 'Studies in History' - now taken over by Boydell and Brewer - like the Cambridge series draws on doctoral theses, transmogrified, some more convincingly than others, into 'real' books. A R Warmington's *Civil War, Interregnum and Restoration in Gloucestershire, 1640-1672* (1997, £35) is on the whole successful. Taking for its field a vital shire, it naturally enough begins with a justification for its arena now that, along with many other sorts of revisionism, the move away from the notion of county communities as cohesive entities seems almost complete. Recent work tends to concentrate on divided allegiances within areas where willy nilly local disputes get caught up in regional and national

developments. Here Gloucestershire is shown as typical or as atypical as any other county, reflecting if only in a cracked and spotted mirror the national picture. 'If there ever was such a thing as a county community in Gloucestershire, it was not in 1640 but in the 1670s.' Herein lies much of the value of this book - its narrative through civil wars, interregnum and Restoration with particular reference to the relationships of local and successive central governments. Throughout there is little that Warrington misses - popular culture is there along with economies, urban and rural. A page or two on the regime of the Major-Generals reinforces the view that it was 'very different from the centralising military dictatorships of traditional belief'. *D'accord*.

Sutton Publishing have added two well-illustrated and appealing volumes to their informal series on civil war and interregnum localities. Malcolm Atkin's *Cromwell's Crowning Mercy: The Battle of Worcester, 1651* (1998, £19.99) sees the city as 'the alpha and omega' of those years, scene of an early skirmish to the culmination of three civil wars in the defeat there of the King of Scots in 1651. The author, the county archaeology officer, brings his close knowledge of the landscape and topography into a brief survey of what happened in a 'moderate and conservative' area, 'fearful of change brought about by either extreme', neutral as war clouds gathered, then 'wearily' paying out to the royalist garrison or the parliamentary raiders, sometimes both. But the book is emphatically a study of Worcester in 1651, the choice of the aspirant Charles Stuart in toils for a fierce engagement which turned out to be for Cromwell 'the crowning mercy' which clinched him as 'our chief of men', in Milton's eyes for a while at least. What was important to the citizens was the insidious impact of successive wars and the unwelcome armies on their lives over a decade of disruption. Somehow Worcester, as other urban and rural areas, survived. Atkin offers a vivid and moving account of it all. He admires Cromwell's strategy, his confidence in himself and his men's confidence in him. 3 September was for him a lucky day, indeed, presaging the stability he sought when a military could give way to a civilian sword. As Protector he went a long way to providing it, but his task unfinished, seven years on, the day let him down, opening a way to a situation out of which someone else's crowning mercy emerged.

For King and Parliament (1999, £25) by John Lynch is a work of similar quality. It takes us back to the 1640s and to a larger, more emphatically involved city: Bristol. Derived from a Ruskin College dissertation, enlarged and deepened, it brings out Bristol's critical strategic importance in the west and, indeed, in the whole national conflict. Initially under parliamentary control, not welcomed by all Bristolians - there was a foiled royalist plot in 1643 - it fell to the royalists under Rupert later in 1643,

after a siege which brought out 'a mixture of courage, incompetence, cowardice and confusion' on both sides. That raised the king's hopes across the whole country, marking the peak of his forces' successes. Bristol was, after all, an administrative, commercial, manufacturing and military centre, almost a second capital. But 1645 saw advantage moving towards parliament as the north was lost and the New Model Army (and the politics associated with its formation) led to victory at Naseby. Bristol therefore became more vital to both sides. When to the king's anger and distress Rupert surrendered to Fairfax, amid cries of treachery, the New Model was free to mount and win the last campaign - in the south-west, to which Bristol was the key.

Sutton could not let the 350th anniversary of the trial and execution of Charles I go by uncommemorated. Graham Edwards's *The Last Days of Charles I* (£19.99) portrays the hard road to the 'martyrdom' - for the monarchy, for the people, for the Church of England. Condemned as 'that man of blood', Charles found immortal longings in his finest hour, memorably depicted in Marvell's ambiguous 'Horatian Ode'. Cromwell, of course, comes frequently into the story, but Edwards is not disposed to overplay his role. There was more to this great set piece of English history than the spleen of an overweeningly ambitious soldier-politician and the evidence cannot support the charge of a marvellously intricate net woven to trap the king. The regicides - all manner of men - were not Oliver's creatures, as their words and behaviour when some of them in turn came to their own execution, a more terrible one, demonstrate. The pragmatism of Cromwell's approach to life impresses Edwards, who sees not a detailed blue print for his future, not even a sketch scrawled on the back of an envelope. As for Charles, his fault surely lay not in his stars but in himself.

Austin Woolrych, long a member of the Association and a major contributor to our understanding of the 1640s and 1650s, has been honoured on his eightieth birthday with a splendid festschrift, edited by an admiring trio, Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden. The articles in *Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution* (Oxford UP, 1998, £30), like the title itself, reflect Austin's abiding interests, pursued in ground-breaking works on the Army Council, 'Barebones', Milton and Oliver himself. An appreciation by Lesley le Claire, custodian of the Clarke Papers, which Austin has so profitably and pleasurably explored, comments on the historian's 'sane voice, calmly and courteously avoiding the various brands of determinism', and notes that he has himself been a soldier, a statesman (within university politics, an arcane area) and always a writer of elegant prose. Among fourteen articles, by friends and former pupils (who are friends, too), attention may be particularly drawn to John Sutton's on the commissioners assistant to Cromwell's Major-Generals - a

Staffordshire case-study. He finds them, not unexpectedly, a much more homogeneous lot than their overseers. Blair Worden unfolds Milton's subtle changing of his estimate of Cromwell - less and less favourable. J C Davis brings Hobbes and Harrington together. But the volume is a cornucopia, rich not least in its impressive bibliography of A H Woolrych and its characteristic photo-portrait, the eyes sharp with intelligence and experience.

Tom Reilly is a rarity - an Irishman in The Cromwell Association. He was born in Drogheda, a place name not unfamiliar to friend and foe alike of Oliver Cromwell, and for years has been working and publishing on its history. From tracing Drogheda's medieval walls he has come to a detailed study of what happened in 1649, in the invasion and conquest of Ireland, of which the siege of Drogheda was a focal point. Under the somewhat surprising title, *Cromwell: An Honourable Enemy* (Brandon, Dingle, Co Kerry, 1999, £17.99), he tells an 'untold story', a different story from the one which assigns to Oliver a place in Irish history as 'a bloodthirsty maniac and religious fanatic', as if once across the Irish Sea he felt he was loose and absolved from all humanity, allowing him to carry out ruthless and indiscriminate slaughter of ordinary and unarmed citizens among the troops of the garrisons that fell to him. Reilly's doubts about the truth of that charge were induced by examination of the sources alongside the historiography when he wrote in 1993 a short study of Cromwell at Drogheda. He has since been driven to try 'a modern objective analysis...from an Irish perspective', looking beyond 'traditional' accounts which, as it happens, date mostly from the nineteenth century and which were, he suggests, written to serve nineteenth century purposes. His main thrust is that Drogheda and Wexford were not isolated events but part of a complex war beginning in 1641, during which an estimated third of the population perished, of famine and disease as much as of massacres. (These last were nothing new - hark back to Francis Drake on Rathin Island.) Reilly's analysis of 1649 itself shows a Lord General, much experienced, fighting certainly a fierce campaign but doing it entirely on the bases of current military principles and practices - 'and it is to his enormous credit that he never once departed from those parameters'. Thus the citizens of Drogheda were not indiscriminately slaughtered and the fate of the garrison (royalist soldiers not townspeople) was the expected result of Ormonde's orders not to surrender. To ignore a summons to surrender on terms meant no quarter.

Reilly sees that siege as a military encounter between two essentially English factions in a struggle for power over and within the constituents of the Stuart inheritance. Wexford was different. It was a confederate town, a base for royalist privateers, and in its final defiance there were evidently

armed townsfolk alongside the troops. While admitting that it is more difficult to exonerate Cromwell there, Reilly faces up to the task. Pointing out the absence of eye-witness accounts, he surveys such evidence as there is indirect, *ad hoc*, blatantly partisan. He himself finds Oliver's 'treatment of ordinary people always honourable'. He offered terms to garrisons and generous ones were accepted at Ross. During the campaign he punished routine soldierly disorderliness. The Irish campaign must, he stresses, be judged in the context of long-standing English policies for Ireland. What was novel was that Cromwell was sent to defeat both the confederacy and the royalists in the service of the nascent and nervous Commonwealth at a time when he said himself he was crazy in his health. (Like many of his contemporaries, he lived on the edge of illness.) His task he set about with military precision. That was his way. Reilly is not starry-eyed about him - few Association members are - but he cannot see a monster or a hypocrite, rather a serious man who was both of his age and in some measure transcending it. The analysis justifies the final comment: 'there must now be reasonable doubt about [his] involvement in the deaths of ordinary unarmed people of Ireland'. No surprise that the book is causing controversy in Ireland. It will do so, too, over here if, as it should, it finds an English publisher. Nothing could be more apt in this year of the 400th anniversary of Cromwell's birth and the 350th of his Irish expedition.

Ivan Roots

In addition to this selection of recent books, reviewed in depth by Professor Roots, it may be useful more briefly to highlight a number of other works published over the past year which may be of interest to readers. The following are intended not as detailed and critical reviews but more as concise introductory sketches of a dozen or so of the most important or accessible works appearing over the last twelve months.

A trio of broad and wide-ranging overviews have been published during the opening months of 1999. One is entirely new, David L Smith's *The Stuart Parliaments 1603-89* (Arnold, £15.99 paperback). In large part a work of synthesis, though also drawing upon fresh research and primary sources, this is the first single-volume assessment of Stuart parliaments to have appeared since the mushrooming of research and publication, and with it the revisionist challenges to the pre-revisionist orthodoxies, of the last three decades. David Smith charts a safe course through these troubled waters, not surprisingly finding elements of both continuity and change in the seventeenth century. This is essentially a study of the English (and Welsh) parliament; the Irish and Scottish parliaments (1653-59 aside, separate institutions) receive only passing comment. This attractive and

thoughtful study is in two parts, the first thematic, exploring membership, attendance, structure, procedures, officers and functions, the second chronological, in three chapters assessing the parliaments of 1603-40, 1640-60 and 1660-89; a brief 'epilogue' surveys the parliaments of William III and Anne. There are detailed end-notes, a glossary, appendices of dates, Acts and officers and a bibliography of primary and secondary sources.

Derek Hirst's *England in Conflict 1603-60. Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth* (Arnold, £18.99 paperback) 'descends' from his 1986 study *Authority and Conflict. England 1603-58*. The relationship between the two is clear. Both are principally narrative histories of the early and mid seventeenth century which, after three broad, 'setting-the-scene' chapters, embark upon a chronological account of the period. Although the headings of these narrative chapters have often been reworded, the chronological divisions of the earlier work are largely retained. Two brief but new chapters have been added, on 'Taking Sides' in 1642 and on the period 1658-60, thus taking the coverage down to the Restoration. Throughout, the text has been extensively revised and rewritten to incorporate the mass of new research and writing of the intervening thirteen years - it is rare to find more than a few sentences of text unaltered and much of the writing is entirely new. Like its predecessor, this is essentially a study of England, but there is a far stronger coverage of Scotland and Ireland, a clearer recognition of England's position within a triple kingdom, especially in the chapter on 'Crisis in three kingdoms, 1638-42'. Although sources are not referenced, an informative 'bibliographical essay' is included.

The third broad study is also a revision of an earlier work, but in this case the title is unchanged, Roger Lockyer's *The Early Stuarts. A Political History of England, 1603-42* (Longman, £15.99 paperback). Unlike Hirst's narrative-based study, this is a thematic examination of the first four decades of Stuart rule in England. Accordingly, it is not the best starting point for a reader new to the seventeenth century; he or she should start with a narrative account, before tackling this more subtle study. Although the order of the chapters has been somewhat rearranged, the division of the material in the first edition of 1989 has been largely retained. A chapter on the economy of England has been dropped to make space for three new chapters looking at the Personal Rule of Charles I and (again reflecting the stronger 'British' perspective of the last few years) at Scotland and Ireland under James and Charles. A brief 'postscript' on the causes of the civil war has also been added. Again, the entire text has been reviewed and updated where necessary, though here the revisions have often been more selective - much of the text of the first edition has survived largely unaltered in the second edition. Direct quotations within the text are footnoted, there is an

appendix listing office-holders, an extensive and fully revised bibliography and six pages of maps.

Apart from the works reviewed in depth by Professor Roots above, there has been little new on James I or Charles I over the past year, though Roger Lockyer's crisp and thoughtful assessment of *James VI and I* in Longman's 'Profiles in Power' series (£11.99 paperback) should be mentioned. It complements rather than supersedes two other student-orientated short studies of the 1990s, namely Christopher Durston's *James I* (Routledge, 1993) and S J Houston's *James I* (2nd edn, Longman, 1995).

Of the three studies of the causes of the civil war published over the past year, two are revised editions of earlier works. R C Richardson, *Debate on the English Revolution* (Manchester UP, 1998) is the third edition of a work which first appeared in 1977 and was 'revisited' in 1988. As before, this is a work of historiography, charting the changing interpretations of the civil war which have been advanced over the last three and a half centuries. All the chapters have been revised and updated where necessary, but three completely new chapters have been added, looking at twentieth century interpretations which focus on 'social complexities', 'politics, political culture [and] revisionism', and 'reverberations'. It is a measure of how research, writing and theorising have all expanded in the (latter half of the) present century that while four chapters still suffice to survey the debate from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, a further seven chapters are now needed to explore the wide variety of explanations advanced during the twentieth century.

1998 also saw the publication of the second edition of Ann Hughes's *Causes of the English Civil War* (Macmillan, £11.99 paperback), a revised and updated version of a work which first appeared just seven years before. As Professor Hughes notes in her introduction, while the first edition was born out of the revisionist versus counter-revisionist conflict of the 1980s, the second edition may benefit from the somewhat calmer historiography of the 1990s. Some of the conflicts still hot when the first edition was written, such as disputes over the existence of the county community and the degree and importance of localism, have since cooled, while other, apparently less controversial, ideas have gained prominence, most notably the adoption of a British rather than an English perspective on the (causes of the) civil wars. Although the basic structure and division of material is little changed, and much of the text has required only light and limited revision, some rather larger alterations have been made, reflecting this stronger British approach of recent years and the clearer but more subtle perspective upon the various shades of revisionism and anti- or post-revisionism which the passage of time has allowed.

The third study is wholly new, Norah Carlin's *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Blackwell, 1999, £9.99 paperback). Having set the scene - 'The Problem of Causation' - the book opens with an examination of the short-term collapse into war during 1637-42, and then goes back to assess broader, longer-term causes in three substantial chapters focusing on religious, political and social and economic issues. The closing chapter reassesses three of the most enduring 'monocausal' explanations - that the war was caused by the deficiencies of Charles I, ideological conflict or social conflict. There is both a guide to further reading and a detailed bibliography, together with a brief glossary of terms. The book lucidly sets out the variety of interpretations which have been and are current, indicating many of their strengths and weaknesses. On the other hand, the author does not give a strong, clear lead on what she believes caused the war - there is no 'conclusion' to the book - and the reader is left to mull over the variety of interpretations related here.

Two essentially military histories of the civil war(s) have been published over the past year, Stuart Reid, *All the King's Armies. A Military History of the English Civil War* (Spellmount, 1998, £19.95), and J P Kenyon & J H Ohlmeyer (eds), *The Civil Wars. A Military History of England, Scotland and Ireland* (Oxford UP, 1998, £25). The first is a narrative-based account of the English (and Welsh) war, somewhat in the mould of the great military histories co-authored by Peter Young a generation ago. With the exception of Cromwell's campaign in Scotland in 1650-51, there is almost nothing here on the wars in Ireland and Scotland. The focus is on battles and campaigns, with chapters on 'The Western Front, 1642-3', 'Lostwithiel and II Newbury', 'Naseby Fight' and so on, and no less than three chapters devoted to the run up to and the battle of Marston Moor. The text draws upon secondary and readily accessible printed primary sources, especially the published memoirs and diaries of the participants; both unpublished documentary sources and the great Thomason collection of tracts, pamphlets and newspapers appear to have been used far more selectively. The text is supported by ten maps and ten black and white plates.

The second work, edited by Dr Jane Ohlmeyer who stepped in upon John Kenyon's sudden and untimely death in 1996, is a broader, deeper and more thematic study, which takes a British rather than an English approach. The first half of the book focuses on the military history of the wars, with separate chapters on the civil wars in Scotland, Ireland and England (in that order) and on the naval war. The second half looks more broadly at the nature, experience and impact of the wars, with chapters on sieges and fortifications, logistics and supply and civilians. These are sandwiched between an opening chapter on the background to the civil wars and a closing chapter 'Between War and Peace' which carries the story

from 1651 down to 1662. The extensive end-notes confirm that the ten contributors have drawn upon a wide range of primary source material, published and unpublished. The text is supported by ten maps, numerous black and white illustrations and a chronological table.

A third history of the civil wars, Martyn Bennett's *The Civil Wars, 1637-53* (Sutton, 1998, £5.99 paperback) is very different in style and approach. Appearing in Sutton's 'Pocket Histories' series, it aims to provide a very brief and inexpensive introduction to the subject. In just 100 pages of text, Dr Bennett covers sixteen dense and complex years, from 'The Scottish Revolution' down to 'Exporting the [English] Revolution'. There is a balanced coverage of Scotland, Ireland and England and Wales, in places giving separate accounts but making frequent cross-references and bringing out the 'British' inter-relations. Inevitably, it has proved impossible to cover everything in around 20,000 words. Some issues are discussed very briefly or skated over - for example, there is little here on the variety of explanations offered for the causes of the English civil war - and at times complex developments and issues are covered too concisely and needed fuller discussion. However, in the main this is a good, solid introduction. There is a chronological table, two maps, end-notes and a bibliography.

It is a pleasure to welcome back into print John Morrill's rich and subtle study of *Revolt in the Provinces. The People of England and the Tragedies of War 1630-48* (Longman, 1998, £12.99 paperback). This is a second edition of a work which first appeared in 1976 as *Revolt of the Provinces*. Most of the original text reappears here with only very minor amendments. Although the documentary appendix of the first edition has been sacrificed, in its stead we have two completely new chapters, both very valuable - an introductory chapter which places the book in its historical and historiographical context of the mid 1970s and the revisionist tide of those years, and an important concluding chapter, an 'exercise in scholarly auditing', which shows how research since the mid-1970s has shed further light on the topics covered here. Although there is no bibliography, there is a list of theses consulted, plus full and detailed footnotes and two maps.

A Cromwell Association member and resident of the Isle of Wight, Dr Paul Hooper, has written a very attractive new study of *'Our Island' in War and Commonwealth. The Isle of Wight 1640-60* (Cross Publishing, 1998, £13.00). In part narrative, in part thematic, Dr Hooper offers a fresh account of the history of the island in the mid seventeenth century. Several chapters relate key military developments - the island, in fact, had a fairly quiet war, for despite considerable pro-royalist elements it was secured for parliament without serious fighting at the beginning and remained in parliament's hands throughout. Perhaps even more interesting are the

thematic assessments, of island personalities, civic life in Newport, the survey and sale of 'Carisbrooke Parke', churches and clergy, parliamentary representation, the treatment of Sir John Oglander and so on. The text rests upon extensive archival research - indeed, one of the book's strengths is the inclusion, within the text or as appendices, of so much contemporary material, either in transcription or in its original form. The text is also supported by sixteen black and white illustrations and by further appendices of family trees, lists of commissioners and royal servants and so forth. Dr Hooper is to be warmly congratulated on such an attractive and interesting study. (Although copies can be ordered through bookshops in the usual way, they may be more easily obtained direct from the author, Dr Paul Hooper, Selborne, Pyle Shute, Chale, Isle of Wight, PO38 2LE, adding £1.90 to cover UK postage.)

Despite the quatercentenary, there has not been a flood of new books on Cromwell in 1998-99. Apart from the works by Tom Reilly and Malcolm Atkin (reviewed in detail by Professor Roots above), just two other studies require mention here. Ivan Roots (ed), *Into Another Mould. Aspects of the Interregnum* (2nd edn, Exeter UP, 1998, £12.99 paperback), is a greatly revised and expanded version of a work which first appeared in 1981, focusing upon the eleven years of the interregnum but in the process saying much about Oliver as head of the army and head of state. The three articles of the first edition - on 'Unity and Disunity in the British Isles', local government reform in England and Wales and the politics of the army - reappear here, but two completely new chapters - on Wales during the interregnum and on Cromwell's Protectorate parliaments - have been added. A new introduction and bibliography top and tail this collection. And last but by no means least, John Cooper, *Oliver the First. Contemporary Images of Oliver Cromwell* (National Portrait Gallery, 1999, £4.50 paperback) is a short but authoritative study of the contemporary paintings, engravings, coins, medals, seals and masks of Oliver. Updating and re-presenting the work on Cromwell's portraiture undertaken by the late Sir David Piper at the time of the tercentenary of Oliver's death, this pamphlet discusses twenty-four contemporary images of Oliver, all of which are reproduced in black and white or in colour. The high quality of Samuel Cooper's work shines through, a view supported by John Cooper. Many of us will share his interpretation of the Buccleuch miniature:

[it] stimulates intimate engagement with the unmasked Cromwell; its forceful simplicity, bereft of any prompting iconography, allows us to project onto it all that we have learned about this complex man since he was given back his voice by Carlyle's edition of his *Letters and Speeches* in 1845.

Peter Gaunt

SUMMER SEASON 1999

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

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

admission free

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

open every day 10am-5.30pm

admission charge

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

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

admission charge

CROMWELLIANA

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

ISBN 0-905729-10-2

