

11

The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers¹

Angela McShane

In May 1650, *A Perfect Diurnall of Some Passages and Proceedings of Parliament and in Relation to the Armies in England and Ireland* reported that 'very lately [...] at Milton in Barkeshire' a 'company of [5] Royalists at an alehouse, being drunke, they out of zeale of affection to their King at Bredagh, would drink his health in blood, and to effect this, unanimously agreed to cut a peece of their Buttocks, and fry their flesh that was cut off on a grid-iron'. The group were discovered when one man's 'excessive bleeding' forced his companions to call a surgeon. In turn, this alerted another man's wife who lived nearby. She burst into the room and 'laid about her' with a pair of tongs 'so sav[ing] her husband cutting of his flesh'. The ensuing commotion drew the attention of the authorities. The men were questioned by the Governor of Wallingford, Major Arthur Evelyn, and were bound over to appear before the next Quarter Sessions.²

Little further information about the case remains. Although the reporter anticipated a hearing before the Berkshire sessions, records do not survive for this period, and no clear reference to the case has been found elsewhere. The village of Milton was situated on the road between Wallingford and Wantage. It had one major inn near the church, known in the late-seventeenth century as 'The Dogg'.³ During and after the civil war, local loyalties ranged from ardent Anglican royalism to Presbyterian and sectarian radicalism. Nevertheless, the county was a royalist stronghold until 1646, when, after a long siege ending in the surrender of the castle to General Fairfax, Major Arthur Evelyn was appointed Governor of Wallingford. After that time, the castle was used to confine dissidents and concerns about a royalist resurgence in the area were high.⁴

In what follows, the cultural contexts in which this remarkable episode in Milton took place, and from which contemporary behaviours and their meanings were inevitably constructed, will be explored. We will see how such events, rather than simply appealing to our taste for the bizarre and spectacular, can illuminate something of the everyday experience of royalists in interregnum England. On one hand, multiple imaginary readings of

the report drawn from the very real discourses and milieu of 1650s England will be examined, offering a broad range of perspectives from which contemporary readers of opposing political and religious stances might have received the piece. On the other hand, it will be argued that these unusual drunken antics might also be read as an attempt to enact a secular sacrament, expressing and strengthening a loving bond with the absent King, and as a means to heal and strengthen the blood of the dismembered 'body politic': reflecting, more broadly, a politicisation of drinking, developing from the mid-seventeenth century that was to have far reaching consequences, perhaps even to our own day.⁵

Reading sensations

Joy Wiltenburg has argued that, by the seventeenth century, 'sensationalist' accounts [of crime] had become 'cultural agents', with an 'ability to mould common responses to extreme violations of social norms' and can be an important source for historians of popular culture.⁶ Such accounts, she points out, worked by fostering shared emotional responses of repugnance and horror through a range of literary strategies. However, even though cultural vocabularies (such as the languages of social distinction; biblical stories and allegories; classical mythology and exemplars; emblems and visual tropes), were widely shared, or appropriated, in 1640s and 50s England, responses to sensational stories, and the way in which readers applied them to lived experience, could be hotly contested in accordance with political, religious and social divisions.⁷

A Perfect Diurnall was an officially sanctioned parliamentary news-serial that ran from 1640 to 1655.⁸ Edited, for the most part, by Samuel Pecke, it was no simple propaganda tool.⁹ As Jason Peacey has shown, editors and writers, even of government-sponsored news-pamphlets, frequently promoted their own views by judiciously selecting, juxtaposing, editing and commenting on news stories.¹⁰ This was perhaps especially true in 1650 when that master of collection and juxtapositioning, John Rushworth, oversaw the production of *A Perfect Diurnall*.¹¹ The Milton story was positioned alongside various more and less sensational home reports, mostly dealing with concerns over 'dangerous persons to the Commonwealth' in the wake of the 'Act against Papists, Soldiers of Fortune and Cavaliers', which, one report recorded, had been read for the second time at court sessions all over the country.¹² Remarkably, neither the (anonymous) author of the 'letter from Berkeshire', nor the editor, offered any further gloss on the story. Though certainly a disreputable tale, the events were left to speak for themselves to a broad readership that almost certainly reached across the political and religious spectrum, from Anglican royalists to Fifth Monarchy men. The number of news-pamphlets began to drop under the republic but access to printed information about events as they unfolded, whatever its

194 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

provenance, had become an essential requirement.¹³ How might this widely differing readership have interpreted this strange occurrence?

My own readers might want to suggest that the (possibly fictional) antics of drunken men are hardly worth analysing. But, as Phil Withington has recently pointed out, it is only by studying the 'interpersonal dynamics of drinking' that 'questions relating to the practices, rituals and attitudes surrounding the consumption and meaning of drink' can be investigated.¹⁴ Contemporaries certainly considered stories of drunken behaviour worth reporting and a serious enough matter for the authorities to enquire into more deeply. Excessive drinkers were occasionally able to persuade magistrates that being 'in their cups' had led to uncharacteristic behaviour – a 'want of due se[v]eritie' complained of by divines – but, at this time of heightened superstition and fear, such reports were regarded in an altogether more sinister light.¹⁵ In the aftermath of war and regicide, the company that 'disaffected' men kept needed to be monitored and, where possible, controlled. *A Perfect Diurnall* reported that cavaliers in Exeter had been divested of their weapons and persuaded to swear to a 'negative engagement not to act anything prejudicial'.¹⁶ Nevertheless, the social behaviours of such men still required careful surveillance.

Although healthing was a customary practice, during the civil war years it had become ever more violent and politically divisive, increasingly involving gestures, prayers and curses, rituals and speech-acts that, unchecked, could lead to serious consequences.¹⁷ Sermons, old, new, or in revised editions, published during the war years, warned that men in drink were 'unmasked'. The prolific pamphleteer Richard Younge (alias 'Junius Florilegus') reminding his readers of Plato's aphorism, 'wine [...] is the daughter of Verity', advised that drunkenness 'discovers the secrets of the heart' and 'disapparels the soule'.¹⁸ For those who held to this philosophy, the activities of drunken cavaliers inadvertently exposed both their own true calibre and that of their cause.

With so little corollary evidence, we cannot easily examine the contingent nature of the events the report described. We can, however, look more laterally at the cultural and conceptual frameworks within which the subjects, writers and readers of the report operated. Taverns and alehouses could be both literary spaces and arenas for cultural discourse.¹⁹ Younge likened the tavern to a private library, with pots and glasses instead of books ranked on the shelves, in which 'they will one with a coale, another with a candle, fill al the wals and seelings with Epithalmiums, Elegies, and Epitaphs'. The common tendency of even poorly educated men in company, 'the veriest lack-latins', was to perform, compose and discuss poems, songs and other literary forms, effectively disseminating literary knowledge and its implications as exemplar. As Younge pointed out, 'all is spoken in print that is spoken by [drunkards], though their phrase (the apparel of their speech) hath a rash outside, and fustian linings'.²⁰ It was in just this kind of drink-sodden environment that

classical, biblical and literary knowledge was most likely to influence people's behaviour directly. It would be no big step from reciting, composing and inscribing to enacting literary ideas, and we might reasonably surmise that whatever the (clouded) thinking behind this extraordinary case of rump-slashing and blood-drinking, it was likely to have been at least partly inspired by literary models.

Extraordinary readings

We can approach the Milton story by turning to some of the more lurid interpretations that may immediately have suggested themselves to *Diurnall* readers. A thirst for blood was a familiar image in sensationalist literature. It was a characteristic attributed variously to anthropomorphised weapons, papists, rebels, conspirators and other devilish, vengeful villains. Alternatively, heroic, passionate figures might be drawn into blood-lust by the horror of a great injustice, or despair. During the war years, parliamentarian and royalist writers increasingly hurled accusations of outrageous bloodthirstiness at each other. Indeed, the King himself was dubbed a 'man of blood', an epithet that played a vital role in the charges brought against him at his trial.²¹

Readers antagonistic to the royalist cause may have discerned in the Milton story a coven of male witches, imbibing blood as part of a charm that would work in the uncrowned Prince Charles's favour (styled the 'King of Bredagh' in the report), as his struggle continued in Ireland. The cutting of flesh from the buttock could be read as the inversionary act of the witch or demon, while the necessary dropping of breeches it entailed implied potentially sodomitic practices.²² Presbyterian schoolmaster and clergyman, Thomas Hall, declaimed that drunkards and health-drinkers were blasphemous 'Black Devils' and 'observers of superstitious and heathenish costumes', while Richard Younger argued that the drunkard was particularly susceptible to the devils demands: he was 'demoniaicall; obsessed , or rather possessed with a Devill [...] of his own choosing [...] Yea [drunkards] may most fitly be compared to the Devil himselfe; whome they most of all resemble'. Imagining a company of drunkards as a group of necromancers, Younger described how by,

making the Alehouse or taverne their study; their circle the pot, themselves the conjurer, mens soules the hire, reputation of good fellowship the charme, the characters healths, the Goblin raised is the spirit of the buttery; and [they] drink God out of their heart, health out of their bodies, wit out of their heads.

He also pointed out that 'health drinking upon their knees was first invented and used as the Devils drink-offering [...] which the Pagan idolaters, sorcerers and witches consecrated and gave to Beelzebub [...] as Basil and Augustine affirme.'²³

196 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

An alternative interpretive model is suggested in non-conformist clergyman John Gere's 1648 pamphlet, written 'for the satisfaction and [...] direction of a godly Parliament-Man'. Describing health drinking as '*in genere malorum* – a work of darkness', he argued that drinking healths to the monarch was tantamount to the idolatrous worship 'the Papists perform to deceased saints'.²⁴ For many in civil-war England, 'papist' and 'cavalier' were synonymous terms, a viewpoint further supported by a growing royalist martyrology (culminating with the death of the King), which tended to focus on well-known gentlemen-at-arms, many of whom were Catholic.²⁵ Bloodthirsty (though not blood-drinking) papists had been luridly described in the pamphlet press, most recently during the Irish rebellion. Blood was thought to carry with it the vital spirits and the soul, so that, by drinking the blood of Protestants, papists could capture their souls. This idea was publicised in 1617: '[The Pope] thirsteth after blood [...] He thirsteth after our soules, which if he carry along with him into hell, we may not safely question him, Pope why dost thou this?'²⁶

Based on these literary possibilities, readers could interpret the health-drinking in Milton as a 'horrid blasphemy' committed by a devilish crew of Catholic cavaliers, presumably using their own flesh and blood to replicate that of Christ in a parody of the mass. This would indeed have been an extraordinary and supremely blasphemous act. But, these interpretations are problematic on several counts. In the first place, while letting and drinking blood, and possibly cooking or consuming flesh, in the context of a lewd, hedonistic entertainment was typical of the witch's *modus operandi*, the sabbat was not intrinsic to accusations of witchcraft in England as it was in Europe.²⁷ Moreover, if the writer or editor had wished to impute witchcraft as a reason for the outrage, they could easily have said so, especially as a report of a witch taken in Monmouth appears just a few lines further on. The two stories are separated in the text, however, by anxieties about 'high flowne cavaliers' and the preservation of general order and peace by the 'eminency in the county'.²⁸ This places the Milton story in the domain of practical concerns about disbanded and disaffected cavaliers, rather than fears about witchcraft and demonic powers.

Secondly, blasphemy of word or deed was prosecuted with increasing fervour by puritan officials, attracting very large fines for those who swore volubly and, after the 1650 Blasphemy Act, a sentence of at least six months imprisonment.²⁹ Such an outrageous blasphemy as the subversion of the sacrament, representing a direct threat to the well-being of the community, would surely have provoked at least summary imprisonment? But these men appear only to have been bound over to face charges at a later date. Moreover, on the limited evidence we have, they appear to have been respectable men. They had sufficient standing to be given access to an unattended private room in the tavern; at least one was married; and when another found himself in difficulties they were able to call for an expensive surgeon. Such

men are surely unlikely to have perjured their souls to such an extreme extent, however drunk they were.

Lastly, it must be in doubt that these men were thought to be papists. Letting a room to a group of known papists would have put the landlord's licence seriously at risk. The report refers to them as 'royallists' rather than cavaliers, while the ingesting of their *own* blood and spirits did not signify a papist appropriation of unsuspecting Protestant souls. On the contrary, as Edward Leigh's *Annotations upon all the New Testament* (1650) pointed out, 'To give a man blood to drink is to kill him, as Tomyris of old said to King Cyrus.' Queen Elizabeth I had 'effectually accomplisht' the role of the Angel in Revelations because she had 'made the [Jesuits and] Priest[s] to undergoe a bloody death, to drink blood, and also made all that received and entertained them to drink blood too'.³⁰

Readers sympathetic to the Royalist cause could draw upon an alternative range of blood-drinking and flesh-eating motifs, allowing them to interpret the Milton story, in some sense positively, as a ritual pact between vengeful conspirators. Texts of vengeance depended upon the taste of blood and flesh to enhance their visceral horror. One well-known tale of vengeance, so popular it was often printed as a ballad story, was Titus Andronicus, where, in revenge for the loss and murder of his sons and rape of his daughter, Titus feeds the scheming Empress of Rome a pie made of the flesh and blood of her own guilty sons.³¹

Increasingly during the war, royalist literature appropriated and reiterated the biblical axiom 'blood cries out for blood', accusing parliamentary rebels of devillish bloodthirstiness, and threatening them with like reward.³² These incriminations became almost hysterical in response to the deaths of royalist martyrs, Charles Lucas and George Lisle in 1648 and, from 1649, the King himself. In 1648, *The Parliament Porter*, describing the 'sceane of blood and horror' at the siege of Colchester, concluded: 'Goe on in blood fell monsters, tread on Kings,/Yet know that vengeance hastes on Eagles Wings'.³³ *An Elegie on the Death of [...] Sir Charles Lucas* charged the rebels with being 'mighty monsters, who outvie/ The strange man-eating Anthopophogi'; they had 'suckt Bouchers blood' and 'this seven yeares, whilst none controules,/ Have quaft our purple Blood in mazor Bowles'.³⁴ The image of drinking blood from mazors – traditional, domestic wooden vessels – implying the uncivilised poverty of Scots, Presbyterians and Puritans, and the sacrilegious use of non-precious vessels from which to drink sacred blood, was repeated in *The Parliament Porter*.³⁵ In 1649, *Mercurius Pragmaticus* described the 'Royall-sacred bloud of Kings', as 'milk for babes of Grace' which 'Weighes heavie when 'tis spilt/ and loudly at Heav'n gate, it rings/To scourge rebellious guilt'.³⁶ And a mock litany prayed of the 'Juncto' [parliament]: 'May the blood they have shed,/and their King murdered,/aloud for vengeance cry:/til the Heavens do send,/some plague for their end,/that have destroyed monarchy'.³⁷

198 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

Royalist clergyman Francis Quarles inadvertently provided a model of the 'Revengeful Man' in his 1646 collection of *Meditations, soliloquies, and prayers*. His spirit inspired by the voracious and inexorable eagle, his soul damned with the passions of hatred and injured honour, the man filled with desire for vengeance finds his only comfort in ingesting the blood of his enemy:

O What a Julip to my scorching soule is the delicious blood of my Offender! and how it cooles the burning Fever of my boyling veynes! It is the Quintessence of pleasures, the height of satisfaction, and the very marrow of all delight, to bath and paddle in the blood of such, whose bold affronts have turn'd my wounded patience into fury? [...] My Eagle spirit flies [...] and like ambitious Phaeton climbs into the fiery Chariot, and drawne with fury, scorne, revenge, and honor, rambles through all the Spheares, and brings with it confusion and combustion; my reeking sword shall vindicate my reputation, and rectifie the injuries of my honorable name, and quench it selfe in plenteous streames of blood. [...] My conscience is blood-prooffe, and I can broach a life with my illustrious weapon with as little reluctance, as kill a Flea that sucks my blood without Commission, and I can drinke a health in blood upon my bended knee, to reputation.³⁸

The archetype of bloodthirsty rebellion, the history of Cataline's conspiracy, was known to every grammar-school boy in the kingdom. Ben Jonson's treatment of the tale dramatically illustrated the horrific, blasphemous, blood-drinking ritual with which the conspiracy was ushered in:

Bring in the wine and bloud
 You have prepared there [...]

 I have kill'd a slave,
 And of his bloud caused to be mixed with wine.
 Fill every man his bowl. There cannot be
 A fitter drink, to make this sanction in.
 Here, I begin the sacrament to all.

The effect of this blood-drinking was at once symbolic, physical and psychological. On one hand creating a guilty bond between the conspirators and on the other, as Cataline declaims, the ingestion of the slave's blood poured 'Fierceness into me, and with it fell thirst/ Of more and more'.³⁹

In 1648 and 1649 royalist texts likened the parliamentary cause to Cataline's conspiracy.⁴⁰ *The Famous Tragedie of Charles I* (1649), a bitter play pamphlet, told the story of the Royalist demise. In Act I Cromwell and Hugh Peters plan the death of the King. In Act II the executions of Lucas and Lisle at the end of the siege of Colchester are portrayed as a betrayal so shocking it leads to the

conversion of a parliamentarian soldier. He, in Act IV, murders Colonel Rainsborough in direct blood vengeance. In Act II, as the besieged royalists watch in vain for relief to arrive, and await the parliamentarian onslaught, George Lisle prepares a loyal health (in sherry) for all those about to make their last stand. He reminds his men of the classical precedents for feasting in the face of the enemy, so raising them culturally above their enemies, usually represented as antagonistic towards 'civilised' education derived from 'pagan' texts. Lisle taunts the army outside the gates: '[they] should participate of our flowing cups would they but take the paines to come amongst us, such as the Roman Cataline did provide for those he had drawn into his confederacy, wine mixt with blood (an horrid sacrament)'.⁴¹

Literary representations of blood-drinking and flesh-eating, motivated by the desire to wreak violent revenge, may perhaps have influenced royalist readings or, indeed, served as models for the Milton cavaliers. Stories of siege warfare had particular resonance for the residents of Milton. The King visited Wallingford Castle several times during the war, and the Wallingford siege was a long drawn out affair – lasting sixteen weeks – although, unlike Colchester, it ended with honour unimpaired, on both sides.⁴² Royalists, rendered inactive by defeat; perhaps under threat of sequestration; under surveillance by their communities (and their wives); and forced to incorporate new and detested forms of government, taxation and manners into their lives, might well have been moved by a sense of injustice and dishonour to the making of a desperate and disreputable pact, appropriating the bloody rituals of rebels in a conspiracy against the new state. However, as with the parliamentarian readings discussed above, none of these sensationalist models completely fit the facts because they all necessitated cutting and ingesting the flesh and vital spirits of others, rather than one's own.

Ordinary readings

An alternative approach is suggested by cultural theorist Ben Highmore's analysis of Sherlock Holmes's methods and motivations. Holmes, Highmore points out, is terrified by the mundane, and turns to the intoxicating effects of cocaine for relief. However, when some bizarre and puzzling events are brought to his attention – through the small ads in the newspaper, or an unexpected call at the door – it is precisely Holmes' acute observation of the dull, repetitive course of the everyday that enables him to unravel the extraordinary mystery.⁴³ What might we learn by drawing out the more ordinary elements in the Milton story?

Here, a group of men, who once had something better to do, meet in a typical rural tavern: they talk politics, get drunk, and challenge each other to ritual acts of bravado.⁴⁴ These were relatively ordinary men, not poor, but not rich either: none are named in the account, suggesting that none had a name worth mentioning. Surrounded by an equally ordinary materiality, their

200 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

private room had a fireplace, gridiron and tongs, allowing them to stir up the fire, warm drinks, or cook. Younge described just such a typical tavern scene, set up to cope with heavy drinking, as 'a large roome, ranked ful of Pots, Cannes, Glasses, Tobacco Pipes, rashers on the coales, red herrings, a gammon of bacon, caveare, Anchovies, [...] together with a Jordane for their urine on the one side and a boule for their vomit on the other'.⁴⁵ The men would have carried knives, to eat with, and, possibly, fashionable arms, such as daggers. Even the account of being disturbed by a fire-tong-wielding wife was not an uncommon occurrence, although its inclusion in this tale may have been intended to augment the humiliation and impugn the masculinity of the men concerned.⁴⁶

The popularity and ubiquity of what were termed the 'Lawes and Ceremonies to be observed' of drinking are also reflected in the story.⁴⁷ Largely inspired by classical models, the upsurge of wine-drinking, healthing, and drunkenness in early modern England had already caused much consternation amongst divines and worthies, sparking a range of sermons and moralising texts.⁴⁸ These uniformly related changes in drinking practices since the late-sixteenth century: lamenting, 'Heretofore it was a strange sight to see a drunken man, now it is no newes; heretofore it was the sinne of Tinkers, Hostlers, Beggars, &c now of farmers, [Citizens] Esquires, knights, &c'; 'Heretofore wine was only sold in Apothecaries shops, and drunk rather in time of sickness then in health: now its vented in Tavernes, as if it grew in the Thames'.⁴⁹

If, as is likely, the Milton healthers were ex-soldiers (Berkshire experienced several sieges and the battle of Newbury), we could attribute their behaviour to the natural effects of militarisation.⁵⁰ *The Famous Tragedie* reflected how loyal health drinking had changed during the civil war, becoming imbued with new significations. In contrast to the Cataline aberration, Lisle appropriates the sacramental ritual as a means of creating a bond of love, rather than fear, between those engaged in arms for the King. Lifting the spirits, and acting as a spur to courage, healthing was accompanied by singing, not of sacred music, but of loyal drinking songs of the kind that were issued on single sheets, or in royalist miscellanies.⁵¹ At the same time, it was hoped that performing their loyal drinking rituals in full view of the besieging army 'will mad the rebels'.

In this, royalists achieved their end. One letter, sent to the House by a parliamentarian commander at Colchester, claimed 'Our Purdues lie so near the enemy, as to hear them discourse [and] drink Healths'.⁵² Moreover, royalist drinking was maddening enough to attract the derision of the Parliamentarian press. In 1648 *Mercurius Britanicus Alive Again* advised cavaliers thinking of restarting the war 'to eschew all those inconveniencies and timely contain yourselves at your Clubs, and there under the Rose vent all your set forms of execrations against the Parliament and Army [...] like Persians consult in your drink of your great affairs and speak of such attempts in cold

blood, next morning you would dread to think on [...] six beer glasses of Sacke brings the King and all his Progeny unto you'.⁵³ Our extraordinary case might, then, have been a fairly ordinary act of royalist military-machismo, a defiant statement about their continued identity as the King's soldiers.⁵⁴ But, this neither completely explains their healthing in blood, nor, more especially, the cooking of their flesh.

Blood-letting was a common experience in seventeenth-century England. One treatise on the subject warned against the 'wilfull temeritie and rashnesse of some ignorant people, which for every small impediment have recourse presently to letting of blood [...] and do urge forward the Chirugian and euen greedily draw upon themselves [...] manifold inconueniences'. Where you let the blood from, why and what you did with it were all significant.⁵⁵ These men chose to bleed from their buttocks, which had no particular medical significance (though one text recommended bleeding from 'the haemorrhoids').⁵⁶ On the other hand, a wound on the buttock would be less easily remarked upon, while the backside was a favoured area for joking and swearing. Perhaps this was an early example of satirising the purged, Long Parliament, described as 'the Rump' by Clement Walker in 1649 (though not generally used as a term of abuse before 1659), while jokes about 'Crumwell' and the Saints 'loving a Bum-well' were in circulation even earlier.⁵⁷ The location for their incisions may simply have been dictated by the desire to furnish their ritual with blood to drink and flesh to cook. Military men would have been only too familiar with the range of wounds that could be inflicted safely on the body. If they could avoid infection, cutting the buttock should have provided blood and flesh, while inflicting only a minor lesion.

'Bad' blood, drawn for medical reasons, was carefully discarded, but health-drinking in 'good' blood may not have been uncommon, despite flying in the face of religio-scientific opinion: as expressed in 1616 by William Harvey that 'the soul is in the blood'; or in Hobbes's 1651 translation of Deuteronomy 12:23: 'Eat not the blood, for the blood is the soul, that is, the life'.⁵⁸ Heated pamphlet debate over the use of animal blood in cooking drew on the same fears and beliefs.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, in 1621, Robert Burton decried the behaviour of young gallants in the throes of love, 'for it is an ordinary thing for these enamoratos of our times [...] to stab their arms [and] carouse in blood'.⁶⁰ Bernard Capp relates a 1650s episode, in which a young man cut the flesh above his heart in order to drink a health in blood to his love.⁶¹ And, in 1661, Presbyterian divine Thomas Hall reminded his readers of the 'extreme practices' of 'fanatic and frantick' men of 'extreme opinions': 'they rant they roar, they sing, they swear, they drink they dance, they whore they lye, they scoff, yea some there are (I hope not many) that put their own blood into their drink, and then drink a health to the King and to the confusion of Sion and its King'. This 'horrid [...] blasphemy', reported to him, Hall states, 'by persons of good repute', may have derived from the report on Milton.⁶²

202 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

Drinking blood mixed with wine, then, was commonly linked to the heated passions of love. Burton described love of country and friendship amongst men as 'a sacred communion' and quoted Plato's saying that, only lovers 'will dye for their friends, and in their Mistris quarrel'.⁶³ As the *Perfect Diurnall* had reported, the Milton royalists' extravagant demonstrations of self-sacrificial loyalty were inspired by the 'zeal of their affection for their King'. Charles I's own discourses, and fate, suggested a porous boundary between the King's body and that of his subjects, within and between members of the body politic. In a speech at Oxford, he declaimed: 'I bleed in your wounds [...] give me your hearts and preserve your own bloods. The heart of the Prince is kept warme with the blood of his subjects'.⁶⁴ As Jerome de Groot has argued, combined with the metaphor of the King as the heart of the nation, 'the influence of blood on the body [was rendered] more pervasive, invasive and inclusive than the standard hierarchical structures deployed by political theorists', leading to the royalist male body being 'celebrated [in elegies] as part of a loyalist corporate whole'.⁶⁵

Royalism depended upon a loyalty based primarily on the passion of love, rather than the less reliable motivation of man's inevitably flawed reason. Indeed, the effect of reason without love was 'crazy brained' rebellion and republicanism. Drinking could temper and release the bonds of reason and allow the flow of natural affection the loyal subject should feel.⁶⁶ This philosophy required moderation, however, and even well-intentioned drinking could easily lead to the opposite effects of those desired. As Burton pointed out, 'Love and Bacchus are violent Gods, [they] so furiously rage in our minds; that they make us forget all honesty, shame and common civility'.⁶⁷ Even royalist publications, aiming to galvanise disheartened cavaliers with the hope that the King's cause could still be won, expressed exasperation with the despondent, dissolute drinking that brought the Kings cause into disrepute. In a sermon originally preached before the King at Oxford, army chaplain William Chillingworth thundered against:

they that maintain the King's Righteous Cause with the hazard of their Lives and Fortunes; but by their oathes and curses, by their drunkenness and debauchery, by their irreligion and prophaneness, fight more powerfully against their partie, then by all other meanes they doe or can fight for it; [...] that strict caution which properly concerns themselves in the Book of Deut 23.9 [...] *When thou goest to Wars with thine Enemies, then take heed there be no wicked thing in thee;* not only no wickedness in the Cause thou maintainest, nor no wickedness in the means by which thou maintainest it; but no Personal Impieties in the Persons that maintain it [...] I cannot but feare that the goodnesse of our cause may sinke under the burthen of our sinnes.⁶⁸

The *Famous Tragedie* also reflected this concern. As the Colchester soldiers drink their loyal healths, Lisle warns them of the need to avoid excess, but

acknowledges that, at such a time, his words carried too much 'sage to palliate the drink'. Captains were only too aware that, instead of acting as a spur to action, drinking could render men incapable or uncontrollable. Worse, it could become a displacement activity. In 1649, *Mercurius Pragmaticus* castigated 'Cavalier Babies, whose ambition it is to set at home and pick their fingers and drinke healthes in the behalfe of his Majesty. Is this a time to compound my masters?'⁶⁹

Melancholy and the everyday experience of defeat

Why did ardent royalists turn so resolutely to drink and drunken rout? These were not young men who had rejected the idea of achieving patriarchal status.⁷⁰ These were respectable men who had been, and still were, willing to sacrifice everything for their King. The issues at stake were enormous. What would make them ignore the overwhelming imperatives of shame and reputation, bringing upon themselves and their cause castigations of cowardice and vice, even from their own side? Royalists did not just indulge in the occasional bout of drunkenness: they embraced the vice as a badge of identity. They revelled in and made a virtue of it. What virtue could be found in what was universally acknowledged as sinful behaviour?

Here we return to Sherlock Holmes, and his desperate relationship with the 'post-enlightenment plague' of 'boredom'. While cultural theorists consider repetition as fundamental to understanding the everyday experience of 'modernity', historians more often characterise early modern life, especially in the civil war and interregnum period, as a dynamic struggle in which ordinary people were consciously engaged. Sources dictate that times when nothing out of the ordinary was happening and life went on in an undisturbed and unremarkable way are not easy to find. Perhaps the instability and unpredictability of early modern life tended to militate against the possibility of boredom, as Robert Musil suggested, 'In earlier times [...] people were like stalks of grain [...] moved back and forth more violently by God, hail fire, pestilence and war than today'.⁷¹

The popularity and ubiquity of texts on the *pre*-enlightenment scourge of 'melancholy' invites us to think again, however.⁷² The best-known contemporary study is Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, revised and reprinted five times between 1621 and 1638, and (posthumously) twice more in the 1650s. Additionally, in 1640, Jacques Ferrand's 1623 treatise on 'love melancholy', translated and prefaced by a garland of poetic tributes from scholars, was printed in Oxford. The debilitating feelings of fear and sorrow that characterised 'melancholy', Burton argued, were caused by a combination of mundane idleness and disappointed love: elements fundamental to the social and literary practices of cavaliers at home and in exile.⁷³ Melancholy increasingly occurred as a theme in literary works over the seventeenth century, and its dangers were highlighted through the 'frequent employment [of] metaphorical language mapping external macrocosmic conflict onto the internal

204 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

microcosm – passions were “seditions”, [and] the cause of “Civil Dissension” in the soul’.⁷⁴ Indeed, Ferrand asserted that ‘the diverse and violent perturbations of love-melancholy which afflict the mind of a passionate lover [deprived of a loved one] are the causes of greater mischiefs than any other passion of the mind whatsoever’.⁷⁵ Melancholic diseases, brought about by the disappointment of royalist affections, not only threatened the mental health of individuals, they endangered the well-being of the whole body politic.

While it would be anachronistic to elide modern ‘boredom’ with the early modern condition of melancholy, the insights of scholars into boredom, and what Julia Kristeva termed ‘abjection’, offer some useful phenomenological and psychological models against which to read the extraordinary behaviour of our cavaliers, and others like them. Describing boredom as symptomatic of a disenchanted individual for whom ‘a sceptical distance from the certainties of faith, tradition [and] sensation renders the immediacy of quotidian meaning hollow or inaccessible’; ‘nothing means, nothing pleases, nothing matters’; Elizabeth Goodstein also points out that, ‘Boredom [...] is a defence. A refusal to feel that protects a self, threatened by its own fear or desire or need for what it seems to eschew. A means of stabilizing subjective existence, without confronting the gaps between imagination and reality, that render defence against feeling necessary.’⁷⁶ Similarly, Kristeva characterises abjection as ‘one of those violent dark revolts of being, directed against a threat that seems to emanate from an exorbitant outside or inside, ejected beyond the scope of the possible, the tolerable, the thinkable’. Abjection, she posits, is caused by a disturbance in ‘identity, system [and] order [that] does not respect borders, positions, rules’.⁷⁷

The early 1650s witnessed fundamental changes in local and national government and in the policing of morals, manners and the household economy. All these changes had to be newly incorporated into the contexts of the ‘everyday’. For royalists, previously engaged in the intense life or death struggle to defend the monarchy, the new work-a-day situations those adjustments created brought with them the ‘melancholy’ of the defeated, disillusioned, displaced, confused, bereaved and love-sick. De Groot argues that the Kings execution led to ‘a crisis of representation and a wounding that could not be sutured’ or located ‘within a recognisable narrative’: the ‘illusory guarantee of signification collapsed’.⁷⁸ Not only did cavalier actions ‘speak’ loudly of these feelings of alienation, they were given articulation in the poems, plays, songs and stories, circulated via manuscript, print and word of mouth, that helped to maintain the identity and coherence of the royalist cause during and after the civil war.⁷⁹

At the same time, royalist drinking was both caused by, and a cause of, social and political isolation. Younge described the ‘company keeper’ as ‘the barrenest piece of earth in all the Orb: the Common-wealth hath no [...] use of him [...] he hath not so much as a voice in the common-

wealth'.⁸⁰ The unaccustomed lack of a voice and standing in their communities undoubtedly drove many royalists deliberately to drink beyond acceptable norms, set by a society which they could not acknowledge, and refused to take part in.⁸¹ Perhaps drunkenness provided a temporary escape from the everyday drudgery of defeat, or the exhausting replaying of hopes and plans for a royalist recovery. But, as Edward Muir has pointed out, 'what rituals do is not so much mean as emote'.⁸² Cavaliers, disillusioned with monarchy, and alienated from the Commonwealth, needed to renew their sense of identity, and re-engage emotionally both with each other, and an imagined State to come. Healthing rituals expressly sought to inspire the virtuous passions of love and fortitude, and to inhibit cowardice, tedium and melancholy. They also provided important tests of inclusion, so successful that they were incorporated into an unofficial state policy after the Restoration.⁸³

The most common remedy for melancholy, recommended by medical authorities, was the ingestion of wine. Burton commented: 'I do not find a more precise remedy, then a cup of wine or strong drink [...] it takes away fear and sorrow [and] he that can keep company and carouse, needs no other medicines.'⁸⁴ Some writers even suggested drinking to the point of extreme drunkenness, to distract the sufferer from their sorrows. Medical and religious texts claimed a close connection between the 'heart's blood' and the 'blood of the grape'; one sermon declared that 'Wine is the blood of the earth'; others pointed out that their medical properties were also entwined.⁸⁵ A pamphlet entitled *The Blood of the Grape*, addressed to his 'intrauled Country', explained that 'the liquid part diffused in the substances of the Plants themselves, which as their blood conserveth life in them [...] the Blood of the Grape [...] as it appeareth to be blood, in it is life'. Claiming that wine could restore both life and health, the pamphleteer declared that it was better to drink too much than too little as 'all affects of diseases of plenitude or fulnesse are more safe because more curable then diseases of Emptinesse'.⁸⁶ Where wine drinking offered no cure, bleeding was recommended by the medical authorities, with arms, ankles, 'hammes', thighs, or haemorrhoids, being the usual points of access recommended.⁸⁷

The human body was thought to 'possess extraordinary medicinal and curative powers'.⁸⁸ Consequently, blood and mummified flesh were commonly used as medicine for disturbances of the brain, such as the 'falling sickness' [epilepsy], and the worst effects of melancholy (though not mentioned as cures by Burton or Ferrand). In the classical tradition, to be effective as a medicine, blood and flesh was cut from the fresh wounds of a gladiator. Ingesting fresh human blood, from a body that had died violently, was believed to revitalise the drinker. The drunken Milton cavaliers might easily have conceived of themselves as defeated gladiators, and by mixing their own fresh blood with the 'blood of the vine', they created a

206 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

drink with medical properties that could ease their melancholic condition and rejuvenate their blood. Possibly, the accusation of cooked flesh was inspired by a smell of cooking flesh occasioned by the cauterising of wounds, or it too could have signalled the preparation of a 'body' medicine for mental disturbance, as 'mummy' to ingest. Whilst the abject mutilation of their bodies produced shared pain and scars, creating a pact, their blood and flesh provided medicine that could ward off the drowning effects of despair and despondency.

Conclusion

By drawing upon current understandings of the popular cultures of seventeenth-century England, brought about not least by Bernard Capp, and many of the notable contributors to this book, numerous contradictory readings of the bizarre events in Milton in 1650 emerge, perhaps none of which are entirely satisfactory. While the actions of these drunken royalists may have been understood in various sensational ways, taken to their conclusion, they made little sense. If an act of atrocious blasphemy, this would not fit with their affection to the King; if a Catline conspiracy, or act of bloody vengeance, they replicate it poorly, in drinking their own and not their enemies' blood. Their desire to mutilate themselves may signify a determination to mark themselves as a loyal band, willing to form a desperate pact to overthrow the new state.

Yet, our ordinary readings may have led us to a more extraordinary conclusion. Excessive drinking could do more than enhance your masculinity, display your military-style bravado, or madden your old enemies. Flesh, blood and wine could all be used as medicine for distressed and distracted minds and bodies. The royalists of Milton prepared their ritual feast as a way to emote; as a secular sacrament, in memory of the old King and in celebration of the new; and also as a way to heal the body politic within themselves, through the efficacious use of bodily medicine for their affective disorders. A ritual drinking that could, for a time at least, ease the melancholy of their meaningless, everyday existence, helping them to survive until God's vengeance was wreaked, and the King returned.

Notes

- 1 Bernard Capp sent me this story some years ago. His students will instantly recognise the hallmarks of his generous gifts of 'goodies from the archive'. It is with great pleasure and enormous gratitude that I return it to him here. My thanks to the early modern research seminars at Merton College, Oxford and Leicester University for stimulating discussions on earlier versions of this paper, and especially to Joanne Bailey, David Crowley, Martin Ingram, Jason Peacey, Dave Postles, Tim Reinke-Williams, Claudia Stein and Phil Withington for their help and comments.
- 2 29 Apr.–6 May 1650, 218.

- 3 P.H. Ditchfield and W. Page (eds), *A History of the County of Berkshire* (4 Vols, 1907–24), vol. IV, 361–5.
- 4 *History of [...] Berkshire*, vol. III, 517–31.
- 5 For royalist drinking see L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge, 1989), 134–8; J. Scodel, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern Literature* (Princeton and Oxford, 2002), ch. 7; A. Smyth, 'Profit and delight': *Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640–1682* (Detroit, MI, 2004), 154–68; M. Keblusek, 'Wine for comfort: drinking and the royalist exile experience, 1642–1660' and A. McShane, 'Roaring royalists and ranting brewers: the politicisation of drink and drunkenness in political broadside ballads from 1640–1689' both in A. Smyth (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne. Drink and Conviviality in 17th-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2004), 55–88; A. McShane, "'No Kings rule the World/ Without Love and Good Drinking": political and material cultures of drinking in seventeenth-century England', unpublished paper, IHR Seventeenth Century Seminar, Jan 2009 (publication forthcoming).
- 6 J. Wiltenburg, 'True crime: the origins of modern sensationalism', *American Historical Review* 109 (2004), 1377–1404, 1378.
- 7 See R. Chartier, *Cultural History* (Cambridge, 1993), esp. 40–5.
- 8 From 1643 to 1649 the title was *A Perfect Diurnall of Some Passages in Parliament and some other parts of the Kingdome*.
- 9 For Pecke see J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English News Books 1641–1649* (Oxford, 1996), 13, 24, 28, 33, 48, 53, 66, 74, 76, 103; J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004), esp. 159, 191–2, 246.
- 10 Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 105, 246.
- 11 J. Raymond, 'Rushworth', *John* (c.1612–1690)', *ODNB*; idem, *Invention*, 173, 308.
- 12 *Perfect Diurnall*, 29 Apr.–6 May 1650, 219.
- 13 Raymond, *Invention*, 13–14; See also I. Atherton, 'The itch grown a disease: manuscript transmission of news in the seventeenth century', in J. Raymond (ed.), *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* (2002 edn); J. Miller, *After the Civil Wars* (Harlow, 2000), ch. 4.
- 14 P. Withington, 'Company and sociability in early modern England', *Social History* 32:3 (August, 2007), 293; see also B.A. Tlusty, *Bacchus and Civic Order: The Culture of Drink in Early Modern Germany* (Charlottesville, 2001), 1.
- 15 Robert Harris, *The Drunkards Cup* (1622), unpaginated [A+5]; Junius Florilegus, *The Odious Despicable and Dreadful Condition of the Drunkard Anatomized* (revised edn, 1649), 21; See also D. Rabin, 'Drunkenness and responsibility for crime in the eighteenth century', *Journal of British Studies* 44 (Jul., 2005), 457–77.
- 16 *Perfect Diurnall*, 29 Apr.–6 May, 1650, 223.
- 17 For a history of healthing see William Prynne, *Healthes Sicknesse. Or, a compendious and briefe discourse proving the drinking and pledging of healthes to be sinfull and utterly unlawfull unto Christians* (1628), 15–20 and Harris, *Drunkards Cup*, 17–20, 28–9; on changing healths see McShane, 'No kings rule the world'; on cavalier rituals see Potter, *Secret rites*, 134–8; L. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth. Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago, 1986), 214; S. Achilleos, 'The Anacreontea and a tradition of refined male sociability' and M. Keblusek, 'Wine for comfort', both in Smyth (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne*, 21–35, 69–88; J. De Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke, 2004), 111.
- 18 I. Green, 'Younge, Richard (fl. 1636–1673)', *ODNB*; Florilegus, *Drunkard Anatomized*, 7; see also Harris, *Drunkards Cup*, 22.

208 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

- 19 M. O'Callaghan, 'Tavern societies, the Inns of Court, and the culture of conviviality in early seventeenth-century London', in Smyth (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne*, 37–54.
- 20 Florilegus, *Drunkard Anatomized*, 10; See J. Fleming, *Graffiti and the Writing Arts of Early Modern England* (Pennsylvania, 2001); T. Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety*, chaps 4 and 5; On libraries as social spaces see K. Loveman, 'Books and sociability: the case of Samuel Pepys's library', *Review of English Studies*, forthcoming.
- 21 See P. Crawford, "'Charles Stuart, that man of blood'", *Journal of British Studies* 16:2 (1977), 41–61.
- 22 S. Clarke, *Thinking With Demons* (Oxford, 1997), chaps 2 and 6; see also C. Wells, 'Leeches on the body politic: xenophobia and witchcraft in early modern French political thought', *French Historical Studies* 22:3 (1999), 351–77; cf. A. Shepard, "'Swil-bolls and tos-pots": drink culture and male bonding in England, c.1560–1640', in L. Gowing, M. Hunter and M. Rubin (eds), *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe, 1300–1800* (Basingstoke, 2005).
- 23 Thomas Hall, *Funebria Florae, the Downfall of May Games* (1660), 1; Florilegus, *Drunkard Anatomized*, 3–4, 16.
- 24 John Geree, *θειωφαρμακον. A Divine Potion to preserve spirituall health, by the cure of unnaturall health-drinking* (1648), vol. 1, 7–8. See also Barnabe Rich, *The Irish Hubbub* (1619), 24.
- 25 E.g., John Smyth and Charles Brandon. See I. Roy, 'Royalist reputations: the cavalier ideal and the reality', in J. McElligot and D.L. Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), 89–111.
- 26 *A Solemne Ioviall disputation, theoreticke and practicke; briefly shadowing the Law of Drinking together, with the solemnities and controversies occurring* (1617), 10.
- 27 Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 15; Wells, 'Leeches on the Body Politic'.
- 28 *Perfect Diurnal*, 29 Apr.–6 May 1650, 219.
- 29 B.S. Capp, 'Republican reformation: family, community and the state in inter-regnum Middlesex, 1649–60', in H. Berry and E. Foyster (eds), *The Family in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2007), 47.
- 30 Edward Leigh, *Annotations upon all the New Testament* (1650), 605.
- 31 Extant ballad sheets include, *Titus Andronicus complaint* (1629); *The lamentable and tragicall history of Titus Andronicus* (c. 1661). Ballads on the subject were registered in 1594 and 1656 see, H.E. Rollins *An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries in the Register of the Company of Stationers of London* (Hatboro, PA, 1967); entry nos. 1123, 2643.
- 32 See Genesis 3 v.10–11: 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground'; 9. v.5–6: 'At the hands of everie man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shal his blood bee shed.'
- 33 4 Sept.–11 Sept. 1648, 7–8.
- 34 *An Elegie on the Death of that most Noble and Heroick Knight, Sir Charles Lucas [...]* by the Excellent Rebell Fairfax (1648).
- 35 4 Sept.–11 Sept. 1648, 1: 'let base elves/ Trample on Prince and Peers/ Sucking our bloods to fat themselves/ Another seven years'; 2, described the 'bloody conspirators at Westminster and Derby house' as 'Quaffing the peoples blood in Mazor bowles'.
- 36 *Mercurius Pragmaticus (for King Charles II)*, 24 Apr.–1 May 1649, 1.
- 37 *A Curse against Parliament Ale* (1649), 6.
- 38 Francis Quarles, *Boanerges and Barnabus: Judgement & mercy for afflicted soules, or, Meditations, soliloquies, and prayers* (1646), 193–6.
- 39 Ben Jonson, *Cataline's Conspiracy* (1611), sig. C4; (1669 edn), 13.

- 40 For example, *An Elegie on [...] Sir Charles Lucas*: '[the rebels] With Cataline, have sworn to Levell all/ To your distinction Diabolicall' and 'they shall receive their Hire/With Cataline, in never dying fire'.
- 41 *Famous Tragedie*, 16–18.
- 42 Ditchfield and Page, *History of [...] Berkshire*, vol. III, 'The borough of Wallingford', 517–31; for the Colchester Siege, see B. Donagan, *War in England, 1642–1649* (Oxford, 2008), ch. 15.
- 43 B. Highmore, *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory* (2002), 2–5.
- 44 For male sociability, see Shepard, 'Swil-bolls and-pots'.
- 45 Florilegus, *Drunkard Anatomized*, 10.
- 46 On women using violence to restore order, see B.S. Capp, *When Gossips Meet, Women Family and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2003), 263–6, 311–18; G. Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003), ch. 3, esp. 86–96.
- 47 [Thomas Heywood], *Philocothonista, or, The drunkard, opened, dissected, and anatomized* (1635), pt. ii, esp. ch. 12; see also Harris, *Drunkards Cup*; sigs A2r–v; *Solemne ioviall disputation, passim*.
- 48 For classical models see Achilleos, 'Anacreontea'; for sermons see Robert Bolton, *Some Generall Directions for a comfortable walking with God* (edns, 1625, 1626, 1630, 1634, 1638); Prynne, *Healths Sicknesse*; Rich, *Irish Hubbub*.
- 49 See Harris, *Drunkards Cup*, sig. A2v, and on recent increase in numbers, 2. These lines were repeated by Florilegus, *Drunkard Anatomized*, 20 – who added 'Citizen' to the list of culprits and the comment on wine.
- 50 B.A. Tlusty, 'The public house and military culture in Germany, 1500–1648', in B. Kümin and B.A. Tlusty (eds), *The World of the Tavern. Public Houses in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2002), 136–56; De Groot, *Royalist Identities*, 111; Roy, 'Cavalier realities'.
- 51 *Famous Tragedie*, 16–18; Smyth, *Profit and Delight*; McShane, 'Roaring Royalists', 72–5.
- 52 'Proceedings in Parliament: July 1–August 1, 1648', in [John Rushworth ed.] *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State: 1647–8* (7 Vols, 1721), vol. VII, 1172–3.
- 53 16 May 1648, 5.
- 54 See Keblusek, 'Wine for comfort', 60.
- 55 Simon Harward, *Phlebotomy: or, a Treatise of letting of Blood* (1601), sig. A2v. See also Nancy Siraisi, *Medieval and early Renaissance Medicine* (Chicago, 1990), ch. 4, esp. 105–9.
- 56 Jacques Ferrand, *επιωατριανια, or a treatise discoursing of the essence, causes [...] and cure of love, or erotic melancholy* (trans. E. Chilmead: 1640), 262, 339.
- 57 B. Worden, *The Rump Parliament* (Cambridge, 1977), 4; *The Second Part to the Same tune or The Letanie Continued* (Thomason's MS, 13 Nov. 1647).
- 58 Quoted in C. Hill, 'William Harvey (no parliamentarian, no heretic) and the idea of monarchy', *Past & Present* 31 (1965), 101.
- 59 See Anon., *A Bloudy Tenent confuted, or, bloud forbidden* (1646).
- 60 Robert Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1651 edn), 527.
- 61 Quoted in B. Capp, 'Cultural Wars in the 1650s', unpublished paper for 'Sex and the (pre-modern) City' Conference, IHR, 31 Jan. 2009.
- 62 Thomas Hall, *Funebria Florae: The downfall of May Games etc* (1661), 1. My thanks to Martin Ingram for kindly drawing this passage to my attention.
- 63 Burton, *Anatomy*, 427–8, 533.
- 64 *The Kings Maiesties speech [...] before the Vniversity and city of Oxford* (1642), 5.
- 65 De Groot, *Royalist Identities*, 13–16, 148.

210 *The Extraordinary Case of the Blood-Drinking and Flesh-Eating Cavaliers*

- 66 Achilleos, 'Anacreontea', 33, quotes Herrick on the effects of drink: 'Rouze the sacred madnesse; and awake/ The frost-bound-blood, and spirits; and to make/ Them frantick with the raptures, flashing through/ The soule, like lightening, and as active too'; see also McShane, 'Subject and object: material expressions of political love', *Journal of British Studies* 48:4 (2009).
- 67 Burton, *Anatomy*, 542.
- 68 W. Chillingworth, *A Sermon preached at the publike Fast before his Majesty at Christchurch Oxford* (Oxford, 1644), 12–13.
- 69 24 April–1 May 1649, 13.
- 70 Shepard, "'Swil-bolls and-pots'"; idem, 'Manhood, credit and patriarchy in early modern England c.1580–1640', *Past & Present* 167 (2000), 75–106.
- 71 E.S. Goodstein, *Experience Without Qualities: Boredom and Modernity* (Stanford, 2005), Preface.
- 72 See discussions in A.H. Kitzes, *The Politics of Melancholy from Spencer to Milton* (New York, 2006), esp. chaps 5–6; M. Altbauer-Rudnik, 'Love, madness and social order: love melancholy in France and England in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries', *Gesnerus* 63 (2006), 33–45; A. Gowland, 'The problem of early modern melancholy', *Past & Present* 191 (2006), 77–120.
- 73 See discussion in Kitzes, *Politics of Melancholy*, ch. 6, esp. 155–60.
- 74 Gowland, 'Problem of early modern melancholy', 118; 84–6.
- 75 Ferrand, *ερωτομυθια*, 7; see Altbauer-Rudnik, 'Love madness and social order', 33–6.
- 76 Goodstein, *Experience Without Qualities*, 2–4.
- 77 J. Kristeva, 'Approaching abjection', in A. Jones (ed.), *The Feminism and Visual Culture Reader* (2003), 389, 391 and idem, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (trans. L.S. Roudiez, New York, 1982), ch. 1.
- 78 De Groot, *Royalist Identities*, 142–3; 171–2.
- 79 See M. Keblusek, 'Wine for comfort', 57–60; De Groot, *Royalist Identities*, ch. 6.
- 80 Florilegus, *Drunkard Anatomized*, 14.
- 81 Potter, *Secret Rites*, 138, 'the prison and tavern are [...] enclosures in which, with the help of alcohol, the cavalier can carry on rituals of loyalty [...] once a private macho routine, [rituals] had become both a secular liturgy and a way of parodying the authority of a government they refused to recognise [...] drunkenness [...] [released] the body into a world of quasi mystical experience', 138–9, 147–9, 203.
- 82 E. Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe* (2nd edn, Cambridge, 2005), 299; 1–11; 298–301.
- 83 See McShane, 'No Kings rule the World'.
- 84 Burton, *Anatomy*, 389–90.
- 85 *Warning to Drunkards*, [B7].
- 86 Tobias Whitaker, *The Blood of the Grape* (2nd edn, 1654), 2–11. The 1638 edition claimed that 'humane life from infancy to extreme old age [could be maintained] without any sicknesse by the use of wine'.
- 87 Burton, *Anatomy*, 398–401.
- 88 This paragraph draws upon the following: L. Noble, "'And make two pasties of your shameful heads": Medicinal cannibalism and healing the body politic in *Titus Andronicus*', *ELH* 70 (2003), 677–708, quotation at 681; R. Sugg, "'Good physic but bad food": early modern attitudes to medicinal cannibalism and its suppliers', *Social History of Medicine* 19:2 (2006), 225–40; K. Gordon-Grube, 'Anthropophagy in post Renaissance Europe: the tradition of medicinal cannibalism', *American Anthropologist*, new ser., 90:2 (Jun., 1988), 405–9; Wells, 'Leeches on the body politic'.