

The Royalist Reader in the English Revolution

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy by Jerome Edward Gerard de Groot. This thesis has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines of the Modern Humanities Research Association.

October 2000

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

200 25988 6

Thesis L6919

The Royalist Reader in the English Revolution

Jerome de Groot, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Abstract

This thesis offers an interpretation of Royalist literature of the first civil war. It particularly addresses the importance of spatial metaphors and material realities to loyalist notions of identity and meaning. I illustrate how royalist space was predicated upon scientific and mathematical notions of authority and hierarchy, and how this sense of 'absolute space' inflected royalist conceptions of a variety of other locations: gender, society, language, the public. The thesis traces how Charles attempted to use economic, political and juridical measures to create a context in which he could impose certain socio-spatial relations and structures of identity. Proclamations and royal protocols polemically reconfigured the institutional life of the country. Licensing of the presses provided a controlled textual mediation of information and fostered particular definitions of national identity. Against this background discourse Charles and his court created a model of Royalism which inflected and created social relations and in particular notions of allegiance. Modes of behaviour that seemed outside the bounds of institutionally and socially defined normality were caricatured as external, alien and other. The model of Royalism I postulate throws into new relief studies of Parliamentary texts, and restructures our thinking about allegiance, text and identity during the Civil War period.

My thesis falls into two sections. The opening two chapters establish the material contexts and constraints of publication during the war. Chapter one looks in depth at the relocation of the court within the city of Oxford, considering the institutional and political manifestations of this movement. Chapter two analyses censorship and licensing, circulation and the status of text. The second part of the thesis considers a wide variety of texts published at Oxford, considering specific modes (panegyric, elegy) and forms (speeches, satires, epic, topographical verse). These works are analysed by reference to the contexts outlined in the opening section. By considering tracts, newsbooks, sermons, institutional reform, painting, poetry, hitherto unconsidered manuscript material, political theory, translation and linguistic textbooks I contextualise in depth and further our understanding of Royalist culture.

Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Illustrations	iii
Abbreviations	iv
Introduction	1-23
Chapter 1 The Court at Oxford: Institutional Royalism	24-85
Chapter 2: 'read/ All backwards': The Royalist reader in the English Revolution	86-147
Chapter 3: 'the limbs move severall wayes, but all to one end': Public space	148-198
Chapter 4: 'soil'd with guilty Letters': Oxford panegyric	199-254
Chapter 5: 'Great Honr. bids mee vse my might': The Royalist poet in the English Revolution	255-318
Conclusions	319-322
Appendices	323-327
Bibliography	328-369

Acknowledgements

I firstly gratefully acknowledge the substantial financial assistance of the Arts and Humanities Research Board and the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. Both bodies awarded me generous funding to undertake this project. The AHRB granted me further funding to visit libraries in the United States. I was also the recipient of a Falconer Madan Research Fellowship from the British Bibliographical Society which allowed me to spend several months working in Oxford.

Reproduction of Rawlinson MS B. 121 as Figure 1 is by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. Transcription of Harleian MS 6851, fol. 117 r–v, and Egerton MS 2978, fols. 133r–134v as Appendices I and II is by permission of the British Library. Transcription of Merton College Archives, MS 1.3 (College Register 1567–1731), pp. 360–1 as Appendix III is by kind permission of the Warden and Fellows of Merton College, Oxford.

The following academics have been extremely generous with their time and expertise: Sharon Achinstein, Jonathan Bate, Fred Botting, Edward Burns, Anne Coldiron, Stephen Clucas, Dennis Danielson, Nick Davis, Ian Donaldson, Ian Gadd, John Hale, Gervase Hood, James Loxley, Claire McManus, David Norbrook, Timothy Raylor, Jennifer Richards, Julian Roberts, Julie Sanders, Ceri Sullivan, Andrew Thrush, Susan Wiseman. Tom Cain and Lois Potter were stimulating and thorough examiners who suggested some very interesting new directions that this work will take from now on. My thanks to them for a decent grilling.

I would like to thank the staff of the following University libraries and archives who have helped me greatly: University of Liverpool; the National Library of Wales; the Public Record Office; the National Library of Scotland; the Bodleian Library; University College, London; the Folger Shakespeare Memorial Library, Washington D. C.; the Houghton Library and the Widener Library, Harvard University; the Beinecke Library, Yale University; the British Library, especially the Manuscript Reading Room and Rare Books Room; the Cambridge University Library; the Oxford City Archives; Ann Smith, Archivist, Sherborne Castle Estates; L. K. Champ, Senior Archives Assistant, Hampshire Record Office; Stephen Dixon, Borough Archivist, Medway Archives; University of Newcastle upon Tyne; Tyne and Wear Record Office; John Rylands Special Collections, University of Manchester. Particular thanks is due to the following archivists who were welcoming and helpful during my time in Oxford: Norma Auberti-Potter, Elizabeth Boardman, Christine Butler, Judith Curthoys, Caroline Dalton, Robin Darwall-Smith, Cliff Davies, John Jones, Naomi van Loo, Fiona Piddock, Alan Tadiello, Lorise Tapliffe, Angela Williams.

I would like to thank Andrew Moor for wit and understanding; Matthew Creasy for his humour, friendship and generosity; James Cannon for inspiration and loyalty (and without whom); Mark Greif for Bostonian hospitality and Good Times; Helen Freshwater and Andrew Cummins for beer and late-night conversations. Friends in Oxford, Newcastle, Edinburgh, Huddersfield, Liverpool, Watford and Stoke have helped to make the whole process relatively painless.

I have had the good fortune to work with James Knowles, a supervisor who is exceedingly generous with his time, knowledge and energy; his guidance and friendship has been constantly helpful and inspiring throughout the last few years.

This project would never have been finished without the coercion, threats, support and love of Sharon Ruston, She who can spot an MHRA transgression at 50 paces. All my love and thanks.

This thesis is for my parents and my sister, with love, admiration and respect. It is dedicated, however, to them *and* the late Jeremy Maule, who once called me a toad: ‘There is even some Milton in it.’

Illustrations

Figure 1: Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS B. 121: Petition of the King's Servants for payment of fees (reproduced with permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford)

after p. 41

Figure 2: Plan of the King's apartments (according to British Library, Harleian MS 6851, fol. 117 r-v: Arrangement of the King's quarters, *Hand of Sir Edward Walker*)

after p. 50

List of Abbreviations

BL:	British Library Manuscript
Bod:	Bodleian Library Manuscript
CJ:	<i>Journals of the House of Commons</i> , 101 vols (London: 1803–52)
CSPD:	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, preserved in the Public Record Office, 1547–1704</i> , 92 vols (London 1856–1972)
DNB	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
HMC:	<i>Historical Manuscripts Commission</i>
Larkin:	Larkin, James, ed., <i>Stuart Royal Proclamations volume II: Royal Proclamations of King Charles 1624–1646</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)
LJ:	<i>Journals of the House of Lords</i> , 79 vols (London: 1771)
Madan:	Falconer Madan, <i>Oxford Books: A Bibliography of Printed Works Relating to the University and City of Oxford or Printed or Published there. Vol. 2: Oxford Literature 1450–1640, and 1641–1650</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912)
PRO:	Public Records Office

For ease of reference I have annotated the early material I use with either a Thomason Tract (TT) or a Wing Short Title Catalogue number in square brackets following the bibliographic reference. I refer to Falconer Madan's bibliographic numbering of texts published from Oxford as catalogued in his *Oxford Books* as 'Madan' but sometimes use specific page numbers if referring to details of entries or annals. The year is assumed to begin on 1 January and I have noted this with a square bracket correction. Manuscript abbreviations have been silently expanded but other than that texts have not been modernised in any way.

Introduction

Charles I was a Cavalier King and therefore had a small pointed beard, long flowing curls, a large, flowing hat and *gay attire*. The Roundheads, on the other hand, were clean-shaven and wore tall, conical hats, white ties and *sombre garments*. Under these circumstances a Civil War was inevitable.¹

Noe bound controules th'unweari'd space; but Hell,/ Endlesse as those dire paines which in it dwell.²

¹ W. C. Sellar and R. J. Yeatman, *1066 and All That* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1993), p. 75.

² Abraham Cowley, *The Civil War*, ed. by Allan Pritchard (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), II, 377–8.

The Royalist Reader in the English Revolution: Space, identity, text

In this thesis I concentrate on Royalist literature and culture of the early 1640s, particularly the period 1642–46 when Charles' court was based in Oxford. I look at the creation of an institutional discourse of Royalism, and analyse how this influenced cultural production and loyalist identity. As is implicit in my capitalisation of the word *Royalism*, I understand the institutional reconfigurations of the early 1640s to be a fully realised project undertaken in response to the threat of the Parliamentary enemy. Royalism was a conflation of cultural and social practices configured by the legal definitions and institutional discourses of Charles' government. The thesis particularly considers how the print discourse of Royalism constructed the notion of a loyalist subject, a 'Royalist reader'. Much historical work has shown that our understanding of allegiance during the conflict is often not attendant to extensive ambiguities and local complexities.³ However, the representation of political identity during the war, as opposed to the physical experience of life on the ground, was far less concerned with the ambivalence of loyalty than with using polemically informed definitions of behaviour to exclude and attack perceived enemies. My thesis is therefore a study of the *representation* of identity and allegiance during the period. All texts produced during the Civil War had a conscious polemic function, as has been shown by the work of David Norbrook, Nigel Smith, Lois Potter and James Loxley.⁴ Furthermore, I suggest

³ For instance, see Ann Hughes, 'The King, the Parliament and the localities during the English Civil War' in *The English Civil War*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London and New York: Arnold, 1997), pp. 261–287. Lucy Hutchinson's Commonplace Book (Nottingham Record Office, MS DD Hu/1), for instance, shows a politically motivated reader participating in the transmission of seemingly polarised texts. Her manuscript includes poems by Cleveland and Denham, and extracts from Nicholas Caussin's courtly love text *The Holy Court*. Hutchinson's political and cultural identity is obviously more complex than has hitherto been thought. I am grateful to David Norbrook for discussion of this manuscript and Hutchinson's reading.

⁴ David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England 1640–1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994); Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997).

throughout this thesis, texts all shared a similar goal: to define and construct their audience by establishing definitions and models of identity. This Introduction will trace the fundamental dynamics of the relationships and intersections between identity, text, space and reception in order to lay the basis for the analyses which appear in later Chapters.

The epigraphs to this section encapsulate and illustrate the two threads of my argument: that the Civil War was seen by Royalists as a conflict of identity; and that loyalist writers and poets defined identity in spatial terms. Sellar and Yeatman highlight the perceived polarisation of identities during the 1640s, illustrating the hermeneutic importance of particular signifiers in the formation of political and cultural identity. The Royalist pique devant beard, particular ways of speaking, worshipping, and acting in public, or the sombre attire of the puritan, were seen, in print at least, to construct a particular identity and enact certain modes of social and cultural behaviour. So, for instance, the 'Roundhead' is characterised by his 'short haire/ his little Beard and his longe Eares'.⁵ Such definitions for the King's side came from within the court at Oxford, and were based on an institutional discourse of inclusion. As Stuart Hall has recently written:

Precisely because identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse, we need to understand them as produced in specific discursive formations and practices, by specific enunciative strategies. Moreover, they emerge within the play of specific modalities of power, and thus are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are the sign of an identical, naturally constructed unity — an 'identity' in its traditional meaning.⁶

For Hall, the construction of identity is about inclusion and boundaries. Produced within circumscribed and controlled discourses, identity is defined in relation to what it is not, and, to develop Hall's underlying spatial assumptions, *where* it is not. Throughout his work he

⁵ Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 71, p. 11, l. 1.

⁶ 'Who needs Identity?' in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ed. by Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (London: Sage, 1996), pp. 1–18 (p. 4).

employs spatial metaphors of inclusion and exclusion, arguing that the ‘unity, the internal homogeneity which identity treats as fundamental’ is a ‘constructed form of closure’ (p. 5). Constructing an identity is about circumscribing discourse and prohibiting or denying entry to conflicting identities or modes of behaviour. Hall’s work offers a model of the construction of identity which will be useful in the following discussion. In particular, Hall’s model of identity acts as a bridge from *1066 and All That* to the second epigraph, which is from Abraham Cowley’s poem *The Civil War*. During the war Royalist poets deployed spatial metaphors to construct and define a sense of loyalist identity. They saw puritan or Parliamentary identities as stepping outside of the boundaries of authority, enacting a radical transgression which was unholy and treasonous, and in many cases, undefined by any known language or legal practice.⁷ For Cowley, the boundless and unfettered location is what defines Hell; it is spatially and temporally endless. By denying the ‘absolute space’ of a divinely created universe, the population of Hell is cast into an uncontrolled and unending abyss. Royalist poets defined loyalist behaviour as being subject to the ‘absolute space’ of the monarch, as a duty to act according to certain guidelines and boundaries.⁸

The Royalist project was concerned with constructing a notion of loyalist identity which was based on the exclusion of difference and the denial of any authority other than that of the King. In this thesis I will show how Royalist identity was defined and configured; I invoke the spatial inflections of the terms ‘defined’ and ‘configured’ intentionally in order to demonstrate how fundamentally important concepts of limiting,

⁷ In his poem ‘When first to th’Winds and Waves’ from the University collection of panegyric *Musarum Oxoniensium, Serenissimæ* (Oxford: 1643, by L. Lichfield), [TT E62 (14)], R. Meade defines the Parliamentary crimes as outside of the legislative imagination: ‘Shame o’their Country, who e’re have thought/ That beyond Treason they could start a fault’, ll. 29–30.

framing, confining and spatial modelling are to understanding constructions of social and cultural identity.⁹ In the thesis I illustrate how Royalist space was predicated upon scientific and mathematical notions of authority and hierarchy, and show how this sense of ‘absolute space’ inflected Royalist definitions of a variety of other conceptual or physical locations: gender, language and published texts, society, the public. Royalism was based upon set hierarchies and systems which constructed, organised, and controlled the subject and emphasised the authority of the King. My thesis traces how Charles used economic, political and juridical measures to impose certain socio-spatial relations and structures of identity.¹⁰

As has been suggested, space is not an unproblematic concept and the use or study of spatial metaphors should be informed by contemporary theorising on the subject. In their critique of the negligent deployment of spatial metaphor in the humanities and social sciences, Neil Smith and Cindi Katz argue for an understanding of the connection between physical and conceptual space:

In social theory and literary criticism, spatial metaphors have become a predominant means by which social life is understood [...] there has been little, if any, attempt to examine the different implications of material and metaphorical space. Metaphorical concepts and uses of ‘space’ have evolved quite independently from materialist treatments of space, and many of the latter are cast in ways that suggest equal ignorance of the productive entailments of spatial metaphors. Yet if a new spatialized politics is to be both coherent and effective, it will be necessary to comprehend the interconnectedness of material and metaphorical space (‘Grounding Metaphor’, p. 68).

⁸ See, for instance, James Ussher’s delineation of *The Sovereignes Power and the Subjects Duty: Delivered in a Sermon, at Christ-Church in Oxford, March 3. 1643* (Oxford, Printed for W. W., 1644) [TT: E36 (13)].

⁹ In the context of this study, it is significant that ‘configuration’ is a 1646 coinage and that the third sense of ‘define’, to limit or confine, is a 1643 coinage.

¹⁰ Neil Smith and Cindi Katz, ‘Grounding Metaphor: Towards a Spatialized Politics’ in *Place and the Politics of Identity*, ed. by Michael Keith and Steve Pile (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 67–84 (paraphrasing p. 73).

Commentators who use spatial figures undermine their work before it even begins by not even considering the significance of the term: ‘spatial metaphors are problematic in so far as they presume that space is not’ (Smith and Katz, ‘Grounding Metaphor’, p. 75).

Contemporary Marxist or Postmodern approaches define space as a product of social forces (Smith and Katz, ‘Grounding Metaphor’, pp. 76, 82–83). They point to the increased commodification of space, and are particularly interested in the urban dynamics of 19th- and 20th- century capitalism. Such theories have been recently shown to have rich possibilities for the discussion of social and cultural practices. As Michael Wiley has written, ‘Imaginative configurations of space — in literature, architecture or social utopian tracts, for instance — also can affect reality by demonstrating “real possibilities” for alternative modes of social and political life’.¹¹ The approaches of Henri Lefebvre, Neil Smith and David Harvey have been filtered into early modern England, most notably by Max Thomas, although his approach is based in semiology and often neglects material reality.¹² This study will use their work to begin thinking about the spaces of identity constructed during the first Civil War.

Space may be conceptualised in varying ways, and in the following discussion I will present certain definitions and attempt to show why such models of space are important to an understanding of the 1640s. Most theorists date the integration of contemporary ideas of space to the revival of classical philosophy and geometry during the European Renaissance. The theorists of what commentators have termed ‘absolute space’ were Copernicus, Newton, Kant and Descartes. They themselves were theorising a concept which had been in part created by the ‘emerging space-economy of capitalism [...] capitalist social relations in

¹¹ Michael Wiley, *Romantic Geography: Wordsworth and Anglo-European Spaces* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), p. 3.

Europe brought a very specific set of social and political shifts that established absolute space as the premise of hegemonic social practices' (Smith and Katz, 'Grounding Metaphor', p. 75). What they and others term 'absolute space' is a concept which underpins the construction of a hegemonic or hierarchically structured society. 'Absolute space' is linked to Platonic ideas of absolute or ultimate truth and ideal forms; it is the 'conception of space as a field, container, a co-ordinate system of discrete and mutually exclusive locations' (Smith and Katz, 'Grounding Metaphor', p. 75). All space can be measured and defined. This is particularly expressed in the geometry of Euclid; importantly for Royalist uses of 'absolute space' during the 1640s, Fournier's *Elementa Euclidis* was republished in Oxford in 1644 (Madan, #1748).

Rather than see space as empty, an area to be filled, Henri Lefebvre theorises the concept of space as crucially complicit in, and a result of, the production of social and cultural commodity relationships. This is in contrast to 'absolutist' and, as we will see, Royalist notions. Lefebvre conceives that all space is ideologically mediated. He argues that 'any space implies, contains and dissimulates social relationships — and this despite the fact that a space is not a thing but rather a set of relations between things (objects and products)'.¹³ Spaces are institutional locations created and maintained by the state to control and maintain the status quo:

It would be more accurate to say that [space] is at once a precondition and a result of social superstructures. The state and each of its constituent institutions call for spaces - but space which they can then organise according to their specific requirements; so there is no sense in which space can be treated solely as an *a priori* condition of these institutions and the state which presides over them. Is space a social relationship? Certainly - but one which is inherent to property relationships

¹² 'Urban Semiosis in Early Modern London', *Genre*, 30 (1997), 11–29.

¹³ Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. by Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1991), pp. 82–83.

(especially the ownership of the earth, of land) and also closely bound up with the forces of production (which impose a form on that earth or land); here we see the polyvalence of social space, its 'reality' at once formal and material. Though a *product* to be used, once consumed, it is also a *means of production*; networks of exchange and flows of raw materials and energy fashion space and are determined by it (Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, p. 85).

The state constructs spatial and social superstructures in order to create and maintain the notion of the subject. The English Civil War was in many ways a defence of this spatial privilege defined by Lefebvre, particularly associated with the land.¹⁴ The Royalist project defended an outmoded definition of absolutism which was predicated upon hierarchical and hegemonic social and spatial structures. Charles and his court deployed several institutional methods in order to control and maintain the social superstructures maintained by the Church, the State and the Universities. As Chapter One of this thesis will show, the extensive economic and institutional reforms undertaken by the court at Oxford were intended to bypass the authority of the Parliament and to create a financial and social context for the Royalist project. Later Chapters will navigate and negotiate Royalist metaphorical and material space, in particular, textual space. Lefebvre's illustrations of the inflections and hegemonic importance of the definition of space are therefore used to highlight the spatial assumptions and ideological configurations of the Royalist project.

The definition of space which Civil War Royalism deployed was 'absolute': it was definite, *a priori*, and could be controlled and defined. It was space produced and conceived by Copernican notions of the structured hierarchical nature of the universe. In part this was due to the revival of Platonism at the Caroline court, which emphasised the attainment of

¹⁴ 'But (Masters) if you knew how much your Estates, and Being depends on the life and safety of our good King, you would no sooner apprehend him in danger, then you would run to His rescue, as you would fly from Plague and beggery', *A Speech made by Alderman Garroway, At a Common-Hall* ([Oxford], Printed in the Yeare 1643) [TT: E245 (29)], p. 4. This speech was actually written by Edward Hyde (see discussion below); the text is attributed and discussed by Graham Roebuck, 'Cavalier' in *The English Civil War in the*

the ideal within a definite social and cultural order.¹⁵ Such Platonic-Copernican concepts stressed the attainment of an ideal within a Christian universe, with God as the ultimate arbiter and creator of space. Copernican theories of the hierarchical model of the universe were increasingly popular at court and the Universities throughout the 1630s and 40s.¹⁶ Royalist theory conceptualised the population of Britain as subjected within the space of the nation, defined and controlled by their relationship to the King. A Kingdom is not necessarily a geographical or topographical construct: 'You whose rare goodnesse in a Forraigne State/ New Subjects and a Kingdome could create'.¹⁷ Royalty constructs the absolute space of nation and creates the 'Subject': 'Scotland a faire part o'th' Kings house may fill,/ Let England be His Presence Chamber still'; 'for where he resorts,/ He creates Kingdomes too, as well as Courts'.¹⁸ The Royalist project attempted to impose this model of authority and absolutism and avoid the dialectical and problematic transgressions of the Parliamentarians.

Three examples will introduce the deeply complex language of space, identity and exclusion deployed by Royalist writers. In Mildmay Fane's survey of Northamptonshire, 'The Cosmography of this County', the poet addresses the disruption of normal spatial relationships and considers how this relates to the dislocation of identity and allegiance:

It alwaies in former times stood distinguished by

Literary Imagination, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 9–27 (p. 9).

¹⁵ See Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) for a discussion of Christian Neoplatonism, pp. 15–18.

¹⁶ For Copernicus at Oxford see Nicholas Tyacke, 'Science and Religion at Oxford before the Civil War' in *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History presented to Christopher Hill*, ed. by Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 73–94. See also the notebooks of John Greaves, Bod, Savile MS 47.

¹⁷ W. Creed, 'So in an instant sprung', *Musarum Oxoniensium Serenissimæ*, ll. 14–15.

¹⁸ Richard Stevenson, 'What were our latest feares', ll. 33–34; F Palmer 'Heark Damon, d'ost not heare the noyse', ll. 43–4, both from *Musarum Oxoniensium Serenissimæ*.

Longitude of east & West & yet held paralell ye
Hundreds to all seruices but now it is Lancht wounded
& cut through by so many miridian Lines hott fiery
Zealots or rather bonte feux fire brands of Cisme &
seeds men of all seditions yt it acknowledges noe bou
nding Tropicke but striues to Lay Leuell in ye
Equator both Day & Night a Like. Pesant & Peer
noe difference twixt Thrones & Coblers Bulkes.¹⁹

Fane contributes to a Royalist strand of positional or topographical poetry that decries the newly unstable latitudes. The traditional and set ways of mapping the nation have been challenged and upset by the myriad rules and structures of the Parliament. Geographical space itself has been sundered, and this is mapped onto social interaction. The aristocracy has been reduced to the same status as the peasant; the boundaries and rules that formerly ‘distinguished’ between particular social spaces have been transgressed. Hierarchies and hegemonies have been attacked and destroyed, and this levelling now admits ‘noe difference’, emphasising an equality and egalitarianism anathema to Royalists: ‘Pesant & Peer/ noe difference twixt Thrones & Coblers Bulkes’. This erosion of the crucial difference between class identity and structure is seen as physical and topographical.

For Royalists, therefore, space had both a metaphorical and a material significance. Material space was changed by metaphorical or conceptual shifts; similarly, metaphorical space, or text, was inflected by material circumstances and location. In a speech allegedly made at a contested physical space, the Guild Common Hall (see discussion in Chapter Three), Edward Hyde’s Alderman Garroway sought to highlight how the war was being fought for the physical and bodily safety of the subjects, which was inextricably linked to traditional ownership of the land: ‘I wonder what kinde of Government is preparing for Us, when they will not allow that the imprisonment of Our person is the taking away Our

¹⁹ Harvard, Eng. fMS 645, p. 29, ll. 1–9.

Liberty, or the taking away the twentieth part of our estates, is the destruction of our property' (*A Speech made by Alderman Garroway*, p. 6). The legal definitions of ownership and therefore citizenship have been ignored in favour of a mob rule. Garroway's speech was an official expression of Royalist notions of the city and definitions of behaviour, disguised as a loyalist expression of goodwill. Royalists saw that the war itself was a space, a theatrical stage: 'should the wars continue, what insufferable daily miseries must this wretched Kingdome expect, when all places shall onely be, as it were, constant scenes where Tragedies are daily acted.'²⁰

Metaphors of space are constantly deployed by Royalist texts throughout the war, and this final example will show how these tropes relate to loyalist concepts of reception and the construction of the reading subject. Richard Harwood's *The Loyall Subiect's Retiring-Roome, Opened in a Sermon at St Maries* figures the text as a peaceful space in which the reader can reflect and find diversion from the war and attendant troubles:

To a Person, alwayes Employed in the numerous perplexities of a troubled State, [...] a With-drawing Chamber may be as Welcome, as a Haven to the Mariner, after a Rough sea. Please your Honour to step into it, you shall find it ready furnished for your entertainment, not with the vaine trimmings of art, but those more reall ornaments of a noble mind, Prudence, and Patience.²¹

Harwood's conceptualisation highlights the dual significance of 'space' during the period. The text is imagined as a metaphorical space, a location of retirement from the world. It is also a physical space, an area with set limits and specified decoration. Harwood figures the quarto volume as a closet into which the loyal courtly reader can withdraw to find peace.

The text is a space which can be controlled, a safe haven from the 'numerous perplexities of

²⁰ *Prince Charles His Gracious Resolution Concerning the present Affaires of this Kingdome* (First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for John Rivers [1642]) [Wing C3041], p. 7.

²¹ *The Loyall Subiect's Retiring-Roome, Opened in a Sermon at St Maries, on the 13th day of Iuly, (being Act-Sunday) in the After-noone. A.D. 1645, Before the Honourable Members of both Houses of Parliament,*

a troubled State'. The space of the nation state itself has been upset and distended by the multivalent ambiguities and unstable parameters of the new situation. Books exist as objects within a social domain and both presuppose original material 'production' and imply a relationship with a public space. This passage demonstrates Smith and Katz's insistence on the 'interconnectedness of material and metaphorical space'; the text is a physical artifact which has a conceptual spatial dimension and inflection ('Grounding Metaphor', p. 68). Harwood figures the reader as drawn into a text which has a physical integrity and location. It is a room, a closet into which the interlocutor may step. As the lines from Cowley cited above illustrate, however, Royalist definitions of space were inextricably linked to questions of identity and this present example shows how by entering or engaging with a particular textual space a reader confirms and enacts their loyalty.

Therefore, space and spatial metaphor relating to text were of vital importance in the construction of a loyalist or Royalist identity. This concern with the space of the subject is reflected in Royalist reception theory. The following discussion will delineate how texts attempted to construct an idealised audience, a 'Royalist Reader', through the deployment of spatial definitions of subjection and text. Harwood's construction of the text as a ready-furnished space which the loyal reader enters presupposes that a text has a spatial quality which cannot be tampered with; it is definite and *a priori*, a room with physical walls and specific dimensions. Royalist reception theory was predicated upon the idea that the text was a metaphorical and material space. This space is tightly controlled, and therefore the 'Royalist reader' engaged with the text in a particularly structured and organised fashion. The title of my thesis alludes to Sharon Achinstein's book *Milton and the Revolutionary*

Assembled in Oxford (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645) [TT: E300(1)].

Reader, as well as various other books on reader-response and reception.²² The present study shares with Achinstein's a concern with the textual construction of the 'political subject'.²³ My work differs from studies of response and audience by concentrating on intention rather than reader actualisation. Royalist writers represented the action of reading as a closed activity undertaken in particular places and governed by specific rules. I do discuss the experience of reading during the war, and the conditions of experiencing text, but my primary purpose is to look at how authors and institutions intended their work to be read. I do not seek to deny reader-response reception theories but rather choose to concentrate upon the 'implied reader' rather than the actualising reader. Susan Wiseman provides a useful model:

The playlets of the 1640s, then, do suggest the ways in which *form* is being used by the newswriters to shape the imagined reader as a political subject and make opinion [...] Ultimately, the circulation of political debate in the pamphlet play consists in the texts imagining of a reader, a political subject, which it seeks to create and manipulate.²⁴

Wiseman's formulation of a 'political subject' suggests an audience with an active role in public debate. The imagined reader constructed by Royalist texts is more passive, an audience to be inscribed upon rather than one engaged with several conflicting discourses. As will be seen, however, the overwhelming tenor of Royalist genres - Letters, Speeches, Tracts, Sermons - is of a controlled dialogue. Royalist pamphlets created textual space which had specific boundaries and whose analogue was the controlled hierarchical nature

Sig. A2v.

²² In particular William H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995), Lucy Newlyn, *Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) and Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: the Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).

²³ *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 3.

of the royal court. The thesis considers the models constructed by Royalist writers for the reception of their text, and in particular their attempts to control and conceptualise the space of reading. I analyse the textual mediation of identity. This analysis of the spatiotemporal aspect of texts necessarily invokes the work of Roger Chartier and Michel de Certeau, whose notions of reception, actualisation and *espaces lisibles* point to the links between cultural, textual and material space which are the basis of this study. Chartier defines *espaces lisibles* as ‘texts in their discursive and material forms’ as opposed to texts being actualised by a reading.²⁵ My thesis depends on a notion that Royalist print culture constructed a particular *espace lisible* that was not concerned with the active reception or actualisation of the text and in fact found reader interaction or interrogation with a text problematic. The interpretative community or constituency of Royalism was not allowed to do much interpreting. This is obvious if we consider Robert Herrick’s poem ‘When he would have his verses read’, a verse which insists that his poetry is attended by social and religious behaviour of a decidedly polarised nature:

In Sober mornings, doe not then rehearse
The holy incantation of a verse;
But when that men have both well drunke, and fed,
Let my Enchantments then be sung, or read.²⁶

Herrick’s text creates an ‘intended’ reader who will approach his verse with particular care and enact various partisan modes of behaviour in order to define their polemic identity. The audience is constructed and controlled by their engagement with the verse. Their reception

²⁴ ‘Pamphlet Plays in the Civil War News Market: Genre, Politics and “Context”’ in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Joad Raymond (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 66–84 (p. 79).

²⁵ Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books*, trans. by Lydia G. Cochrane (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), p. 2.

of the poems is mediated by the intentions of the poet who controls the consumption and understanding of his verse. The thesis therefore analyses the strategies deployed by Royalists in attempting to control the actualisation of a text.

My intentionalist model of reader-response theory draws upon the work of Quentin Skinner, who sees texts as ‘speech-acts’ or conscious and active interventions in an ongoing contemporary debate:

Any text must include an intended meaning; and the recovery of that meaning certainly constitutes a precondition of understanding what its author may have meant [...] So I am far from supposing that the meanings of texts are to be identified with the intentions of their authors; what must be identified with such intentions is only what their authors meant by them.²⁷

As David Norbrook has written, it is necessary to view ‘literary concerns in the context of social rhetoric’ (*Writing the English Republic*, p. 10). J. G. A. Pocock and Skinner have highlighted the importance of ‘texts as events’, reading works within the context of their ‘illocutionary’ meaning.²⁸ The aim is, as Norbrook defines it, ‘to read poems not as timeless monuments or as part of a generalised and uniform culture but as engagements with other texts, involved in an ongoing process’ (*Writing the English Republic*, p. 11). Royalist texts are read as such ‘illocutionary’ acts, interventions in a contemporary debate inflected by censorship and a Royalist discourse of national identity and allegiance.

Furthermore, the works of Norbrook, Skinner and Pocock are themselves accounts of reader-response. Textual engagement presupposes a response to a text. Quentin Skinner

²⁶ *Hesperides, or, the Works Both Humane & Divine of Robert Herrick Esq* (London: Printed for John Williams, and Francis Eglesfield and are to be sold by Tho: Hunt, Book-seller in Exon. 1648) [Wing H1596], ll. 1–4.

²⁷ *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and his Critics*, ed. by James Tully (Oxford and Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), p. 261.

²⁸ J. G. A. Pocock, ‘Texts as Events: Reflections on the History of Political Thought’ in *The Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 21–35.

has modulated his position, granting the author more autonomy than he had previously allowed:

My argument may thus be said to exemplify a particular approach to the study and interpretation of historical texts. The essence of my method consists in trying to place such texts within such contexts as enable us in turn to identify what their authors were *doing* in writing them [...] What this means in practice is that I treat Hobbes's claims about *scientia civilis* not simply as propositions but as moves in an argument. I try to indicate what traditions he reacts against, what lines of argument he takes up, what changes he introduces into existing debates.²⁹

Hobbes's texts actively and consciously intervene in contemporary debate. They are responses to other texts, and present a model of reading within the particular methods they deploy and the tropes they use to negate and answer. In the same way, loyalist writers were also 'Royalist readers': they responded to the physical, textual and conceptual constructions of Royalism as expressed through official documentation and the ritual structures of the court. They wrote within a culture of censorship in which various specific readers were addressed. Their own reading and analysis of Royalist texts was expressed in their subsequent work. It is important to examine how they responded to, participated, and collaborated, in the construction of a Royalist cultural space. In particular it is important to analyse how, as readers, they allowed the experience of this reading to colour and influence their own writing. Their interventions into the contemporary political debate were explicitly motivated and influenced by Royalist bias. Their response to loyalist discourse is to use it in their own work. They validate the literal space of such texts and emphasise the text's power as a 'narrative of space' in constructing 'a place of its own'; their inclusion of elements from Royalist discourse, be it image, metaphor, social model or generic

²⁹ Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 7–8.

innovation, actualises ‘the spatial divisions which underlie and organise a culture’.³⁰ The spaces which they deny or exclude, ‘answer’ and attack, are Parliamentary in character. Royalist poetics were ‘elaborately dialectic’ and part of this aspect is an innate dialogue with an Other, the textually constructed entity which is Parliament (Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 96).

Reader-reception theory has long depended on identifying sets of ‘interpretative communities’, a collective which possesses a common language and identity. Meaning is dependent upon the reader sharing with the text a set of conventions; an understanding of a text implies the awareness of a specific language.³¹ Texts demand and expect a ‘fit’ or ‘informed’ reader who responds to the systematic deployment of recognisable signs. The constrictive nature of loyalist spaces, and their value in creating interpretative communities, can be shown by considering the example of language. Publications were spaces constructed by a system of authority, the King’s language. As Sharon Achinstein has argued, this is why Royalist constructions of the Parliamentary project are so concerned with language: attempts to refigure the space of language, as with all attempts to alter previously hierarchically structured spaces, were seen as attacking the absolute space controlled by the authority of the King.³² My discussion of the Royalist grammar *Vindex Anglicus* in Chapter Two will show how loyalist linguistic theories were extremely hierarchical and predicated upon the authority of the King’s divinely apportioned language.

³⁰ Michel de Certeau, *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*, trans. by Brian Massumi (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), pp. 67, 68.

³¹ See Stanley Fish, ‘Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics’ and Jonathan Culler, ‘Literary Competence’, both in *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 70–101, 101–18. For an application of these ideas see Stanley Fish, *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost* (London: Macmillan, 1967) and Nicholas von Maltzahn, ‘Milton’s Readers’ in *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*, ed. by Dennis Danielson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 236–53.

As Judith Butler has argued, language is itself an instrument of censorship, as the rules of grammar “‘decided” prior to any individual decision are precisely the constraining conditions which make possible any given decision [...] The speaking subject makes his or her decision only in the context of an already circumscribed field of linguistic possibilities.’³³ Royalist theory of language meant that as an interpretive community, everyone was subject to the linguistic rules and authoritative space controlled by the King. Language created an identity which was fundamentally Royalist. This repressive aspect of expression was addressed by Parliamentary intellectuals such as John Wilkins and Samuel Hartlib, who throughout the 1640s ‘seriously considered the development of a truly open, dogmatically neutral means of (written) communication’, a universal language free from monarchical hierarchies.³⁴ The efforts of Hartlib and his circle illustrate that the Parliamentary intelligentsia recognised this and were constructing radical new strategies to avoid complicity with the monarch by establishing a language of knowledge exchange.

Royalist texts attempted to construct their readership, assuming a shared ideological sympathy inherent in the very language. Rather than allow the reader an active role in the construction of meaning and an intervention in political debate, as was the intention of the polyvocal parliamentary works, Royalist texts attempted to communicate within a language of obedience, to create a loyal imagined audience, the ‘Royalist reader’. Crucial to this relationship is the close involvement of the court in the production and circulation of

³² ‘The Politics of Babel in the English Revolution’, in *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution*, ed. by James Holstun (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 14–45.

³³ *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997), p. 129. For notions of secrecy and closed language in later Royalist writing, see Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*.

³⁴ Gerhard F. Strasser, ‘Closed and open languages: Samuel Hartlib’s involvement with cryptology and universal languages’ in *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, ed. by Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

texts. The centralised body attempted to control a closed 'interpretative community'. Foremost in the construction of such an ideal is the preliminary matter addended to texts. The discussion of dedications and prefaces in Chapter Two highlights the profound difference between Parliamentarian and Royalist notions of the role of the 'reader'; parliamentary texts addressed the possibility of a multitude of readings, deploying a language of subservience recognisably based on patronage negotiation and enfranchising their audience into the political debate, whereas Royalist texts denied the reader the ability to interpret or create meaning. Works denied the possibility of independent or interpenetrative readings by insisting that meaning was innate or immanent in the text, emphasising centralised control of interpretation and the subjugation of the audience. They actively denied the empowering of the reader which Parliamentary texts assumed and the collapse of licensing had enabled.³⁵

The model of Civil War textuality I present in this thesis is at considerable odds with most contemporary criticism of the period. I build on the work of James Loxley and Lois Potter, not least in assuming that Royalist literature is engaged and worthy of study. With the exception of Potter and Loxley, critics have tended to focus primarily on work produced from London, and have assumed that the collapse of the Star Chamber in 1641 led to a newly 'free' marketplace of print and a proliferation of textual interaction with the political debate. Nigel Smith succinctly characterises what is seen to be the effect of the growing print marketplace: 'The enhanced use of print made possible the exchange of

1994), pp. 151–161 (p. 151). See also Jana Pšivratská and Vladimír Pšivratský, 'Language as the product and mediator of knowledge: the concept of J. A. Comenius' in the same volume, pp. 162–175.

³⁵ For parliamentary reactions see Lucasta Miller, 'The Shattered *Violl*: Print and Textuality in the 1640s', in *Essays and Studies 1993*, ed. by Nigel Smith (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993), pp. 25–39.

views in a public forum' (*Literature and Revolution*, p. 26). Sharon Achinstein analyses what she terms a 'revolution in reading':

Released from the bonds of censorship, eager pamphlet writers during the English Revolution ushered in a new era of political conduct. They put arguments about the people's rights and duties into actual practice by reaching out to an audience of the people and by presenting matters that had previously been censored. They did this by demanding that their audiences make political choices and that they participate in the political process: in sum, they invoked a revolutionary idea of the reader (*Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*, p. 3).

Achinstein's model reveals much about contemporary criticism of the war period. In particular, her diction suggests an inflexible reading of the events predicated upon various assumptions: writers were 'newly freed from the constraints' or 'bonds' of censorship; homogenous audiences were themselves enfranchised to 'make political choices'. This language of emancipation reflects a politicised interest in the workings of the English 'revolution'. Critics have focused their attention upon texts which challenged the authority and hegemonic structures of the King and the establishment. Literary critics and historians who have written about the period have tended to concentrate on literature and discourse written in support of Parliament. Nigel Smith suggests that 'Royalist literature was condensed, flattened, stopped. Much of it was produced in covert manuscript form' (*Literature and Revolution*, pp. 11–12). This denies validity to the 900 or more texts published from Oxford during the war. Furthermore, as is shown in Chapter Two, not all of England had been 'released from the bonds of censorship' (*Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*, p. 3). Texts produced at Oxford were still read by the official censor, and published by controlled presses. Parliament reimposed licensing in 1643. Cheap print and the theoretical defence of reasoned debate were only one aspect of the construction of political identity during the civil war. The fact that hundreds of texts were printed does not necessarily imply that access to them was greatly widened; outside London transmission

and circulation of pamphlets was poor, and literacy rates were still very low (not to mention the actual cost of the items, which precluded many).³⁶ My contention is that critics who have addressed Parliamentary languages of authority, disobedience and notions of the public during the Civil War have defined them in opposition to a discourse we still know little about. Royalist literature is still a relatively 'unmapped' area. Achinstein's model of the 'revolutionary idea of a reader' needs to be tested against other conflicting identities.

The thesis is presented in two sections. The opening two Chapters establish the circumstances and contexts of Royalist textual production. They outline the definitions and models of Royalism addressed throughout the rest of the study. Chapter One examines the conditions of production and the institutional structuring of Royalist identity; Chapter Two analyses the status of production and illustrates how texts attempted to influence and construct their 'intended reader'. The first Chapter concentrates on the court at Oxford. The court is central to any discussion of a construction of Royalist identity or a Royalist project; its influence on the culture and thought of those who defended and supported the King was profound both conceptually and materially. The Chapter begins by reviewing the material changes which were attendant upon the movement to Oxford. New manuscript and archival material is used to reconstruct the organisation and structure of the court. In particular I consider the institutional reconfiguration of the court, and illustrate the consequences this had for cultural and national identity. The Chapter analyses institutional changes and how these were represented through printed proclamations. I look at how the official proclamations and protocols issued by the King from Oxford constructed an institutional

³⁶ David Cressy's study of literacy is the only rigorous historical examination of this subject for the period. He calculates that 'more than two-thirds of the men and nine-tenths of the women [in England] were so illiterate at the time of the Civil War that they could not even write their own names' and that 70% of the

version of identity and allegiance. The models of obedience created by the court's reconfiguration of Royalist culture influenced all publications emanating from Oxford. The framework or superstructure of centralised authority constructed a particularly Royalist identity.

The second Chapter analyses the notion of publication and the private for Royalist writers during this period, with particular attention to issues of reception. I consider the physical means of textual production, and give close attention to licensing, Royalist reception theory and constructions of an 'intended reader'. Texts work hard to construct an implied readership, a process of exclusion which does not allow debate. In particular the Chapter examines how Royalist texts conceive of a supine and passive audience, controlled and unable to challenge the authority of the text. I use various examples to illustrate how Royalist textuality evolved a closed, controlled nature in contrast to the open, transforming nature of publication in London. In particular I discuss the importance of censorship in the construction and transmission of texts.

The second half of the thesis considers a wide variety of works published at Oxford, considering specific modes (panegyric, elegy) and forms (speeches, satires, epic, topographical verse). These texts are read within the parameters outlined in the opening Chapters, and the section analyses how they respond to, celebrate and criticise centrally imposed models of space, controlled textuality and engaged identity. Chapter Three considers the relationship between public oration and published text. Concepts of public and private space are very important in Royalist polemic attacks on Parliament. The Chapter explores how loyalist speeches attempted to reproduce the moment of their

male population in the 1640s was unable to read or write, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and*

delivery in order to control their innate meaning. The transforming public domain radically altered Royalist notions of print and this, linked with an engaged partisan poetics, led to the evolution of a new concept of panegyric.

Chapter Four considers the university volume *Musarum Oxoniensum Serenissimæ Epitabaria*, published to celebrate the arrival of Henrietta Maria in Oxford. This Chapter links with Chapter Three in a discussion of panegyric. It also includes an extensive discussion of Royalist articulations of socially constructed gender roles in response to the profoundly unsettling changes taking place in London, and the problematising of masculinity inherent in representations of lengthy and bloody warfare. *Serenissimæ*, and the companion volume *Bevill Grenville* (discussed in Chapter Five), are unique texts of the period. Published within a month or so of each other, they represent a specific mode of Oxford panegyric, and consist a unique corpus of poetry produced from within the city during the war.³⁷ As such they are arguably the apotheosis of Royalist expression. The University asserted and protected its unique monopoly of discourse with these publications. The *Serenissimæ* volume in particular reanimates a traditional University genre in order to publicly praise the order and control of the Stuart monarchy. Chapter Five looks at Royalist poets as readers and considers their reactions to and collaborations with the discourse of Royalism.

Writing in Tudor and Stuart England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 2, 72–3.

³⁷ Bevill Grenville died on 5 July 1643, and the Thomason copy of *Bevill Grenville* is annotated 'Aug: 12'. The Queen entered Oxford in late July of the same year, and the Thomason copy of *Serenissimæ* is annotated 'July 31'.

Chapter 1

The Court at Oxford: Institutional Royalism

The state is more than the sum of its institutions; it exists through those institutions, but is also above and beyond them. It is power, propaganda, a climate of opinion, culture. It inhabits our minds, shaping our beliefs and desires.¹

Whereby I can tell, all things will be well,
When the King enjoys his own again.²

¹ Tom Paulin, paraphrasing Hegel, *Minotaur: Poetry and the Nation State* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1992), p. 1.

² Martin Parker, 'Upon defacing of White-hall' datable to the late 1640s, quoted from *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse* ed. by David Norbrook and H. R. Woudhuysen (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993), ll. 7–8.

1.1 Introduction

This opening Chapter outlines the structures of the new court at Oxford and analyses the creation of a newly configured Royalist identity through institutional reform. In particular I analyse the construction of Royalism socially, culturally, economically and legally. I argue that it became necessary to reconfigure the space of subjection and to institutionally define the boundaries of loyalist identity.

As work on allegiance during the war has consistently argued, loyalty to a centralised party or ideological system was largely subsumed by domestic and local rivalries. This Chapter therefore does not attempt to analyse the reality of Royalist identity, but rather to demonstrate how a certain type of Royalist identity was constructed and encouraged. The Chapter will briefly concentrate on the movement of the court to the city and then analyse in depth the construction of a Royalist identity and discourse through institutional and legislative reform. Oxford is of central importance during the war years. It became a locus of allegiance, and represented a particular ideological standpoint. London became forcibly displaced as the central locus for Royalist consciousness. Those at court actively constructed Oxford as the Heavenly inverse of London's Hell. To an extent this was facilitated by the King's settling his court at Oxford, which in itself was necessitated by the unforeseen length of the war. It was also a result of the King's need to divorce his court entirely from Westminster, materially and conceptually. As a result of this conceptual focus, it is my contention that work not produced at Oxford had a very different inflection to that published from the city. Texts were produced within a close culture of control and collaboration, printed at the bequest of the court. Chapter Three discusses how the spatial origin of texts was an important aspect of their meaning and nuance for Royalists; Oxford was perhaps the most crucial interpretative location of all during the war.

In this Chapter I look in particular at how Royalism presented itself to the world and defined itself now that this self-dramatisation had become necessary. The legal and economic space of nation became focused through the King; the hierarchies of 'absolute space' were institutionally defined through the configuration of a Royalist superstructure. Furthermore, the legal discourse of war Royalism defined civil identity and attempted to construct the subject. The section analyses the creation of an institutional identity for the court by the Proclamations and official documents issued by Charles and the Oxford Parliament during the war period. In a series of what are effectively statutes the King attempted to recreate the institutional identity of his Westminster court in Oxford and issued edicts for how his people should behave, believe, live and conduct themselves. The Proclamations worked to create a model of Royalism and define the space of subjection. They encoded certain fundamental elements into their version of loyalty: denial of the status and legality of Parliament, unwavering devotion to the King and his authority, and, importantly for notions of privacy and freedom, a judicial definition of allegiance whereby use of London courts was both illegal and disloyal. I establish the contexts for the textual creation of civil war Royalism, and the institutional measures deployed for the construction of a loyalist identity.

The Chapter begins by analysing the physical situation for those who joined the King at his court. This section will give an insight to the material and mental world of the court that produced the central texts and definitions of civil war Royalism. Charles' official and unofficial entourage found themselves in new circumstances. The opulence of the 1630s courts was replaced by an overcrowded city full of disease and deprivation. Whilst painting and music still continued to be important in the cultural life of the court, they can hardly be said to have flourished; William Dobson, the semi-official portraitist, had to

husband his paint, resulting in some poorly executed works.³ My contention is that the newly configured court structures and the physical conditions affected the work produced by writers and poets during the war years, as later considerations of Abraham Cowley, Thomas Weaver and Martin Lluellyn will demonstrate.

I use manuscript material to establish a new understanding of the physical circumstances of those attending the King at Oxford, in particular pertaining to the arrangement of court and household. I then analyse the structures of government implemented by the King, in particular the Council of War and the evolution of the Privy Council. The King governed through the new Council of War and by ignoring the skeleton Parliament he called in 1643. Attention is paid to the ramifications the centralising of power had upon the construction of a Royalist identity in relationship to the locally orientated politics and motivations of the country. I then consider how the reconfigurations of legal and institutional procedures constructed a new identity for the English subject, a Royalist mode of behaviour. The final section of the Chapter moves to analyse *Mercurius Aulicus*, the newsletter by which much of this new information was transmitted to the country.

1.2 The occupation of Oxford

The city of Oxford was initially occupied in late August 1642 by Royalist forces under Sir John Byron. After the raising of the Royal Standard in Nottingham the Mayor of Oxford had dutifully ordered the publishing of Royal Proclamations, and in August of that year both the city and the university had begun to arm themselves. Byron and his forces entered relatively peaceably; he was publicly welcomed by the University vice-chancellor and the

³ Dobson's later Oxford portraits 'give the impression of an artist eking out very meagre resources [...] as conditions grew worse in Oxford, he was simply starved of the materials with which to paint', Malcolm

Mayor who 'gave Sir John and his companie wine drinke and a free welcome.'⁴ The city council was more lukewarm; rejecting Mayor Leonard Bowman's proposals that they join the university in fortifying, several of them prepared a list of grievances to be sent to Parliament.⁵ When Lord Say approached in September with a superior force Byron left the city.⁶ The Royalist fortifications were dismantled, University men disarmed, and recusant houses searched.⁷

Parliamentary forces stayed until late October. After the battle of Edgehill Charles directed his army toward Oxford, it being 'the only city of England that he could say was entirely at his devotion', arriving on 29 October.⁸ The months of keeping nomadic courts at York and Nottingham had been unsettling and were not practical for the running of a military campaign or a nation. As the war progressed it became obvious that the struggle would be longer than was at first anticipated, and it grew imperative to establish a base and focus for the Royalist effort. The King settled his garrison, court and executive in Oxford, and the city became a symbolic locus for the Royalist contingent. Whilst Charles still

Rogers, *William Dobson, 1611–46* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1984), p. 19.

⁴ *HMC 17* (House of Lords, New Series, XI), p. 325.

⁵ *HMC 17*, pp. 322–33.

⁶ Robert Pinke, the vice-Chancellor, wrote to the then Chancellor the Earl of Pembroke for protection, *A Letter Sent from the Provost Vice-Chancellour of Oxford* (London: Printed by L. N. for E. Husbands and J. Franck and are to be sold at their shops in the Middle-Temple, and next door to the Kings head in Fleet-street, 1642) [TT: E116 (38)]. The piece was printed by the command of Parliament, and includes Pembroke's answer in which he accuses the University of bringing trouble on itself: 'the admitting of Cavaleers, and taking up Arms, could not but make the University a Notorious mark of oppositions against the Parliament, and therefore to be opposed by it. If you had contained your selves within the decent modest bounds of an University, you might justly have challenged me', p. 6. The University is spatially defined by its 'modest bounds'; Oxford has stepped beyond these.

⁷ Cp. the pamphlets *A Happy Victory Obtained by the Trained Band of Oxford Against 400. Cavaleers that had intrencht themselves neere the said City, Sept 7. 1642* (London: Printed for Thomas Cooke, 1642), and *University Newes, or, the Unfortunate proceedings of the Cavaliers in Oxford. Wherein is declared, The severall Misdemeanors and uncivill Behaviour of the two hundred and fifty Troopers which came from his Majesty to assist the Schollers against the Parliament* (London: Printed for John Wright), Madan #1036, #1037.

⁸ Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, 6 vols, ed. by W. Dunn Macray (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1888), VI, 375.

issued Proclamations from travelling courts at Reading or Shrewsbury, they were published at Oxford and the city became the institutional and executive centre of the country for those who denied the legality of the Parliamentary officers in London.

Charles' motives for choosing Oxford are unclear. He often thought to move the garrison to Reading, and important to any consideration of the city-court during the war is that it was the centre of a military campaign with the overcrowding, fear and camp-fever which this entailed. The geographical situation seemed eminently useful to the King. Campaigns in the West Country, Midlands, Wales and even Cornwall could be easily monitored, whilst access to London and Parliament was relatively straightforward. Slightly less helpful were the economic conditions. The county was extremely poor: in the 1636 ship-money assessments it had fallen from second to seventeenth place amongst English counties ranked in order of wealth. The policy of monopolies and general mismanagement had adversely affected the wool trade. There was some military use for the locally produced leather and blankets, but on the whole the country around Oxford produced lace, gloves, stone, bells and decorative steel-work. It was not an ideal situation for a garrison, and evidence suggests that Oxford was still conceived as a temporary base. Sir Richard Wynn's papers include his accounts for the running and maintenance of Henrietta Maria's house in Wimbledon. The accounts indicate that the house was kept, at least superficially or cosmetically, as the garden was particularly cared for.⁹ Despite protestations to the contrary,

⁹ Accounts for the house at Wimbledon are in the National Library of Wales, Wynnstay MSS 167 (1642–3), 170 (1643–4), 171 (1645–7), 172 (1648–9, the year of Wynn's death), and 168 (list of wages and pensions for 1642). MS 168 suggests that payments of pensions and stipends virtually ceased in 1642, but the household accounts show that there was evidently still a standing 'household' of servants (there is a list in MS 167 fol. 107v, in reverse), although the house was obviously run in a very low key way. It is interesting, however, that the place was not taken over by Parliament; furthermore, it is an indication that London was still very much the central focus for the royal family. For a monarchy that was obsessed with location, the case of the house at Wimbledon is a hangover to the heady days of the 1630s; and, increasingly important, it was not cheap: the wages and ordinary expenses for the household ran to £202-14-00 in 1643 (MS 167, fol.

the continued maintenance of the house in Wimbledon shows that Henrietta Maria obviously envisaged returning.

As a basis for a court, the city had several advantages: it was extremely familiar, a hierarchically based society, and had enough private space to map a court structure of sorts onto the physical topography of the University. Laud's chancellorship had attempted to create a 'perfect model for the commonweal, an academy from which those nurtured through discipline to virtue might emerge as governors of a well-ordered nation'; this model was presented to the King during his lavish Visitation in 1636.¹⁰ The proceedings for this event included loyalist drama, and the reputation of the colleges for producing highly acclamatory panegyric verse meant that Oxford had a particularly Royalist cachet even before the arrival of the King.¹¹ Laud saw his University as a microcosm of the State. His Statutes were 'in a sort the outward and visible face of the University' and as a model for the government of Church and State revealed his love of order and centralised power.¹² They combined a rigid collegiate system with an increase in the involvement of the University in student's lives. Opponents complained that the authority of the Chancellor and his representatives was absolute and unquestionable. However, Laud saw this authority as an important step to preserving the order and unity of the University, and, by extension, the state.

97v, in reverse); gardeners were much cheaper, but still ate into an impoverished budget. Other palaces also kept a staff, see the complaints about non payment of wages PRO, LS 8/1 and LS 8/2.

¹⁰ Kevin Sharpe, 'Archbishop Laud and the University of Oxford' in *History and Imagination: Essays in honour of H. R. Trevor-Roper*, ed. by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl and Blair Worden (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1981), pp. 146–65 (p. 150).

¹¹ See Raymond A. Anselment, 'The Oxford University Poets and Caroline Panegyric' in *John Donne Journal*, 3 (1984), 181–201.

¹² Laud quoted in Sharpe, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 147.

On the whole, the university was very sympathetic to Charles. He had personal dealings with several of the senior academics through Laud; both Thomas Laurence (Master of Balliol) and Christopher Potter (Provost of Queen's) had attended the King as chaplains. Several Masters had preached before him (Obadiah Walker from University, for instance), and those friendly to Laud included Robert Pink (New) and Christopher Potter (Queen's). However, there were pockets of resistance, such as Nathaniel Brent (Merton) who was a hostile witness at Laud's trial. Despite Clarendon's claims, moreover, the city itself was not particularly loyalist. John Whistler, Member of Parliament for Oxford, articulated popular hostility to the Royalist occupation, and was arrested in December for urging the citizens not to aid with the fortifications or take up arms for the King. The citizens resented being pressed into working on the town's defences (on pain of a shilling a day) and their sullen unproductivity led to the draft for such work having to be extended to women in 1643.

On his arrival in the city Charles was welcomed at Penniless Bench by the vice-chancellor and the deputy university orator, Richard Gardiner.¹³ Charles made a brief speech in which he emphasised the importance of the city: 'and so esteemed none apter to be made by Us the residence of Our Person; and here, if Our more weightie occasions call us not hence, We intend to abide.'¹⁴ In his declamation the King equates learning with civilisation and war with ignorance. Study encourages loyalty, an echo perhaps of Laud's

¹³ *The Kings Maiesties Speech, As It was delivered the second of November before the University and City of Oxford. Together With a gratulatory Replication expressed by that learned Man Doctor William Strode, Orator for the famous University of Oxford* (First printed at Oxford, and now re-printed at London, 1642) [Wing C2778]. Gardiner gave the speech in place of Strode. The King was presented with a pair of gloves, somewhat less than he had received at his last visit in 1636, 'gloves given at his Majesty's coming to Oxford, £9 10s 0d', *Oxford Council Acts 1626–1665*, ed. by M.G. Hobson, H. E. Salter and J. Carter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 426.

¹⁴ *A Speech Delivered By the Kings Most Excellent Maiestie, In The Convocation House at Oxford, To The Vice-Chancellour, and other Doctors, and Students of the Universitie, expressing his intentions of abiding there* (Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the Universitie. 1643) [TT: E84 (27)], p. 6. Thomason received this on 9 January, 1643.

vision of Oxford (p. 3). Charles' speech emphasises that his residence in Oxford is only temporary, 'till Wee can with safety to Our honour and Person in peace returne to the Jerusalem of Our Nation, Our City of *London*' (p. 6).¹⁵ In the early exchanges of the war much of Royalist discourse centred upon the importance of the capital. In December of 1642 the Privy Council appealed to the citizens of the city to 'promote & give the first moving to an accomodation of peace.'¹⁶

The city and county were quickly disarmed, and the city was quickly transformed into a working garrison. The undergraduates formed garrisons, and drilled on Christ Church Meadow and in the college grounds. The Royalist garrison was forcibly billeted in the city, and the Colleges taken over for military purposes. Magdalen housed the arsenal, the Academic Schools were used to store grain or produce uniforms; New Hall Inn became the Mint and the Castle a prison.¹⁷ Osney Abbey was transformed into a powder mill, and Wolvercote into a sword factory. In 1644 the demolition of the Corn-market provided lead (from the roof) for bullets. The cavalry went to Abingdon. When the minority Assembly came to sit in Oxford the Commons occupied the Great Convocation House and the Lords the Upper Schools. The Queen, for her short time in the city, lodged at Merton, whilst the King had apartments in Christ Church. Sir Edward Nicholas stayed at Pembroke for the duration. The rest of the colleges provided accommodation for the court and the men, who

¹⁵ The figuring of London as Charles' lost Jerusalem was common in religious and political tracts of the period 1642–3, compare Laud's *A Letter Sent from the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury* (Ordered to be printed, First at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for Edward Vere [1642]) [TT: E83 (27)]: '[I desire] no longer life for any end, but to this, to see his Majestie, the glory of our Israel, returne to his Jerusalem, all differences attoned betwixt him and his Parliament', p. 8.

¹⁶ *A Message sent from the Lords of his Majesites Most Honourable Privie Counsaile, now resident with His Majestie Directed to the Citizens of London* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield. 1642)[TT: E130 (12)], pp. 4–5.

¹⁷ For the organisation of military activities in the City, see *The Royalist Ordnance Papers 1642–1646*, ed. by Ian Roy, *Oxfordshire Record Society*, 43 (1963–4). The prison was source of much Parliamentary demonising of Oxford, see for instance Edmund Chillenden's *The Inhumanity of the Kings Prison-Keeper At*

virtually flooded the city.¹⁸ The parish of St. Aldate's had 405 strangers billeted in 74 small 2- or 4- roomed houses, plus the normal inhabitants.¹⁹ A 1643 Census recorded 3320 males between the ages of 16 and 60; the wartime population of the city has been estimated at around 10000 or more.²⁰ In December 1642 there were 2000–2500 foot garrisoned with three troops of horse. These numbers steadily increased as the King mustered his troops. Parliamentary spies in December 1643 reported a garrison of between 2500 and 10000. The Committee for the Safety of Both Kingdoms reported that Charles left on campaign in 1644 with 3000 men, leaving a garrison of '1500 soldiers, a regiment of scholars, and one of townsmen, besides about 300 horse.'²¹

The physical consequences of this burgeoning population were debilitating. Outbreaks of camp-fever occurred regularly during the occupation.²² The colleges soon found that their expenditure on waste removal increased alarmingly, and the City Council wrote to the King on 27 March 1643 that

Whereas great complaint is made to his Majestie for the not clenseing the streets of this Cittie, but suffring the filth and dust to lie in the same, not onelie to the scandoll of the government of this place but allsoe to the great dainger of breeding an infeccon amongst us'.²³

Oxford (London: Printed for G. D. for John Bull, 1643) [Wing C3876]. See also Barbara Donagan, 'Prisoners in the English Civil War', *History Today*, 41 (1997), 28–36.

¹⁸ 'Our will and pleasure is that you forthwith Issue ye Wts to seuerall hundreds and parishe of this our County of Oxford - (where none of our souldiers are quartered) requiringe the Inhabitants thereof forthwith to bringe into such colledges within our City of Oxford such and so many bedds out of the same as they and any of them may conieniently spare for the lodgeinge our Souldiers', copy of warrant to the High Sheriff of Oxfordshire, 20 Jan [1643], in Edward Walker's hand, BL, Harleian MS 6851, fol. 101r.

¹⁹ Margaret Toynbee and Peter Young, *Strangers in Oxford: a side light on the First Civil War 1642–1646* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1973); for the list of strangers in the parish of St. Aldate's, see Bod, Add. MS D.114.

²⁰ Census taken on 7 June, 1643, Bod, MS 28189, fol. 17r–v and another copy at Bod, Add. MS D.114, fol. 19r; population calculated by Peter Young and Wilfrid Emberton, *The Cavalier Army: its Organisation and Everyday Life* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974), p. 49.

²¹ *CSPD 1644*, 6 June, p. 212.

²² MS order by the Lords and Commissioners 'for the obseruance and execution of the Statute made for the releife and ordering of persons infected with the Plague', Bod, Add. MS D.114, fol. 164r.

²³ *Oxford Council Acts 1626–1665*, p. 112. University College Accounts record 'For carrying away 69 loads of dirt at severall times 1-10-0', a major amount of the 3-5-0 maintenance expenditure, University College Archives, BU2/F1/1 (General Account Book 1632–1667), fol. 167r; New College similarly lists 'So to to

The civilised urban space is being infiltrated by dirt and disease. John Taylor, employed by Charles 'To see the Rivers clensed, both nights and dayly', complained of finding:

Dead Hogges, Dogges, Cats, and well flayd Carryon Horses
Their noysom Corpses soyld the Waters Courses:
Both swines and Stable dunge, Beasts guts and Garbage,
Street durt, with Gardners weeds and Rotten Herbage.²⁴

Such conditions inevitably led to rampant disease: 'from those Waters filthy putrifaction,/ Our meat and drinke were made, which bred Infection' (ll. 259–60). This disgust at the violation of what was a pure, clean space can be equated with the concomitant fear of the invasion of public space by multiplying unclean discourses; as Peter Stallybrass and Allon White have written, models of cleanliness were very much concerned with the purity of society and the exclusion of the transgressive and dirty.²⁵ The 'great dainger of breeding an infeccon amongst us' voices a worry that the once clearly defined and healthy public body is disintegrating; the clear lines and hierarchies of the city space are being eroded and destroyed by the burgeoning dirt invasion. The cramped and diseased conditions have been created and fostered by the Parliamentary rebellion and subsequent war, and Taylor's poem emphasises the constant Royalist vigilance necessary to prevent the waters being infiltrated by unclean and uncivic discourse.²⁶

Souldiers for loadinge & cartinge out the dust in the court', New College Archives, 4204 (Bursar's Accounts 1643–44). The Privy Council wrote to Sir Arthur Aston, Governor of the city, regarding the 'way leadeing from the North Gate to St John Colledge and so on to the works is extraordinary bad and so ill kept as it is almost unpassable both for water wch hath no passage, and for durt, that is seldome or never carried away', 15 August 1643, PRO, PC/2/153, p. 215.

²⁴ *Mad Verse, Sad Verse, Glad Verse and Bad Verse* ([Oxford, 1644]) [Wing T479], ll. 254, 255–58.

²⁵ Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (London: Methuen, 1986).

²⁶ Springs and rivers are important motifs in Royalist poetry of the period, see discussion in Chapter Four, below, and Taylor's poem links particularly with Leonard Lichfield's metaphor of the Royalist press: 'The spring/ Must needs be Cleare that issues from the King', 'THE PRINTERS CONCLUSION To Her MAJESTIE', *Musarum Oxoniensium Serenissimæ* (Oxford: 1643, by L. Lichfield), ll. 3–4.

The entourages surrounding the various figures and institutions newly arrived in the city were so large they led the King to issue a Proclamation to ease the overcrowding.²⁷ The central importance of the city of Oxford to the Royalist project was iterated in a Proclamation against the wasting of crops in the county by the occupying army (no such command was issued for any other area).²⁸ Proclamations focused specifically on Oxford, and show that despite the banning of ‘unnecessary persons’ the city was still greatly overcrowded:

Whereas the presence of His Majestie in His Royall Person, and of His Court and Army in, and about the City of Oxford, do of necessity draw thither, and unto the adjacent parts, a great confluence of People, and in the time of Lent it will not be possible that provision can be made for such great a multitude, unlesse His Majesty be pleased to dispence with those penalties.²⁹

The Proclamation also suggests an assumption that the court was ‘of necessity’ huge and expansive. College archives testify to the crowded conditions: entries in the Bursar’s Calculus highlight the cramped conditions and the quick turnover of tenants:

Iter a Chamber under Doctor Walls 1 qter Mr Rogers the three last qters Mr Gardner and Mr Street
Iter the Chamber under Mr Sub rector, 1 qter Mr Cread Mr Trist 2 qter Mr Baker Sir William Buffon two last qters
It the Chamb: under Mr Pelhar 1qter Sr Vernon Mr Ryth 2d & 3d qters Mr Thorpe Sr Blower 4 qter Mr Pagett
It the little Cham: next ye gate in ye new quadrangle Mr Harpur ye 3 first qters Mr Jones ye 4th.³⁰

²⁷ *A Proclamation for the ease of the City of Oxford* ([Oxford, Leonard Lichfield], 1643) [Wing C2611]. Magdalen College papers relating to Strangers in college during the war record that ‘The Names of all the Strangers yt lodge in these chambers were by appointment sent unto the Vicechancellour in a list last week’, Magdalen College Archives, CS 40/9/1, indicating that the colleges had to provide records of those staying in their quarters.

²⁸ *To Our trusty and welbeloved Our Colonells, Lieutenant Colonells, Serjeant-Majors, Captaines, and all other Our Officers of Our Army* (Madan #1186). A similar command was issued in 1643 for preserving the Corn and Grass around Oxford (Madan #1300).

²⁹ *A Proclamation for the better meanes of making provision for the Kings Army* ([Oxford], Leonard Lichfield, 1642[3]) [Wing C2608].

³⁰ Lincoln College Archives, Bursary Archives (Calculus) Box 2: Calculus Book 1643, fol. 18r.

Magdalen accounts also testify to the crowded conditions: ‘Of the Fellowes & Schollers in Magdalen Colledge, there are two at least in every chamber (except a little one) & of those two both in noe chamber at this present absent.’³¹ Martin Lluellyn’s witty lyric ‘Verses made in Bed to one studying in the same Chamber’ composed at Oxford during the war describes the homosocial proximity fostered by this arrangement: ‘Get thee to bed, I say, that gowne and knackes/ Present thee Priam shrunke to Astyanax’.³² For a poem written during a lengthy siege the reference to Priam is unfortunate if pertinent. The verse shows the enforced abnormality of daily life during the war period, and emphasises the martial inflection of every action: ‘All thou read'st there is Watch-word sure, and then/ Stead of a sword lies drawne a Valiant Pen’ (ll. 5–6).

1.3 A New Court

Therefore, the situation was far from ideal for those who had been forced to follow the King to Oxford. In her *Memoirs*, composed around 1676, Ann Fanshawe wrote of the traumatic effect of the court’s move to the city during the civil war:

My father commanded my sister and myself to come to him to Oxford [1643], where the Court then was; but we that had till that time lived in great plenty and great order found ourselves like fishes out of water, and the scene so changed that we knew not at all how to act any part but obedience. For from as good house as any gentlemen of England had we come to a baker’s house in an obscure street, and from rooms well furnished to lie in a very bad bed in a garret; to one dish of meat, and that not the best ordered; no money, for we were as poor as Job; nor clothes more than a man or two brought in their cloak bags. We had the perpetual discourse of losing and gaining of towns and men; at the windows the sad spectacle of war, sometimes plague, sometimes sicknesses of other kinds, by reason of so many people being packed together, as I believe there never was before of that quality; always want; yet I must needs say that most bore it with a martyr-like cheerfulness.

³¹ MCA, CS 40/9/1.

³² *Men-miracles, with other Poems. By M. Ll. St. of Christ Church in Oxon* ([Oxford][Henry Hall], 1646) [Wing L2625], ll. 1–2.

For my own part I begun to think we should all like Abraham live in tents all the days of our lives.³³

Fanshawe's account in many ways figures the experience of all those that followed the King to Oxford, and their anxious attempts to reassert or remap models of behaviour onto a new and unfamiliar situation. In particular, she reflects the concerns and experiences of those that produced culturally mediated versions of Royalism: beset by hardship, poverty and disease; generically and physically 'like fishes out of water'; constantly influenced by the physical reality of the war; knowing 'not at all how to act any part but obedience.' For it is a singular aspect of the work produced by nominally 'Royalist' writers during the war years that the subtleties of the 1630s political discourse as described by Kevin Sharpe were often forcibly replaced by the consciousness of a partisan identity and allegiance.³⁴ Furthermore, the works are entrenched in the wartime culture of the court, as Fanshawe was; full of suffering, hardship, and the consciousness that something great and splendid had been lost or changed irrevocably. Those engaged in both focusing and framing the 'sad spectacle of war' for Fanshawe and her companions found it difficult to keep the physical reality of the conflict at bay, and texts were as much influenced by military and political events as the ramifications of literary style or technique.

For a regime so concerned with physical location — as witness the various significant court spaces, the masque, the architectural expression of the court — the nomadic experience of the war years was extremely unsettling. Ann Fanshawe

³³ *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett, and Ann, Lady Fanshawe*, ed. by John Loftis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 111. She adds to the sense of theatrical spectacle a little later, conflating it with religious purpose: 'Now we appeared upon the stage to act what part God destined us', p. 113.

³⁴ Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

likens the houses at Oxford to ‘tents’, insubstantial and mobile in comparison with the fixed world of the court at Westminster. The new situation imposes different rules onto the formerly factional court life: ‘the scene so changed that we knew not at all how to act any part but obedience’. The masks of the court are lost, as they struggle without finery or fine clothes to maintain some kind of normality. Fanshawe attempts to distance the blunt horror of the situation by imposing a controlling distance on events. She elides theatrical metaphor with the grim reality of war, describing the ‘spectacle’ of the combat outside her windows. Fanshawe and her courtly companions watch the war unfold in front of them, observe the material reality of the King’s quarrel with Parliament invade the spaces around them. Fanshawe’s expression of the distinction between public and private space is also instructive; the war and its attendant traumas happens in the street outside. Within the closed spaces of court, college or domesticity life can still be controlled. Bulstrode Whitelocke’s diary records that when meeting the King ‘Their [the Commons Commissioners] first access to the King was in the garden of Christchurch where he was walking with the Prince, & many Lords & others attending him’.³⁵ Just previous to this meeting, however, ‘Some soldiers & others as they passed in the streets reviled them with the names of Rogues, Traitors, & Rebels, but they tooke no notice of it’ (*Diary*, p. 142). Whitelocke’s account contrasts the pastoral austerity of the civilised and formal court protected by the college walls with the barbarous and violent streets of the city proper. What these examples show is that the space of the court had a material and physical as well as a conceptual nature.

³⁵ *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke 1605–1675*, ed. by Ruth Spalding (Oxford: Oxford University Press and the British Academy, 1990), p. 142.

Whilst Ann Fanshawe found the relocation to Oxford unpleasant, others were reported by Parliamentary newsbooks to be having a wonderful time:

Prince *Rupert* accompanied with some Lords and other Cavaliers, danced through the streetes openly with musick before them, to one of the Colledges, where they had stayed about halfe a houre [‘hearing of a Play’ admits a Royalist newsbook], they returned back againe dancing with the same musick before them.³⁶

This needs to be understood in the context of the London newsbook’s construction of Royalism as a foppish, unauthentic masquerade whose main proponents were licentious and hedonistic foreigners imposing their alien identities onto England’s traditional hierarchies and institutions.³⁷ The city is a space of uncivilised merriment, and there are echoes of Puritan attacks on the *Book of Sports* in the judgmental tone deployed by the newsbook. The libertine cavaliers interpenetrate what the former Chancellor the Earl of Pembroke had called the ‘modest bounds of an University’ (*A Letter Sent from the Provost Vice-Chancellor of Oxford*, p. 6).

However, a secondary effect of the passage is to emphasise how dissimilar the proceedings are to the Whitehall masques and entertainments. The structure echoes that of the ‘running’ masques, seemingly highlighting progressive continuity but in this instance emphasising a curtailed and limited circular movement. Rupert and his companions newly map the process onto a strange and relatively unknown college-based town; a town, moreover, with its own distinct hierarchies and traditions, which only serves to highlight

³⁶ *Certaine Informations*, 30 Oct–6 Nov 1643, quoted in Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), p. 9. Square brackets are Hotson’s interpolation.

³⁷ Certainly it is important that the only figure mentioned is Rupert; the report concludes ‘and immediately there followed them a pack of women, or Curtizans it may be supposed, for they were hooded and could not be knowne.’ Hotson observes, ‘The Parliament newsbooks could never have enough of bitter references to the masques which had been such a costly amusement at the court of Charles’, and quotes *Mercurius Britannicus* on the Oxford Junta: ‘a three dais wonder, a kind of *Anti-masque*, one of her *Majesties mock-showes*, which hath cost the *Kingdome* as much as all those at *White-hall*, that were maintained with *Ship-money*’, p. 9. For

the differences in location and situation. In the same month another Parliamentary newsletter, *Mercurius Rusticus*, crowed that ‘the Queen will not have so many Masks this Christmas and Shrovetide this yeare as she was wont to have other yeeres heretofore; because *Inigo Jones* cannot conveniently make such Heavens and Paradises at *Oxford* as he did at White-Hall.’³⁸ Once more, the change in physical situation enforces a profound conceptual change in the understanding of form, trope and structure. Circumstances force a reassessment and a reconstruction of cultural Royalism mediated by the changed ideological battle and the new location. This is a notion that underlines the literal dislocation of the Royalist party from London; for a King to whom the physicality of a court was important (witness the plans for the Whitehall Court, the Banqueting House), the nomadic nature of the early months of the war figure both physical dislocation and conceptual movement that became expressed generically and institutionally.³⁹ The court at Oxford was an attempt to establish once more spatial order and structure in Caroline life and government.

Recognisable court life did continue, albeit in a constrained fashion, at Oxford. Ambassadors were received at Christ Church, and government business continued. Various of the Royal household were imported into Oxford, including Apothecaries, Vintners, and Officers of the Wardrobe.⁴⁰ The list of officers in Bodleian, Rawlinson MS B. 121 allows us

the animus against Rupert see tracts such as *A Declaration against Prince Rupert* (London: 1642[3]) [TT: E85 (24)].

³⁸ October 1643, quoted in Hotson, p. 9. The account is manifestly untrue; Jones brought his stage machinery to Oxford during the 1636 visitation.

³⁹ For Charles’s spatial notions of order and stability see Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 211–4.

⁴⁰ ‘Application for a warrant for Joseph Wolfgang Rumler, His Majesty’s apothecary, to send certain apothecary’s stuffs to Oxford for the use of His Majesty’, *HMC Report 5* (House of Lords MS), 20 December 1642, p. 61; ‘Pass for John Daintrey and Joseph Atkinson, servants to His Majesty, to go to Oxford with gloves and other necessaries for His Majesty’s use’, 9 March 1643, p. 76; ‘Draft order for passes for Robert

for the first time to positively identify minor members of the Oxford court (See Figure 1). The appearance of a Jester, trumpeters and wardrobe grooms, as well as various officers of the bedchamber, indicates that the household was still full of entertainment. However, the list of officers is brief and suggests a more constrained household than Charles had enjoyed during the 1630s. If one compares the extensive households audited in PRO LC/3/1 (Charles, 1641), BL, Harleian MS 7623 (the Royal children, 1638), National Library of Wales, Wynnstay MS 167 (Henrietta Maria, 1641) and Folger Shakespeare Library, MS X.d 78 (general expenses, 1641), it is obvious that the standing below-stairs courts attending the King and his family at Oxford were much sparser than had previously been the case.⁴¹

Royal dining continued to be opulent; a surviving cellar-book records standard meals consisting of Mutton and Veal (boiled and roasted), Capons, Hens (with Eggs), Partridges, Pheasants, Cocks, Larks, Beef, Mallards, Pig, Salmon, Seaflounder, Venison, Conies, Teales, with baked Tart and 'Pippins' to follow.⁴² Beagles were delivered for the King to hunt with, and Isaac Thorpe petitioned the King to be able to teach his children to dance.⁴³ Masquing may have continued to occur, but there is only fragmentary evidence.⁴⁴

Buchanan and Thomas Edwards, yeomen of the wine cellar to His Majesty to go to Oxford' 17 March 1643, p. 77; 'application for a pass for John Reeve to go to Oxford with 27 pairs of silk hose, 3 silk waistcoats and 6 pair of laced boot-hose for the use of the King and Queen's Majesty', 8 November 1643, p. 116. For music at the court see Jonathan Wainwright, *Musical Patronage in Seventeenth-Century England: Christopher, First Baron Hatton (1605-1670)* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997).

⁴¹ G. E. Aylmer calculates that during the 1630s the Royal households consisted of some c. 1840 staff, *The King's Servants* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961), p. 27.

⁴² 'Table and Cellar Book of Charles I., at Oxford, A. D. 1643-1644', *HMC* (Ormond NS II), pp. 406-10. This volume contains accounts for 1 February to 31 May 1644, listing details of supper and dinner during that time. It also contains a weekly audit of the cellars and pantry from 1 October 1643, continuous for six months. The editors note 'Afterwards there are interruptions which seem to correspond with the period of the King's absence from Oxford', suggesting that the court did not dine so finely (or at least, not centrally), when Charles was away, p. xviii.

⁴³ Madan p. 274; *CSPD 1641-43*, p. 422. John Ashburnham's list of the King's accounts records the hefty outlay of 'To the Duke of Richmond for money lost at play by your Majestie 0012 00 00', suggesting that life

William Dobson painted many portraits of members of the court, including two of the King and the Royal children. The King granted various new offices and titles throughout the time at Oxford, as the petition of the Kings Servants and Officers presented to Charles in 1644 shows.⁴⁵ The greater the honour, the grander the ceremony, and there were at least twelve of these celebrations during the time at Oxford. Ceremonies and rituals were mapped onto the new city. On New Year's Day 1643, the Royal party went to service at either Christ Church or St. Mary's, where the King was greeted by various speeches and presented with a gift by the University. On Maundy Thursday, 1643, the annual washing of poor men's feet took place in Christ Church hall.⁴⁶ Accounts taken by the Bursar of Corpus Christi college in 1643 record payments 'To the Princes servants when hee visited the Colledge 0-11-0', 'To the Kinges footmen 0-11-0' and 'To the Princes Trumpeters 1-0-0'.⁴⁷ Movements of the Royal family were obviously still attended by much pomp and visual ceremony. An interesting variation on this is suggested by a further entry for 'For Gravelinge the Kings walke 0-8-0' (fol. 21v). Apocryphal and romanticised stories of the King secretly visiting Henrietta Maria in Merton using a special path are obviously only half-wrong. This entry

of sorts continued, *A Narrative by John Ashburnham of his Attendance on King Charles the First* (London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1830), p. xxxi.

⁴⁴ BL, Egerton MS 1994, fols. 212r–224r is an untitled masque dated 'August 5th: 1643' (fol. 212r) which would coincide with the arrival of the Queen in Oxford that July. The MS has no concrete link to Oxford, however, and is in all probability a private entertainment.

⁴⁵ Bod, Rawl. MS B. 121, a copy of the petition and lists by Sir William Dugdale, see Figure 2. The Petition claims 'That since these turbulent tymes you Matyes servants have little ells wherewthall to subsist but such benefitts as by your Matyes severall creacons of honour doe accrue to them, and that divers of late have forborne to pay any thing, nowth=standinge most part of them have amenityes granted by such their Patents of greate value then the chardge wch such fees amount to', fol. 2r.

⁴⁶ Other traditional ceremonies were not so welcome: in March 1643 the King's *Proclamation prohibiting all such as were troubled with the disease called the King's Evil* forbade those 'which usually resort unto the Court, at the Feast of *Easter*' from coming to Oxford to receive their cure, Madan #1291. They were excluded from the space of the King's favour for fear they would spread their infection to the Garrison.

⁴⁷ Corpus Christi College Archives, C/1/1/10 (Libri Magni 1642–59), fol. 21r–v. An entry in the City Council records for 31 July 1643 records 'The heralds' demand for £5 for their attendance on the King and Queen in the City is to be left to the consideration of the Mayor and his brethren', *Oxford Council Acts 1626–1665*, p. 114.

indicates that the walk was semi-official and ritually important. Visits to Merton through Corpus were more ceremonial than has been thought, with the purposeful laying of a special path marking the movement and connection between the two locations as specially important in the topographical imposition of the court onto the landscape of Oxford.⁴⁸

The court was fundamentally circumscribed, however. In June 1643 Charles banned excessive decoration on clothing, outlawing lace, ribbons, buttons, and clasps of gold; with the sole exception of the Garter.⁴⁹ This practical and symbolic slimming down of the external trappings of the Cavalier image signalled a sea change in attitudes to external finery and indicated that the King wished his subjects to present a more sober face to the world. It also argues a subtle understanding of the cultural nexus of clothing.⁵⁰ Manuscript poetry attests to the fact that ‘Cavalier’ dress and appearance was an important element of the resistance to Parliament:

What take yee pepper in y^{or} noses
to see King Charles his Coloures worne in Roses
'twas but an ornament to grace the hatt
yet must wee haue an ordninance for that.⁵¹

Elsewhere in this collection a poem allegedly written to the Queen from the King hopes she scorns ‘to be a Doilila & betray/ my strength unto their uncircumcised sway’ conflating outward appearance, and long hair in particular with both symbolic and physical strength

⁴⁸ The King also made provision for a special guard during his walks: ‘When wee shall walke into ye Gardens our will is that 2 or more yeoman of ye Gaurd keepe and attend at the Doores and not to permitt any meane or unknowne persone to enter:’, BL, Harleian MS 6851, fol. 117 r–v.

⁴⁹ *A Proclamation against wast and excesse in Apparell*, Madan #1377. This Proclamation is also somewhat disingenuous given that the King and his family were still spending a great deal on dress: the House of Lords’ MS record ‘Application from George Kirke, gentleman of His Majesty’s robes, for a pass for John Daintre, a groom in the office, to go to Oxford with four dozen of gloves, which are much wanted by His Majesty, and four yards of ‘taby’, two ells and a quarter of ‘taffety’, to be a tennis suit, and two pairs of garters and roses, with silk buttons and other necessaries for making up the suit’, *HMC Report 5* (House of Lords MS), 8 November 1643, p. 113.

⁵⁰ See Graham Roebuck, ‘Cavalier’ in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 9–27 for a discussion of the cultural importance of clothing and livery.

and also resistance to the ungodly and unchosen.⁵² Cowley's much anthologised Prologue to *The Guardian*, performed before Charles and the Prince of Wales in March 1642 on their way up to York, makes hair an index of loyalty: 'For now no Ornaments ye head must weare,/ No Bayes, no Mitre, not so much as hayre.'⁵³ External appearance is part of a performative action, a theatrical choice that delineates and defines identity and loyalty.

Crucially, Charles' Proclamation signalled that the reorganisation of the court at Oxford had an external and cultural hermeneutic value as well as an institutional identity. The fact that Charles excluded the Garter from his ban suggests much about his conception of a Royalist identity and the symbolic encoding of allegiance. He had re-established the importance of the order of the Garter in the 1630s, and attempted to increase its prestige and redesign its procedures: 'The Garter exemplified the courtly culture of chivalry and piety, manliness and chastity.'⁵⁴ It was an integral part of his conception of British nationhood. The Garter was an important part of Caroline emblematic iconography and representation: van Dyck sketched the procession as a draft for a Banqueting House mural, and the Garter is ostentatiously worn by Charles, his son, and many of his household and court in various portraits of the 1630s and 1640s.⁵⁵ It in part represented an Anglo-Catholic tradition in opposition to puritan and Calvinist modes of worship, as Peter Heylin was at pains to point out in his defensive 'Iustification or Assertion' of the Order.⁵⁶ The

⁵¹ 'Vive le Roy', Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 71, p. 62, ll. 1–4.

⁵² 'His Maty valediccon to the Queene at the departure', p. 1, l. 12.

⁵³ Bod, Rawlinson MS 26, fol. 138r, ll. 7–8.

⁵⁴ Kevin Sharpe, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1989), p. 158.

⁵⁵ An important instance is William Dobson's portrait *Charles II as Prince of Wales*. See also David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485–1649* (London: Macmillan, 1997).

⁵⁶ *The History of That most famous Saint and Souldier of Christ Iesus; St George of Cappadocia [...] The Institution of the most Noble Order of St. George, namd the Garter* (London: Printed for Henry Seyle, and are to be sold at his Shop, the signe of the Tygers-head in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1631) [TT: E1087 (14)], p. 1.

Proclamation forcibly reconfigures social boundaries and realigns the courtly hierarchies within the changed circumstances. It privileges the members of the Order by distinguishing them from the rest of the city and the rest of the Court. It also focuses Royalist identity through the cult of St. George, emphasising the importance of a conception of 'England' to the struggle with Parliament.⁵⁷ Christian soldiers fight for truth against the monstrous rebels, protecting the chastity and purity of the nation state.

Physically, however, the Proclamation also emphasised the newly straitened circumstances of the court in Oxford, and the profound changes that concepts of 'court' had undergone. In January of that year Charles had sent away those who could not 'justify their abiding here' (*A Proclamation for the ease of the City of Oxford*). Whilst this command was often disobeyed, it argues an economical view of the court and thus the cultural production of that body; all those that were to stay would in some way physically contribute to the war effort, in combat or in print. The court in Oxford was not full of hangers on and ambitious young men striving for patronage. The city was a place of death and disease, violence and privation.⁵⁸ Evidence such as the work of Sir Robert Stapleton does suggest

Furthermore, the first church dedicated to St. George in England was built by Robert D'Oyley in 1074 'on the West side of the city [of Oxford]', p. 286.

⁵⁷ English and Royalist adoption of the cult of St. George may have fuelled much of the serpentine imagery associated with parliamentary enemies: 'This I am sure of, that this their constant and continuall wearing of St George's Image, may be a faire instruction unto all of this Heroicke Order; never to lay aside St George's resolution, of encountering with the Dragon, that old serpent; that so they may at last receive the blessed and immarcessible Crowne of Glorie', Heylyn, *The History of that most famous Saint*, p. 317.

⁵⁸ Bulstrode Whitelocke recorded 'being come to Oxford, the Governor assigned them their quarters, Wh[itelocke] had his in an Inne, where they confessed that some, & in his chamber, not many dayes before had dyed of the plague, yett God preserved him, & kept him from feare', *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke*, p. 141. He also complains about being attacked and abused in the street, p. 142, pp. 144–45. Richard Atkyns describes a common, though overly formal, duel fought on Bullington Green, quoted by John Adair, *By the Sword Divided: Eyewitness Accounts of the English Civil War* (Bridgend: Sutton, 1998), pp. 77–78. See [Edward Greaves], *Morbus Epidemius Anni 1643 England's New Disease most Contagious at present in Oxford. With the Signes Causes Remedies. Published by His Majesties Command* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University [1643]) [Wing G1792], which warns of the contagious nature of the fever, advising various medicines and 'gentle and easie Vomits', p. 15.

that various intellectual and political coterie existed in modified form.⁵⁹ However, the polycentric court described by Malcolm Smuts and Timothy Raylor was radically slimmed down and those subcourtly bodies that existed on the fringes to a great extent vanished or were subsumed into officialdom.⁶⁰

Courtly dynamics changed significantly, as a brief discussion of patronage will elucidate (see Appendix II for list of Orders and stipends granted by the King during the war period). Politically, being on the right side in academia could lead to large gains. A typical example of academic patronage is that of John Greaves who had fled to Oxford at the beginning of the war, losing his professorship at Gresham College as a consequence of his absence. On the death of John Bainbridge in 1643 he was appointed Savilian professor of astronomy, elected by a group headed by Sir Edward Littleton, the Earl of Hertford, and Sir Edward Nicholas.⁶¹ He was appointed subwarden of Merton in 1642, and successfully petitioned for the official ejection of the hostile Nathaniel Brent from the Wardenship.⁶² In 1648 the parliamentary visitors took a less than charitable view of his dealings: he was ejected from his professorship (and fellowship of Merton), charged with liberating over 400*l.* from the college treasury for the King, and furthermore of having ‘misappropriated

⁵⁹ Stapleton wanted to keep his translation of Musæus private, but this ‘lay not in my power; for my acquaintance (who would know what I was doing) had engaged me for so many Copies’, ‘The Epistle Dedicatory’, *The Loves of Hero and Leander* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall. 1645) [TT: E1170 (3)], Sig. A2v. This suggests a large coterie of intellectuals gathering around his patron Henry Pierrepont circulating texts.

⁶⁰ R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987); *Cavaliers, Clubs and Literary Culture*, Chapters 1–4 *passim*.

⁶¹ *CSPD 1641–1643*, p. 498. The other electors were Sir Robert Heath, Sir John Bankes, and Sir John Lambe.

⁶² Merton College Archives, 1.3 (College Register 1567–1731), p. 351. Brent had already fled to London. His replacement took a while to appoint, occasioning a letter of ‘encouragement’ from the King on 22 March 1643 (p. 351) and finally of command on 24 January 1645 (p. 355). There were further problems within the college, and William Harvey was finally given the position independent of the council. Quite apart from this being another instance of academic preference on the part of the King, his concern for the institutional well-being of the college reflects a worry about the legitimacy and efficiency of a legislature that lacks its proper

college property, feasted with the queen's confessors, and having displayed favouritism and political animus in the appointment of subordinate college officers' (*DNB*).

The institutions of the University were increasingly abused for political gain: in 1645 the University had to ask Charles formally to stop appointing M.A.s for political and largely financial reasons.⁶³ He had awarded some 140 since his arrival three years earlier to 'great multitudes of very noble Gentlemen of all ranks who have done the University much honour in accepting of her favours.'⁶⁴ Such practice was not contained to the University structures; in July of 1643 Charles requested that one John Maplett of Christ Church remain a member of college and be made the next Physician.⁶⁵ Patronage systems became based on military honour, information and academic position, as witness the example of Richard Rallingson who was made M.A. for his 'services in planning the fortifications of Oxford', and that of Sir John Berkenhead who was rewarded for *Mercurius Aulicus* by the King's recommending him for a Readership in Moral Philosophy which he duly received on 3

head. Laud had established Oxford as a model of the Caroline state in microcosm, and his conception is mirrored by the King's intervention in this matter.

⁶³ A Parliamentary pamphlet mocked this practice: 'We are like those whom they call the Kings Doctors, who buy their degrees with money, and are litle regarded afterwards by the Universitie', *The Malignants Lamentation in which All sorts of Royalists, bemoan the miseries which have fallen upon them for taking up Armes against the Parliament* (London, Printed by J. M. 1645) [Wing M324], p. 13.

⁶⁴ Convocation registers quoted in Strickland Gibson, 'The University of Oxford' in *History of the County of Oxfordshire*, 13 vols, ed. by H. E. Salter and Mary D. Lobel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), III, 25. Convocation also petitioned the King on this matter on 21 February 1643, Madan p. 218. Political patronage did continue to expand, however. P. H. Hardacre calculates that there was a 20% increase in ennoblement during the war, and cites the anonymous *The Sence of the Oxford Junto Concerning the late Treaty* (1645):

Who would not fight, cries Dunsmore,
An Earl to be enstyled?
To lose a lordship, Hatton says,
Would make a courtier wild.
Culpepper he grows hot in the mouth,
Damns peace, as if he meant,
Rather than not to be a lord
Fight to be King of Kent.

quoted in *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956), pp. 12–13.

⁶⁵ 'The Deane & Chapter yeilded their assent to this his Maiesties pleasure', CCA, MS Dean and Chapter b.2 (the 'Subdean's Book'), p. 385. Charles terms it an 'Act of favour' to Maplett.

April 1643.⁶⁶ Charles wrote to Convocation of Berkenhead's 'Discretion and Abilities' and his several 'acceptable Services.'⁶⁷

When he entered Oxford to take up residence in late 1642 Charles was presented with a generous token of the University's regard. Their ritualised abasement was tempered by the fact that the present, a gilt cup filled with 200 pounds of gold, reveals the King's need for hard cash over symbol and representative loyalty (when he visited Oxford in 1636 Charles had been content with a banquet and three plays: Strode's *Floating Island*, Wild's *Hospital of Lovers*, and Cartwright's *Royal Slave*). It also illustrates the increasing financial element involved in patronage transactions. The space of monarchical patronage was increasingly no longer that of a simple feudal system of allegiance but a marketplace predicated upon financial relationships. In this instance, and in many more demands and Proclamations outlined below, Royal favour and definitions of obedience and loyalty became inflected by pressing financial necessity. Donations of arms, money and horse are demanded as indexes of allegiance.

Political power became mapped onto University hierarchical systems and hegemonies: in October 1643 William Seymour, Marquis of Hertford was elected Chancellor of the University and he immediately appointed George, Lord Digby as his High Steward.⁶⁸ This courtly control of the systems of University power indicate that when Henry Hall received £28 'for Printing Books for the University' he was in fact being rewarded for his services to the Royal cause (Madan, p. 293). Traditional models of patronage were still current; refusal to acknowledge the London governmental institutions

⁶⁶ Rallingson was given his degree on 17 October 1643 at the King's request, Madan p. 293.

⁶⁷ Convocation registers quoted in P. W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead 1617–1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 34.

meant that Charles was free to appoint a great number of extra officers (see Appendix II). Positions held by pro-Parliamentary figures were reallocated, and loyalty was rewarded, albeit in a purely symbolic fashion. The list shows that institutional patronage was still widespread during the war period. Several members of the King's Council of Oxford were rewarded with lavish gifts of status: Cottingham became Master of Wards and Liveries, Henry Bouchier the Keeper of the Privy Seal, Hyde was Keeper of the Rolls of Common Pleas and Culpepper became Master of the Rolls (see Appendix II).

1.4 Government and Representation

As this brief discussion of patronage has elucidated, power within Oxford was still predicated on a spatial factor: proximity to the King when he was in residence. In order to analyse further how this worked at Oxford the following section will show how the physical layout of the court was reconfigured, and the exclusive conceptual and physical space of the Privy Council became outmoded. This has profound consequences for the hierarchical structures of Royalism, and therefore is important for a consideration of Royalist political or ideological identity. Inclusion within two other committee bodies, the Council of War and the Council of Oxford, became a far more important index of Royal favour. Whilst these bodies included similar personnel to the Privy Council, their power and purpose were very different. In the following discussion I will also present evidence that the Oxford Parliament was simply an impotent adjunct with no power; institutional reform was the preserve of the King, not his Parliament.

⁶⁸ Hertford replaced Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, who had been one of the Parliamentary Commissioners to the King in February 1643 and so was therefore unacceptable as head of the University, Madan, p. 293.

As Kevin Sharpe points out, writing about the most recent shake-up of the court in 1625,

At a time when access and proximity to the King's person were the goals of political ambition, and access was determined by the arrangement of the Royal household, a change of personal style could re-arrange the patterns of court politics.⁶⁹

Charles was a King for whom physical location was extremely important, and the arrangement of his court is an invaluable index of his theories of government and authority.⁷⁰ As Sharpe has argued, Charles' obsession with decorum and order drove the reformation of his court (*The Personal Rule*, p. 209). The 'strict hierarchy of rooms and persons' physically established rules of behaviour and layers of status (p. 209). The new structures at Oxford physically included and excluded, but were far less flexible in terms of creating layers of status. The court and household as it was convened during the mid-1640s was not particularly structured; no records requiring certain behaviour survive, and the ambiguities of behaviour and the multivalent registers of status of the 1630s courts were to an extent lost.

Charles' arrangements for his apartments in Christ Church recreated the structures of the Whitehall court, with various significant changes. British Library, Harleian MS 6851 fol. 117 r-v is an account, in Sir Edward Walker's hand, of the spatial structure of the internal court (see Figure 2).⁷¹ These orders were also published in *Mercurius Aulicus*, illustrating the close link between the court and the newsbook, but also indicating that the

⁶⁹ 'The Image of Virtue: the court and household of Charles I, 1625–42' in *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. by David Starkey (Harlow: Longman, 1987), pp. 226–60 (p. 227). It is instructive that Sharpe's account of the court and household ends in 1642. There has been little attempt to chart the history of the court after 1642. This Chapter contributes a necessarily brief description.

⁷⁰ For Charles' interest in location see especially the plans for the new palace at Whitehall in Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 213–15.

⁷¹ See Appendix I for a transcript of this document. These points are also noted in Walker's minutes for the Council of War, 26 January 1642, BL, Add. MS 15750, fol. 16v.

Fees due to his Ma^{ty} servants upon the
Excacō of Sr W^m Ogle vicount Ogle of
Caterlaugh in Ireland 24th Dec: 1645

~~James Walker~~
~~James Walker~~

To the principall King of Armes "

10-00-00

To the other Kings Herald & Esquiers "

10-00-00

To the gentlemen whores of y^e privy chamber "

08-00-00

Rob: Hodder

To the gent: whores dayly wayters "

08-00-00

John Watson

To the gent: whores Quarter wayters "

08-00-00

Jm: Langston

To the Sergeants at Armes "

08-00-00

Thomas Stone

To the Sowers "

04-00-00

Henry Strabour

To the Musicians & Companyes "

04-00-00

Th: Stone

To the Trumpetts "

05-00-00

John Stone

To the yeomen whores "

03-06-08

Richard Stone

To the Groome Porter "

01-13-08

George Baker

To the Groomes of the chamber "

03-06-08

Wm: Parnan

To the Pages of the chamber "

01-13-04

To the Master Cooks "

01-10-00

Richard Stone

To the footemen "

02-13-04

William Stone

To the Drums "

01-10-00

To the Sweey "

01-05-00

To the Panty "

00-15-00

To the Buttry "

00-15-00

To the Soller "

00-15-00

To the Porters "

03-06-08

To the English Herbinges "

03-06-08

To the yeomen & groomes of the Roobes "

08-00-00

To the gent: of the Soller & Buttry "

03-04-00

To the Pages of the Bodchamber "

08-00-00

To the wardrobes "

08-00-00

To the sergeant Porter "

03-00-00

To the gent: & yeomen Herbinges "

10-13-04

To the Cook of the privy kitchen "

01-12-00

To the Kings Barbour "

03-06-08

To the Bird

To the Damm

arrangement of the King's apartments was important enough in the construction of an image of the court and the hegemonic nature of the Royalist social model to warrant publication.⁷² The strictly hierarchical system which differentiated the nobility and court from 'meane and unknowne persons' was spatially constructed: the court was protected from the outside world by standing guards. The newsbook emphasises the security aspect of the arrangements, including an alarmist report of a spy, a 'servant of Lord Sayes', found in the court 'the same day', and fears that 'some desperate designe might be in hand against His Majesties Person'. In their public manifestation there was a negative aspect to the new household rules; they were protective rather than expansive, emphasising that the most important registers of the Oxford court were safety and exclusion rather than opulence and authority.

Two Grooms of the Guard were to attend the stairs leading up to the 'presence and privy Chamber' with specific instructions 'not to permit any unknowne or meane person to pass upp the Stayres toward that Rome.'⁷³ This is the only instance of an instruction pertaining to behaviour, a major difference from the rules of the 1630s courts, and an indication of the *ad hoc* nature of the arrangements. A Gentleman Usher was to guard the actual door of the Chamber (fol. 117r). Movement toward the Privy and Presence Chamber was controlled, and, as at Whitehall, the back stairs which led to the Withdrawing Chamber were also guarded. However, providing you were 'ye Nobility Councillors of State Judge Bippes Councillors of War or of our Bedchamber' (fol. 117v) you could use this back route

⁷² *The fourth Weeke*, Thursday 26 January [TT: E246 (9)]. The newsbook comments 'Orders exceeding well devised if as well observed'.

⁷³ Fol. 117r. It is unclear whether the room incorporating both the Presence and Privy Chamber was artificially divided (physically and conceptually), as seems to have been the case formerly when the King had created his court at houses with insufficient room to provide space for both, see Sharpe, 'The Image of Virtue', p. 233.

directly to the Withdrawing Chamber, which had not been the case in Whitehall.⁷⁴ The Withdrawing Chamber was adjacent to the Privy and Presence Chamber, and the door controlled by another Gentleman Usher. A wider and more socially fluid range of people were allowed into this room than had been given access at Whitehall. Within the Presence Chamber there was another significant space, a spacious window which allowed more private diplomatic conversation.⁷⁵ Whilst officers of the Bedchamber are mentioned, it does not seem to be a part of the rooms of state complex described here. The internal functions of the court had been streamlined. The King's arrangements even apply to the spaces outside the court; there are instructions regarding his walking in 'ye Gardens' (presumably of Christ Church) and attendance whilst riding.

Access to the Privy chambers was linked to an increasingly material political power. Those who were allowed an audience with the King entered an exclusive space which validated their decisions and allowed them involvement in the running of the war and institutional life of the nation. Bulstrode Whitelocke complains that although Parliament's Commissioners to Oxford were allowed 'a free debate' with the King, 'his unhappines was to trust others judgement more then his own':

He had commonly waiting on him when he treated with the Com[missione]rs, Prince Rupert, the L[ord] Keeper Littleton, the E[arle] of Southampton, & the L[ord] chiefe Justice Bankes, & severall other Lords of his Councell, who never debated any matter with the Com[missione]rs, butt gave their opinions to the King,

⁷⁴ 'In order to overcome some of the architectural deficiencies of Whitehall, the orders firmly forbade any alternative passage to the King via backstairs or privy galleries', Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, p. 215. See Albert J. Loomie, *Ceremonies of Charles I: The Note Books of John Finet Master of Ceremonies, 1628-1641* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1987), p. 29, for a physical description of the Whitehall Palace.

⁷⁵ 'This Speech, or rather Complaint of the Embassadors ended, the King withdrew him unto the window in his presence-chamber at Christ Church; there spake certaine words in private', *A Speech or Complaint, Lately Made by the Spanish Embassadour to his Majesty at Oxford* (London, Printed for Nathaniel Butter, 1643) [Wing C496], p. 5.

when he asked them, & sometimes putt him in mind of some things, otherwise they did not speake att all.⁷⁶

Whitelocke's complaint shows the process of Charles' government in practice. Physical proximity to the King was the most direct route to political power, and membership of his innermost council a means to this influence.

The Privy Council was an important instrument of government, and membership gave unprecedented access to power. The first recorded meeting of the Council in Oxford was in August 1643, although it is arguable, given the fragmentary nature of the evidence, that meetings took place before this.⁷⁷ On May 15 1646, with Fairfax bombarding the city, the records of the Oxford Assembly were deliberately burnt, and it is probable that much else was destroyed at this time as well.⁷⁸ However, as an institutional body, the Privy Council quickly became superseded by the Council of War in terms of running the daily business of the conflict, and was reduced to discussing domestic matters regarding the

⁷⁶ *Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke*, p. 143, p. 145. Whitelocke's frustrations are joked about in a manuscript poem about the King and his council which satirises the incompetent and inefficient chain of command: 'Where good lord Capell is found noe more able/ In counsell then in commanding/ Yet keeping the guard shall be his reward/ For shewing noe more understanding', BL, Egerton MS 2725, fols. 139v-40r, ll. 9-12.

⁷⁷ PRO, PC/2/153. The first meeting is recorded 'At Oxford 15th Augusti 1643' (p. 215). Present were 'Lo: Marq of Hertford, Lord Dunsmore, Ea: of Bark, Lor Cottington, Ea: of Southampton, Lord Seymour, Ea: of Leicester, Mr Comptroller, Ea: of Bristoll, Mr Sec: Nicholas, Lo: Savile, Mr Chan of Th'excheq'. The volume records the meetings of the council from 1640 to 1645, and just two pages earlier records meetings at Nottingham in the summer of 1642 (p. 213). The spasmodic minutes for Privy Council meetings, compared with Edward Walker's detailed records of the Council of War (see below), suggests that the Council was outmoded by the conflict.

⁷⁸ 'When the King left Oxford for the North all his papers were purposely burned in order that they might not fall into the hands of the Parliament', *Acts of the Privy Council vol. 1*, p. ix, although PRO, PC/2/53, fols. 213-33 are fragmentary remains of the Privy Council Register 1643-45, PRO, LC/5/135 contains Miscellaneous Lord Chamberlain's Warrants 1641-3, Bod, Dugdale MS 19 is a register of all docquets of all letters patent and other documents passed under the Great Seal at Oxford 1643-46 'Written by an Officer of the Chancery' (p. ii), and Bod, Rawlinson MS B. 121, fols. 1-10 contains a list of payments made to the members of the King's household. Bod, Add. MS D.114 contains papers relating to the government and fortifications of Oxford (for a particular study of this MS see Toynbee and Young, *Strangers in Oxford*). Evidence is extremely fragmentary, however: PRO, LC/1 (Lord Steward's Household Accounts), PRO, LS/13/169 (Lord Steward's Entry Book of Records), and PRO, LC/9/103 (Lord Chamberlain's Accounts of the Wardrobe) are examples of records that are interrupted between May 1642 and September 1660.

sanitation of the city or the trade in the county.⁷⁹ Much of the business discussed pertained to the execution of court business and liaisons between the King and the city council; the Privy Council executed the King's wishes within Oxford. That said, the Council shared much of the same personnel as that of the Council of War and the King's Household Government.⁸⁰ George Digby, Edward Walker, Montague Lindsey and Christopher Hatton were sworn in during 1643–4. Thus members of the body included representatives from the Council of War (Walker), Institutional Court Government (Lindsey), the King's household (Hatton) and the man in charge of coordinating and supervising the production of the official newsbook, Digby. Despite its legislative irrelevance, the Privy Council was still a powerful space in which these various aspects of the Royalist war effort were co-ordinated. Furthermore, as Whitelocke's complaint illustrates, access to the King led to extensive influence. It seems that there is a disjunction between official institutional practice and how political power was actually accorded; the Royalist legal and procedural reconfigurations were for show, a way of appearing to diffuse power away from powerful and unpopular court figures towards a more council-based system.

The various institutions of the court and government became officially streamlined into the Council of Oxford, an organisation that largely replaced the Privy Council after

⁷⁹ The meeting on 15 August 1643 considered a letter from Sir Arthur Aston, Governor of the City, complaining that the 'way leadeing from the North Gate to St John Colledge and so on to the works is extraordinary bad and so ill kept as it is almost unpassable both for water wch hath no passage, and for durt, that is seldome or never carried away', PRO, PC/2/153, p. 215. The Council considered various local matters, particularly regarding trade (p. 224) and the county of Oxfordshire (p. 219); petitioners to the King and other 'court' business; issued passes; discussed trade, especially considering the cloth trade at Reading and its possible economic gain for the King (p. 226).

⁸⁰ For an overview of the political situation of the early years at Oxford, particularly concentrating on the factional split between the 'ultra' party (Digby and Rupert) and those favouring accommodation (Hyde, Falkland) see Ronald Hutton, 'The Structure of the Royalist Party 1642–46', *Historical Journal*, 24 (1981), 553–69 and James Daly, 'The Implications of Royalist Politics 1642–46', *Historical Journal*, 27 (1984), 745–55. Hutton records the 'declining prestige' of the Council of War after 1644 but focuses mainly on combat rather than domestic or institutional matters.

1645. On 8 May 1645 the Commission for the Council of Oxford was inaugurated under the Great Seal:

with ample instructions and authority for fortifying, sequestrating, levying contributions, raising forces of horse & foot, impresting horses, carts, and carriages, deciding controversies, suppressing confederacies, and issuing moneys out of the Exchequer by warrants signed by them, for the King's service.⁸¹

In total, twenty-six were invested with these sweeping powers.⁸² The commission set taxation and exchange rates and proclaimed on several issues; they also aided Charles in his negotiations at Uxbridge. They supervised the running of the newly minted Royalist state apparatus. This is a profound if superficial shift in the hierarchical structure of government, and accordingly suggests a change in Royalism itself. The King prioritised his court by placing them at the centre of legislative power. Membership of the Council of War or Council of Oxford led to extensive domestic powers and far more influence than had previously been the case.⁸³ Whilst the Privy Council had always been an important adjunct to Charles' government, the new prerogative power of the Council of Oxford invested the members with far more personal power than had ever been the case. The King is again diffusing his power, appearing to take counsel and advice.

The exclusive space of the Privy Council was replaced by a more fluid locus which was more socially mobile than older structures had been; as witness the inclusion of Captain William Legge and involvement of Colonel Daniel O'Neale in the Council of War.

⁸¹ *CSPD 1644–1645*, p. 107.

⁸² Charles, Prince of Wales; James, Duke of York; Prince Rupert; Edward, Lord Littleton; Francis, Lord Cottington; Henry, Earl of Bath; James, Duke of Richmond; William, Marquis of Hertford; Henry, Marquis of Dorchester; Montague, Earl of Lindsey; Edward, Earl of Dorset; Thomas, Earl of Southampton; John, Earl of Bristol; Henry, Earl of Dover; George, Lord Digby; Francis, Earl of Chichester; Thomas, Earl of Berkshire; Arthur, Lord Capell; Francis, Lord Seymour; Christopher, Lord Hampton; Ralph, Lord Hopton; Captain William Legge; John, Lord Culpepper; Sir Edward Nicholas; Sir Edward Hyde.

However, the council was dominated by court figures still. Members were the King's representatives, institutionally and conceptually.⁸⁴ In some ways this was a reconfiguring of the role of government through a reversion to more Tudor notions of government and the representation of the King.⁸⁵ Charles used the traditional local government system of Sheriffs and Justices of the Peace, but also introduced King's County Commissioners, agents of the court and representatives of the King.⁸⁶ As Starkey points out in his introduction to *The English Court*, 'Charles I sought to rule by an "image of virtue" because he had few more solid instruments to hand. Habit and obedience bound men to him and proved surprisingly durable' (p. 23). Charles' move to Henrician models of government faltered in representing the King to the country; the attempted conversion came too late.

Royalism had little time for elected representatives or the advice given by a Parliament. In late-1643 Charles set up his own Assembly in Oxford, attempting to invalidate that at Westminster by calling and recognising another.⁸⁷ The Commons occupied

⁸³ Ian Roy, 'The Royalist Council of War 1642–46', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 35 (1962), 150–69. The records of the Council meetings, kept by Sir Edward Walker, are BL, Harleian MS 6851, and further accounts occur in Walker's papers and correspondence, BL, Add. MS 33223.

⁸⁴ The country-wide diffusion of the court and the King's power was a consequence of policy rather than coincidence, as is suggested by the anatomical metaphors discussed in Chapter 3, below.

⁸⁵ For this see David Starkey, 'Intimacy and innovation: the rise of the Privy Chamber, 1485–1547' in *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. by David Starkey (Harlow: Longman, 1987), pp. 71–119 and his earlier 'Representation through Intimacy' in *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross-cultural Studies in Symbolism*, ed. by Ioan Lewis (London and New York: Academic Press Ltd, 1977), pp. 187–225.

⁸⁶ David Underdown, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1973), pp. 70–71.

⁸⁷ The Oxford Assembly 'could not technically call itself a parliament' due to the legality of that at Westminster which was 'grudgingly' conceded by the King after much persuasion by Edward Hyde, see James Daly, 'The Implications of Royalist Politics', p. 753. If the King could simply deny the existence of a Parliament it invalidated the ratifying and advisory role of that institution and essentially destroyed any notion of a constitution. Daly argues that this would have been too extreme for a Royalist party which supported the King to maintain their hierarchical society, 'but if his authority were too great, their authority, which they regarded as *their* liberty, would be too little', p. 755. This need to redefine notions of Parliament and the King's relationship to the political classes may in part motivate the 'body of England' metaphors increasingly used by Charles through the early years of the war. However, even the anonymous MP diarist cited below refers to himself as a 'parliament' man whilst at Oxford, so maybe Daly overstates his case, Huntington Library, HA MS 8060 (transcript), p. 1. Furthermore, Sermons printed at Oxford continually refer

the Great Convocation House and the Lords the Upper Schools. The King opened the Assembly by emphasising that the sitting members would have very little real power: 'I have therefore called you together to be witnesses of my Actions, and privy to My Intentions.'⁸⁸ Charles pays lip-service to the concept of an equal and advisory parliament: 'be secured and confirmed, [...] there is nothing you can advise me to, I will not meet you in [...] I will be alwaies ready to receive any thing from you, admitting you to Me, or comming to you My Selfe, whatsoever you shall desire' (pp. 5–6). Yet at root his speech reconfirms that the central tenet of Royalist thinking during the early to mid-1640s was the privileging of the King's person.

A fragment of a diary kept by an unknown MP, now Huntington Library MS HA 8060, records the ritual and institutional procedures of the Oxford Assembly.⁸⁹ The diary covers an period of about three weeks from Charles' official opening of Parliament:

Munday morning (Jan. 22) a note upon ye divinitie schole ye entrance into ye Regent house, designed for ye lower house. That all such as come thither parliamt men should repaire to Christchurch hall at 2 a clock, where assembled ye King direct at 3 a clock came forth and made a speech unto them. They made an assembly at ye two houses after this, and adiorned untill ye wensd following ('Diary, p.1).

This is an instance of an official text actually creating institutional space, defining limits and mediating information and representation. The publishing of the note on a door recalls

to their audience by their institutional name, for instance Henry Ferne's *A Sermon Preached at the Publique Fast the Twelfth day in April At St Maries Oxford, before the Members of the Honourable House of Commons There Assembled* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1644) [TT: E46 (5)]. Legally it may not have been a parliament but it was perceived as such.

⁸⁸ *His Majesties Speech Delivered the Twenty second of Ianuary, 1643* (Printed At Oxford, By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1643[4]) [Wing 2784], p. 2.

⁸⁹ 'Diary of the Oxford Parliament, January 1644', Huntington Library, HA MS 6080. I have been unable to see this manuscript and so have used a transcript kindly provided by Dr Andrew Thrush of the History of Parliament Trust.

Mercurius Aulicus' accounts of Proclamations being posted on gates and passageways.⁹⁰

The practice shows how Royal Proclamation and publication defines spaces, conceptually and physically. Within Oxford official texts set boundaries through content, being an extension of Charles' wishes, but also their physical positioning in the city.⁹¹ Before the parliament had sat and had a chance to form an identity independent of the King, this text (and the speech in which he defines their role) has established the dynamics of the assembly.

The diary is principally concerned with court business and jockeying for position.⁹² News of the war is recounted, and various pieces of parliamentary gossip.⁹³ At the first meeting 'theire appeared 105 of the lower house, and every day they increase'; this number rises to 137 within the week, ('Diary', p. 1). Little of importance is debated apart from local issues such as where best to accommodate the members. The document highlights the legislative impotence of the Oxford Parliament. The atmosphere is one of confusion; what information is received is mediated through the King:

Noised thirsd that Nantwich is utterlie burnt to ye ground, and al ye souldiers taken, this was only rumored from some passingers but noe letters uppon it. Thirsd lettrs to

⁹⁰ A declaration forbidding those with the King's Evil to approach the court until Michaelmas was posted 'on the Court gates, and all the ports and passages into the Citie', physically protecting the King and his entourage, *Mercurius Aulicus*, quoted by Madan p. 243. *Aulicus* here indicates a physical delineation within the city of an area that is the court.

⁹¹ Often Proclamations were read at every individual house by sergeants. For example, the order of 13 June 1643 making every household provide tools for the fortifications on pain of tax was 'to be declared by the Churchwardens and constables at euery house', Bod, Add. MS D. 114, fol. 24r. This is an instance where the physical positioning of the text, within or outside a private residence, highlighted the fact that the city was no longer independent but completely in thrall to the King's wishes. It is also an aurally presented representative of the King's policy.

⁹² 'Thirsd. Prince Rupert had his warrant of creation Baron of Kinton (where ye first battle was fought) E. of Holdernesse, and Duke of Cumberland, and it is thought ye place of Master of ye horse is reserved for my Lo. Marquess of Newcastle. Mr Lo. Cottington continues still ye Master of ye Court of Wards, Secretarie Nicholas refusing', 'Diary', pp. 1-2.

⁹³ A brief anecdote highlights the somewhat mercenary nature of war patronage: 'Sr Edw. Dearing uppon Thirsd. left ye Parliamt house uppon a discontent and went to Bristoll, ye reason bycause ye King had denyed him to be Sheriff of Kent', 'Diary', p. 2. Bristol was increasingly a locus of Royalist discontent, most obviously as a bastion of support for the errant Prince Rupert during his public break with Charles.

ye King yt my Lo. Hopton is in very good condition, hath recruited his army wth an addition of 3000 foote, defies Waller ('Diary', p. 1).

This sense of the marginal importance of the Parliament in the institutional running of the war is borne out by consideration of Sir Edward Walker's papers; letters and information are sent to the King and the Council of War rather than the legislature. At best the house is concerned with symbolic defiance: 'This Friday all ye Scotts yt enter wth hostilitie into England by ye upper house are voted Traitors' ('Diary', p. 1). Symbolically, this antipathy to the Scots was reproduced at a procedural institutional level: 'Adam Newton by course expecting to be the Master of ye black rodd (beeing ye eldest waiter, and having pvided all ye formes in ye upper house) is denyed ye place, by reason ye Lords thought it not fitt yt in these tymes, a Scotch man should not come soe neere their consultations, yett generalie voted otherwais a very honest man' ('Diary', p. 2).⁹⁴

More important in terms of legislation, especially during the summer months when Charles was campaigning and the Parliament was in recess, were the King's Commissioners. Their power meant that the government of the country was in the hands of those who sought to define Royalism: the court and the King. The Parliament became a constitutional adjunct, an exercise in propaganda.⁹⁵ Those in London denied its legality, and mocked its quasi-legal minority status: 'that Assembly or Juncto at Oxford (Baptise it by what name you will) is a meere Convention of private men, who have assembled

⁹⁴ The 'Office of Mr of the blacke rodd' was eventually granted 'to Mr Maxwell, and Mr Thayne', BL, Egerton MS 2978, fol. 133r.

⁹⁵ It was also a good way of reclaiming legislators who were then put to work on government business independent of the parliament, see Christopher Kitching, 'Probate during the Civil War and Interregnum Part I: The survival of the Prerogative Court in the 1640s', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 5 (1974-75), 283-93. I am grateful to Gervase Hood of the Public Record Office for this reference. The Huntington 'Diary' also records 'There came two more Paliamt men yt day from London one a lawyer for some part of Northamptonshire now much reformed. The King is so graciouslie pleased, he hath given order yt such as repaire to this assembly need not apply to him for pardon, but immediatlie enter there names in ye office, and ye pardon is consummated', p. 2.

themselves together in the behalfe of the King and Kingdome, to Vote point blancke against the peace and happinesse of both'.⁹⁶ The members at Oxford are merely interested in perpetuating the monopolies of authority and property enjoyed by 'private men'; they are not true representatives of the new publicly empowered populace who support the true Parliament in London.

When the Parliament entered recess in April of 1644, the King complimented them on their service and reiterated their importance as his messengers.⁹⁷ Their purpose is to carry his message and be at his service, individually and collectively:

I think most (if not all) of you are engaged in my service, either in a Civile or a Martiall way [...] But chiefly, and with al possible care to informe all my Subjects of the barbaritie and odiousnesse of this Rebellion, how sollicitous I have bin for Peace, and how insolently, and scornfully rejected; assuring them, that my Armes are rayseed and kept only for the defence of their *Religion, Lawes* and *Libertie* (pp. 2–3).

Legislatively, the Parliament made little impact. They debated few issues of importance, and passed judgement on even less.⁹⁸ They had a symbolic function and a marginal practical effectiveness.

The King's dismissal of the Oxford Parliament and admonition that his MPs go to their various areas of the country to spread his message reflects the need for a Royalist

⁹⁶ *Counter-Votes: Or, An Arraignment, and Conviction of the Votes at Oxford* ([London, 1644]) [TT: E42 (6)], p. 1. The pamphlet continues, 'Hence learne true Subject that *Oxford Votes* (especially if Her Majesty be not present) doe not binde thee to Obedience. Therefore exchange not your money or Plate for Privie Seales (which carry no better credit then formerly) without you would be Voted out of all your substance', p. 1. Another pamphlet called the assembly the 'Apocryphall Parliament at Oxford', *The Oxford Character of the London Diurnall Examined and Answered* ([London, 1645]) [TT: E274 (32)], p. 7.

⁹⁷ *His Majesties Speech to the Lords and Commons Of Parliament Assembled at Oxford* (By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1644) [TT: E45 (4)]. The Parliamentary recess was extended to November (originally October) in September of that year, *A Proclamation to Prorogue the Assembly of the Lords and Commons of Parliament at Oxford*, Madan #1681.

⁹⁸ 'The assembly of members of the Lords and Commons, especially in its first spring 1644 session, acted as a forum for moderate critiques of courtiers and civilian attacks on the military and as an outlet for local disputes', Ann Hughes, 'The King, the Parliament and the localities during the English Civil War' in *The English Civil War*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London and New York: Arnold, 1997), pp. 261–87.

national strategy of government and representation.⁹⁹ Whilst I do not wish to be drawn into the ongoing historical debate concerning ‘central-local relationships’ during the course of the War, it seems clear that the King was in many ways addressing such concerns in his official documents.¹⁰⁰ As has been demonstrated, this thesis is not concerned with the physical reality of allegiance and identity, but more with the representation thereof.

Charles’ county proclamations and theories of political representation illustrate the model of government he was attempting to install. They create a sense of the nation space defined by loyalty to the King; national identity is based in hierarchical systems of government.

The war fractured local identities and profoundly undermined notions of ‘Englishness’ and nationhood, especially in relationship to Scotland.¹⁰¹ Charles’ diffusion of his representatives into the counties was an attempt to modulate the fragmentation the country was experiencing, to refocus or redefine loyalties and hierarchies. Charles attempted to reconfigure allegiance by creating a network of representatives and establishing new institutional bodies in Oxford which would frame a national identity focused through the King, as is argued below. This was an attempt to reverse the increasing populist involvement in political discourse and institutional life, to re-establish his central role as head of the state, administratively and spiritually. Charles still emphasised his right to rule by prerogative, but his rhetoric softens to allow an understanding between King and

⁹⁹ It echoes the *Proclamation commanding the repaire of Noblemen, Knights and Gentlemen of qualitie, unto their Mansion Houses in the Country, there to attend their services and keepe Hospitality* issued in 1626 and 1632 as Charles’ way of controlling the localities. For a discussion of his national purpose in sending the nobility into the country, see Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 9, and *The Personal Rule*, pp. 414–17.

¹⁰⁰ Hughes, ‘The King, the Parliament and the localities during the English Civil War’, p. 261.

¹⁰¹ See Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: the Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

people. This is in turn a return to a more feudal sense of a personal loyalty to monarch, rather than an acceptance of Parliamentary theories of a King ruling by contract or trust.¹⁰²

In 1644 Wenceslaus Hollar's 'Quartermaster' maps were published in London.¹⁰³ Intended for widespread popular usage, the engravings were divided into six easily digestible sections of landscape, mapping the conflict in 'English Myles' onto the physical body of the country.¹⁰⁴ They reflect the fragmentary nature of the war, and are importantly Parliamentary insofar as they do not overtly acknowledge the King's presence in their precise visualisation of the country.¹⁰⁵ The lack of royal crests on the maps implies that the maps are disassociating themselves from the King, despite monarchical involvement in nearly every aspect of English topography, from Royal charters for cities to Royal boundaries for counties. These remain, but it is what is left out that is important. Furthermore, the lack of coats of arms is quite deliberate, as they do appear on Saxton's versions (Fordham 'A Note on the "Quartermaster's map"', p. 51). Hollar's maps construct a nationhood united through a common land but divided into regional identity; a nation, furthermore, with little need for a centralised notion of a King but rather a Parliament that

¹⁰² For the importance of feudal notions of duty and obedience to armed Royalism see P. R. Newman, *The Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War, 1642–46* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).

¹⁰³ *The Kingdome of England & Principality of Wales, Exactly Described With euery Sheere, & the small townes in euery one of them, in Sixe Mappes, Portable for euery Mans Pocket. Usefull for all Comanders for Quarteringe of Souldiers, & all sorts of Persons, that would be informed, Where the Armies be* (Sold by Thomas Ienner at the South entrance of ye Exchange, W: Hollar fecit) [Wing H2447].

¹⁰⁴ See Katherine S. Van Eerde, *Wenceslaus Hollar: Delineator of His Time* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970), for a detailed discussion of these maps. Sir George Fordham argues that the maps were copied wholesale from Christopher Saxton's maps of England and Wales (1580–4), 'A Note on the "Quartermaster's map", 1644' *The Geographical Journal*, (1927), 50–52. A copy in Lincoln College Library, callmark EN.7, contains contemporary MS notes relating to various sieges and battles fought between the summer of 1643 and 1646, indicating that the maps were used to trace the progress of the war.

¹⁰⁵ 'One means by which the state has attempted in the past to capture the discursive field is precisely not only through the appropriation of space (and the map) to its purposes, but by the symbolic constitution of mapped space as national space. In doing so, fledgling national territories sought to establish a national identity abroad, and to create a national ideology at home, sometimes in the face of internal disunity or rebellion', John Pickles, 'Texts, Hermeneutics and Propaganda Maps' in *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor*

‘blended together the overlapping and ambiguous notions of ‘the country,’ ranging from neighbourhood to commonwealth.’¹⁰⁶

In contrast to the decentralisation process physically illustrated by Hollar’s maps, Charles created through his declarations and pardons an image of fragmented, county-led England focused into nationhood through allegiance to the King. The King was always an overriding presence in the construction of a county identity; allegiance to Charles was to be the prime motivation of the local areas. Importantly, Oxford was ‘almost in the heart of my Kingdome; and it brings more comfort unto me, that I am now in the hearts of my subjects’.¹⁰⁷ Conflating anatomical image with cartographic reality, Charles attempts to appropriate the ‘body of England’ rhetoric from Parliamentary usage and map the country on a localised model. The limbs work independently but to one overriding purpose, the service of the crown. Charles had continuously emphasised the political importance of reverence to the state of the King’s body; during the war he had to use different forms to mediate and deliver his message. This reassessment of the King’s relationship with his subjects seemingly rejects the head-body model used by Royalist political theorists in favour of a mutually beneficial relationship, almost gesturing toward the theory of a ‘contract’ between monarch and people. However, the model is still predicated upon a hierarchical interpretation of recent scientific writing and therefore the notion of the state it presents is that of an inclusive body ruled by the heart rather than the head, as Harvey had proved was physiologically correct (see Chapter Three, below). The relationship the King

in the Representation of Landscape, ed. by Trevor J. Barnes and James S. Duncan (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 193–231 (p. 195).

¹⁰⁶ Hughes ‘The King, the Parliament and the localities during the English Civil War’, p. 265; ‘the representation of local interests and the bringing together of provincial and central concerns were at the heart of a parliament’s function and purpose’, p. 265.

posits is warmer and seemingly less exclusive but the rhetoric conceals a firm notion of bodily authority. The country was still dependent upon his will and subject to his whim; he was the delineator and creator of the 'absolute space' of nation.

Ann Hughes has identified the importance of England's 'uniform legal system, crucially dependent at many points on local implementation' in her argument which emphasises 'the close and complex integration of central and local interests within a national culture and a national administrative and political structure.'¹⁰⁸ In many ways the reconfiguring of a constitutional identity undertaken by Charles through 1643 and 1644 was an attempt to impose once again this kind of flexible homogeneity onto the counties under his control. Legal and judicial institutions would lead to a centrally controlled and defined national space. This was a logical extension of the government of the late 1630s and early 1640s, as John Morrill comments: 'what must not be overlooked, is that the government of Charles I became clumsily interventionist, riding roughshod over such local customs and traditions in a drive for efficiency and uniformity'.¹⁰⁹ The Royalist project during the 1640s, the need to define a polemic identity for those who supported the King, had little time for the subtleties of local allegiance and instead concentrated on constructing a detailed national paradigm of loyalty.

I will illustrate this briefly through a consideration of the series of County Proclamations issued by the King during the early 1640s. These began with pardons and

¹⁰⁷ *The Kings Maiesties Speech, As It was delivered the second of November before the University and City of Oxford*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁸ Hughes 'The King, the Parliament and the localities during the English Civil War', p. 262; 'the basis for victory involved the harnessing of local interests, cooperation with, not a challenge to, localism, and the maintenance of the maximum of harmony between the local and the national. Parliament, for a variety of structural, institutional, and ideological reasons, was better able to work with localism than was the King', p. 265.

¹⁰⁹ *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1993), p. 187.

widened into declarations of thanks for support and, most importantly, directions for ‘the better Government’ of certain areas.¹¹⁰ It is not just counties that Charles concentrates on, but important local areas and cities also; the city of Lincoln and the county of Lincolnshire are specifically differentiated, for instance (Madan #1184). The Proclamations acknowledge the importance of local difference and issues but stress allegiance to the central figure of the King:

We do hereby publish and declare, That We are graciously pleased to attribute the Crimes and Offences of Our said Subjects of that County to the power and Faction of their seducers, Who, We beleve by Threats, Menaces, and false Informations compelled and led them into these actions of undutifulnesse and disloyalty towards Us; And we doe therefore hereby offer Our free and gracious Pardon to all the Inhabitants.¹¹¹

Charles’s attempt to create a national identity bound together through the allegiance to the King failed mainly because of local inflexibility, because ‘individual loyalty to a personal monarchy, [...] was often difficult to reconcile with localist ties’ (Hughes, ‘The King, the Parliament and the localities’, p. 265). As can also be seen by the considering of local case-studies, it was because urban loyalties were far more complex than could be resolved through the creation of a national myth and identity.¹¹² However, the very attempt to construct a version of allegiance focused through centrally configured institutions and loyalty to the King reveals a great deal about the fundamental principles of the Royalist project, as the following section will delineate.

¹¹⁰ Specifically Gloucester and Worcester; Oxford, Northampton, Buckinghamshire, Middlesex, Surrey, Berkshire, Wiltshire, Sussex and Kent also received official commands and directions.

¹¹¹ *A Proclamation of His Majesties Grace, Favour, and Pardon, to the Inhabitants of His County of Wilts* ([Leonard Lichfield, 1642]) [TT: 669.f.5 (91)].

¹¹² For the complexities of urban localism, see the Introduction to *The Reformation in English Towns* ed. by Patrick Collinson and John Craig (Hampshire: Macmillan, 1998) or Ann Hughes, *Politics, Society and the Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); for general

1.5 Creating Institutional Identity: Official Publications

From late 1642 onwards Charles issued a series of Proclamations and Declarations which reconfigured the corporate and institutional identity of the nation. These tracts attempted to discredit Parliament and underline Charles' position. They also constructed a legal definition of Royalist identity. The King decreed that

in truth their [Parliament's] Actions have been the greatest scornes of Our Authority, and their Petitions the greatest reproaches and challenges of Us, which any age have produced; And we have not only the cleer evidence of Our own Conscience, but the testimony of all good men [...] neither is there anything wanting to the happinesse of Church and State, but that Peace and Order which the faction of these men hath robbed them off.¹¹³

The Proclamations and Petitions published by the Royalist side throughout the early years of the war were intended to buttress 'Our Authority' and to answer the 'greatest reproaches and challenges of Us' by defining allegiance and loyalty; in short, to institutionally enforce a legally induced return to normality in order to protect 'Peace and Order'. The shifting of the financial and legal legislature was not overly successful, as is shown below. However, what the institutional shift meant practically is very different to its significance in terms of cultural identity, as I will argue here.

Legal issues were of great importance during the war. Charles established his court at Oxford and denied the legality of any courts in London, thus focusing the government of the Kingdom on the seat of his power. Royalist propaganda continually emphasised that the enemy was breaking the law, and refused to recognise Parliament's institutions. As the

discussion relating to the problems posed by local allegiance, see J. S. Morrill, *The Revolt of the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630–1650* (London: Longman, 1976).

¹¹³ *His Majesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects, Upon occasion of a late Printed Paper, Entituled, A Declaration and Protestation of the Lords and Commons in Parliament to this Kingdom, and the whole World* (Printed by His Majesties Command At Oxford, By Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University, 1642) [TT: E128 (37)], p. 2.

discussion of political theory in Chapter Two makes clear, judicial and legal language and concepts were continually deployed by Royalist theorists in denying the authority of Parliament. Parliamentary writers replied by emphasising the legal contract between King and people. William Prynne's involvement in the legal debate illustrates its propaganda and polemic function. He had published *The Sovereigne Power of Parliaments* in 1643, an anthology of legal texts collected to justify the Parliamentary position, and this influenced Parliamentary and religious thinking profoundly.¹¹⁴ *Mercurius Aulicus* continually joked about the Parliamentary neglect of the proper legal procedures, especially with regard to issues of privacy and censorship: 'So that it was unlawfull to breake open the Packets till it was done, and after it was done, 'twas very fit and according to the Law'.¹¹⁵ This sense of invasive surveillance and the flexibility of transgressive legal procedures pervades all of Royalist writings about the opposition. Parliamentary attempts to reconfigure society have led to disruption of normality. *Aulicus* highlights the spatial inversion implicit in Parliamentary legal changes:

And for the Lords, they ordered on Saturday, that if any Officer of any of the *English Courts*, should either send down the Records thereof to *Oxford*, or goe thither in person, (notwithstanding both be to be done by the Proclamation) he shall be held an enemie to the Commonwealth. The Terme for all this holds in *Oxford* for the Courts afore-said, the Lord *Keeper* sitting in the Chancery; and others of the lesser luminaries moving and shining after their proportions in their severall spheres.¹¹⁶

The cosmographical metaphor situates proper legal practice within the hierarchical Copernican solar system, constituted around the King. Like most subjects under the Chancellorship of Laud, astronomy in Oxford during the latter half of the 1630's had had a

¹¹⁴ See Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, pp. 140–41.

¹¹⁵ *The third Weeke, ending Jan. 20*, 1643 [TT: E30 (21)], entry for Tuesday 16 January.

¹¹⁶ *The fourth Weeke* [TT: E246 (9)], Wednesday 25 January 1643.

certain Royalist cachet. The truth of the Copernican system, with its connotations of a centralised sun-King, had been widely acknowledged; and in 1640 Laud's deputy licensed the Oxford printing of the first English defence of Copernicus, John Wilkins' *Discourse Concerning a New Planet*. *Aulicus* situates the new legal institutions at Oxford within the astronomical and geometric space of absolutism.

Charles' Proclamations continually stressed the illegal actions of Parliament in denying his prerogative and authority: 'All which and all other waies of imposing upon our People, to whatsoever intent or purpose, without Our Royall assent, are clearly unlawfull, and unwarrantable'.¹¹⁷ What makes them even more important is that the Proclamations were legal texts: they were a publicly binding contract, issued as decrees, and an extension of Charles' prerogative rule. He did not consult his Oxford Parliament, but raised money and arms through these independent demands. The legally binding language of the Proclamations was conflated by the King with polemically inflected definitions of Parliamentary action: 'Whereas, an actuall and open Rebellion being raised against Us [...] for the destruction of Us and Our Posterity, and the subversion of the Religion, Lawes and Liberties of this Our Kingdom'; 'Whereas we have been long since driven by Force and Violence from Our Palace at Westminster'.¹¹⁸ Loyalty to the King was defined by compliance with Royal Proclamation:

And His Majestie doth hereby Require, and Command all His Officers, Ministers and Subjects whomsoever, whom it may concerne, to yeeld due obedience and

¹¹⁷ *A Proclamation prohibiting the assessing collecting or paying any Weekly Taxes* (1643), Madan #1311, quoted from Larkin, #410, p. 886.

¹¹⁸ *A Proclamation forbidding all assessing, Collecting, and Paying of the Twentieth Part* (1643), Madan #1269, quoted from Larkin, #401, p. 869; *A Proclamation warning all His Majesties good Subjects no longer to be misled by the Votes, Orders, and pretended Ordinances of one or both Houses* (1643), Madan #1387, quoted from Larkin #425, p. 912.

observance to this His Proclamation, as they will answer to the contrary at their Perills.¹¹⁹

The documents legally constructed a loyal populace of Royalist sympathisers bound to act according to the wishes of the King.

The attempt to impose a closed and absolute institutional model was part of the campaign to centre governmental power on the person of the King and to establish a Royalist cultural identity. The official documents published at Oxford present versions of the institutions of the monarchy, from the court of the Exchequer to the religious behaviour of the army. Even church ceremonies became in thrall to the war effort as the King ordered a formal collection to be made every Sunday on behalf of the wounded (Madan #1457). Charles ordered fasts and allowed for slaughter during Lent, corrupting and reconstituting religious practice to his own necessity (Madan #1466). Proclamations related to dress, the church calendar and religious life, swearing, loyalty to the King, paying rent. Subjects were not to assist the Parliamentary Rebels with 'Men, Mony, Armes, Victualls, or Intelligence, to stop any His Majesties Messengers, or Pacquets, or to offer violence to any His Majesties Souldiers'.¹²⁰ The extensive economic and judicial reforms undertaken by the court at Oxford were intended to bypass the Parliament and to create a financial and social context for the civil war Royalist project. They conflated legal and loyalist definitions of the nation state, and mediated individual allegiance without the interference of Parliament; this was an affirmation of Charles' reasons for establishing prerogative rule in 1629.¹²¹

¹¹⁹ *A Proclamation for the Payment of His Majesties Rents, and Revenues into His Receipt of his Exchequer, at His City of Oxford* (1643), Madan #1232, quoted from Larkin #391, p. 853.

¹²⁰ *A Proclamation forbidding any of his Majesties Subjects to assist the Rebels* (1643), Madan #1417, Larkin #435, title.

¹²¹ Charles believed that 'parliaments were threatening his fulfilment of his duty to his people [...] the prerogative [powers] were essential for the preservation of the common good', Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, p. 60.

The King's first act was to adjourn the legal terms, but this was only in anticipation of his returning to preside over a smoothly running legislature.¹²² As the war progressed, however, it became necessary to emphasise the importance of Oxford and to reconstitute the institutional identity of the nation. Proclamations denied various accusations, especially of papal influence in the army, and modified the King's stance on various matters.¹²³ Charles' first major declaration concerned the refusal of Parliament to compromise with him.¹²⁴ He claimed that he only took up arms defensively, and promises protection and remuneration to the families of all those that 'shall have the hard fortune to dye in this Service' (p. 22). Proclamations deployed the language and rhetoric of polemic tracts, and emphasised the legal nature of the King's position:

Wee have made so many Declarations of Our Royall Intentions concerning the preserving of the Religion and Lawes of this Land, That Wee think it not fit often to repeat, Though by Gods grace We seriously intend never to decline or depart from the same. But this seems most strange unto Us, that whil'st (especially at, and about London) Our just and legall Commands are not obeyed, other Orders and Ordinances (for which there is no legall foundation) which not only discountenance, but overthrow the Lawes of the Land that settle Religion, and were the fences of the Subjects property, are submitted unto and obeyed by many of Our weaker Subjects.¹²⁵

The Proclamations of the King, intended to bring order and structure to the nation, increasingly took on this tone of defiance and righteousness. The war was being fought to protect private property, the legal unity of the nation, and true religion. To deny and curtail

¹²² *His Majesties Proclamation for the Adjournment of part of Michaelmasse Term* (Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1643) [TT: 669.f.5 (86)].

¹²³ *A Proclamation declaring His Majesties expresse Command, That no Popish Recusant, nor any other, who shall refuse to take the two Oathes of Allegiance and Supremacie, shall serve Him in His Army: And that the Souldiery commit no rapines upon the People, but be fitly provided of necessaries for their money* (Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most royall maiesty, 1642) [Wing C2574].

¹²⁴ *His Maiesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects, Upon occasion of his late Message to both Houses of Parliament, and their refusall, to treat with Him for the Peace of the Kingdom* (Printed by His Maiesties Command At Oxford By Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University, 1642) [Wing C2258].

the subversion and erosion of his authority represented by the new laws passed by Parliament, Charles was forced to introduce measures and redefine the institutional character of the nation.

In November 1642 the House of Commons issued an Ordinance to assess first London and then the rest of the country for contributions to the war effort.¹²⁶ Charles replied almost immediately, denying the legality of such a move.¹²⁷ In the same week he also issued Proclamations prohibiting the payment and receipt of Customs and Duties (Madan #1129) and Tonnage and Poundage (Madan #1130). These Proclamations were repeated at varying intervals over the next four years. What the Parliamentary move effected, however, was the pressing need to create an institutional identity contrary to that of Westminster, and to move the machinery of the court to Oxford. In July 1643 Charles forbade trade with London (Madan #1414), and eventually all towns 'in rebellion', specifically Gloucester, Coventry, Hull, Warwick, Northampton, Portsmouth, Southampton, Poole and Lyme Regis (Madan #1480). Two weeks later Charles once again adjourned the legal terms, specifically the proceedings at the Westminster courts of the Kings Bench, Common Pleas and Exchequer, but this time commanded that the Chancery and Exchequer, along with the courts of the Duchy of Lancaster, Wards, Liveries and Requests, be removed to Oxford.¹²⁸ In retaliation

¹²⁵ *A Proclamation prohibiting the payment and receipt of Customes, and other Maritime Duties upon the late pretended Ordinance of both Houses of Parliament* (1642), Madan #1129, text quoted from Larkin, #377, p. 830.

¹²⁶ For the shifts in Parliament's constitutional attitude, see David Wootton, 'From Rebellion to Revolution: the crisis of the winter of 1642/3 and the origins of civil war radicalism' in *The English Civil War*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London and New York: Arnold, 1997), pp. 340–57.

¹²⁷ *His Majesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects upon occasion of the late Ordinance and Declaration of the Lords and Commons for the Assessing all such who have not contributed sufficiently for raising of Money, Plate* (Oxford, by L. Lichfield, 1642) [Wing C2261]. This was ordered 'for publishing in churches and chapels of England and Wales' (title-page); it was reprinted several times in Oxford and London.

¹²⁸ *A Proclamation touching the Adjourning of Part of Hilary Terme* (Madan #1140). Material relating to the Oxford Court of Wards during this period survives in BL, Egerton MS 2978, fols. 77r–87v. The King obviously meant to punish those who neglected to attend, and had Sir Robert Heath draw up a 'A List of

Parliament gave orders 'against removing the courts of law to Oxford' (21 January 1643) and passed a Resolution that 'neither the King's Bench nor any other court shall have any jurisdiction over persons committed by Parliament' on 9 February 1643.¹²⁹ The invocation of definitions of jurisdiction emphasises how important to the war these reforms were. The legal domain of the nation was being fought for. Identity and allegiance was to be judicially defined; individuals were either included or excluded within differing versions of legal space.

Institutionally, the entire government of the nation was moved to Oxford. The entirety of the Exchequer was brought to the city, and the King stated that 'No payments or compositions made at Westminster are valid.'¹³⁰ Custom and Duty was also to be paid at Oxford.¹³¹ In time the Prerogative court was eventually moved to the city. Despite the reforms and accompanying Proclamations, income was scarce: the Exchequer attempted to continue as normal, but the effect of the war was to create a much smaller pot of money with far larger demands being made upon it.¹³² Charles leant heavily on the colleges to help him through, and when their resources became exhausted he then applied pressure on college members. He continually called for the donation of arms, horse and plate. The Exchequer gained at most 10% of what it had been accustomed to receive, 'mainly due to

Officers belonging to the Court of Wardes who haue not attended in performance of their duties at Oxford in obedience to his Maties seuerall Proclamacons comaunding their attendance there', BL, Egerton MS 2978, fol. 76r.

¹²⁹ HMC Report 5, pp. 69, 76.

¹³⁰ *A Proclamation for the Payment of His Majesties Rents, and Revenues into His Receipt of His Exchequer, at His City of Oxford* ([Oxford, Leonard Lichfield], 1642[3]) [Wing C2619].

¹³¹ *A Proclamation for the speedy payment of all such summes of Money as are due to His Majesty for Customes, or other Duties upon Merchandize, into His Majesties Receipt at His City of Oxford* (1643), Madan #1252.

¹³² The Privy Council minutes for the period illustrate the increasing concern with ways of raising money, PRO, PC/2/53, esp. pp. 224, 226.

the unwillingness of the people to pay at Oxford.’¹³³ British Library, Add MS. 18980 contains a short treatise entitled ‘The Difficulties that obstruct the Aduance of Moneys in these Parts’ (fols. 32r–v) that lists ‘The not sending down the Privie Seales’ and the problems with obtaining excise and rents as the primary cause of the financial imbalance (fol. 32v). Other sources of revenue were tried: the King created 67 Baronets between 1642–45, who paid him £1095 apiece. New taxes were levied (on “foreign clothiers” for example).¹³⁴ He also muddied the financial waters by allowing certain foreign currency, mostly Irish and French, to become legal tender.¹³⁵ There was also ‘official’ Royalist money coined at the Oxford mint in New Hall Inn, which in 1644 started to distinguish gold coins with an ‘OX’ mark.¹³⁶

The shifting of the financial and legal legislature was mostly unsuccessful. The movement of the machinery of court to Oxford led mostly to confusion and dissent. John Taylor’s ballad *Mad Verse, Sad Verse* expresses his money problems when arriving in Oxford after touring the country. Despite the conceptual credit gained by meeting the King, (‘I rather had lost all I had then missed it’, l. 244), he finds himself financially on the wrong side: ‘My purse was turn’d a Brownist or a Round-head,/ For all the Crosses in it, were confounded,/ To some Employment I my selfe must settle’ (ll. 247–49). Many petitioners had their wills proved twice for safety, and Charles found it increasingly difficult to ensure

¹³³ J. Engberg, ‘Royalist Finances during the English Civil War 1642–46’, *The Scandinavian Economic History Review*, XIV (1966), 73–97 (p. 87). ‘The longer the war lasted the scarcer money became and by a Proclamation of 11 August 1645, issued at Lichfield, the troopers of the King’s army were only paid 6d. a night over and above free-quarter for their “fitting necessaries”’, E. J. S. Parsons, *The Proclamations Issued by Charles I during the years 1642–1646*, 2 volumes (B.Litt, University of Oxford, 1935), I, 30–31.

¹³⁴ *CSPD 1644–1645*, 8 May, p. 107.

¹³⁵ PRO, PC/2/53, p. 224; Proclamations Madan, #1472, #1551. There are various small caches of foreign (largely French and Dutch) coins datable to 1641–3 now on display in the Ashmolean Museum Heberden coin room, the discovery sites of which trace the Queen’s progress from York to Oxford. The coins were evidently being used to pay soldiers throughout England.

¹³⁶ Reginald W. Jeffrey, ‘The Oxford Mint’ in *History of the County of Oxfordshire*, II, 272–73 (p. 273).

that everyone used his courts. In late 1644 Charles voided letters of Marque or Reprisal made before 1 July 1642, imposing retrospective punishment upon those who had not subsequently used the courts in Oxford (Madan #1699).

Charles authorised the production of new Great Seals, physically realigning the state legislature.¹³⁷ In this way, the King appropriated the icons of national identity and refounded them in Oxford; the seals represented the ancient legal administration of the Kingdom.¹³⁸ Charles and Parliament jockeyed for constitutional position over this issue: when the house ordered another ‘counterfeit’ Seal to be cast the King declared it High Treason and made it illegal to act under it (Madan #1494):

That a presumptuous Attempt hath been made by the Major part of the remaining part of the House of Commons to make Our Greate Seale of England, the Making of which by the expresse Letter of the Law is High Treason, and would subvert the ancient and fundamentall Administration of Justice.¹³⁹

Sir John Berkenhead’s poem in *Musarum Oxoniensium Serenissimæ* expresses Royalist disdain for the equivalent Parliamentary attempts to create a national identity through institutional reform:

Let them give Thanks, Lye, Fast, and Vow,
Make a New Seale, New-England too,
Here’s That will stop their wild Career,
The KING’.¹⁴⁰

Writers in Oxford saw the new seal as just the start of Parliament’s attempts to replace the King: ‘You counterfeite His Seale, why not His Hand?’ asked Martin Lluellyn.¹⁴¹ In

¹³⁷ *A Proclamation to Declare, that the Proces of Green Waxe may be sealed at Oxford as well as at London* (1643), Madan #1471, Larkin #450.

¹³⁸ In similar fashion the Rump Parliament created an institutional and national identity for itself by reconfiguring icons of national identity; see Sean Kelsey, *Creating a Republic: the Political Culture of the English Commonwealth 1649–1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

¹³⁹ *A Proclamation warning all His Majesties good Subjects no longer to be misled by the Votes, Orders, and pretended Ordinances of one or both Houses* (1643), Madan #1387, quoted from Larkin #425, p. 915.

¹⁴⁰ *Musarum Oxoniensium, Serenissimæ* ([Oxford] by L. Lichfield, 1643), ll. 3–5, see Chapter Four, below.

Northamptonshire Mildmay Fane mocked the conflation of Parliamentary military and civil lawmaking: ‘now thy great army and Generall/ Doe seek to giue thee & ye Kingdome ye Law’.¹⁴² Fane taps into the rich vein of implied military influence over religious and civic government which *Mercurius Aulicus* and various Royalist pamphlets had established. Institutionally constructed Parliamentarian space was a false prison for true loyalists: ‘That which the world miscalls a Jaile,/ A private Closet is to mee;/ Whilst a good Conscience is my bayle;/ And innocence my liberty’.¹⁴³ Compare also the figuring of wartime England as a prison in Thomas Warmstry’s *The Loyall Subiect’s Retiring-Roome* ‘God help us, we are all prisoners in our native country (for what difference is it to be captive in a strange land, and to be used like strangers in our own?) England it self, the Paradise of the world, is now become our Babylon’.¹⁴⁴ These poems illustrate how official and legal definitions were fundamentally important to constructions of identity and nation; furthermore, they demonstrate the propaganda inflection of the institutional reconfigurations.

Charles’ Proclamations defining the new institutional boundaries of the country were to be extensively distributed: ‘Our expresse pleasure is, That this Our Declaration be Published in all Churches and Chappels within the Kingdom of *England* and Dominion of *Wales*, by the Parsons, Vicars or Curates of the same’ (*His Maiesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects, Upon occasion of his late Message to both Houses*, title-page). Many Proclamations were distributed in this public manner. The British Library copy of a declaration calling for volunteers bears the manuscript inscription ‘This on Satterday last

¹⁴¹ *A Satyr, Occasioned by the Author’s Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, the Kings Cabinet Opened* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645) [TT: E296 (1)], l. 82.

¹⁴² ‘Song or Ode. When ye speakers of either houses Leueing their charges & running away to ye Army’, Houghton Library, Harvard, Eng. fMS 645, p. 6, ll. 23–24.

¹⁴³ ‘The Liberty and requiem of an imprisoned Royallist’, BL, Egerton MS 2725, fols. 138r–9r, ll. 7–10.

was proclaimed in seuerall streets in Oxon.’¹⁴⁵ A copy of a Proclamation regarding the regulation of the army began ‘Theis our Comaunds Wee require forthwth to be published at the head of every Regimt. of our Army and to be fully observed by all both officers & souldiers of our Army, as they & every of them will avoid our high displeasure for their neglects of all or any part of them’.¹⁴⁶ Texts were published in other ways that emphasised the control of church and state: read out before sermons, declaimed by the town crier, or fixed to public spaces and boundaries of particular importance.¹⁴⁷ They defined and mediated the physical space of towns and cities, and constructed the space of the subject.

Royal Proclamations and Ordinances were reprinted and distributed in a variety of places: Shrewsbury, York, Bristol.¹⁴⁸ Various means were used, especially to smuggle the books into London: carriers, bargemen, private letters.¹⁴⁹ Whilst the Court maintained some

¹⁴⁴ *The Loyall Subiect's Retiring-Roome* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645) [TT: E300 (1)], p. 2.

¹⁴⁵ Quoted in Madan, p. 187. ‘On Saturday last this printed paper enclosed was with trumpets and other solemnity in divers parts of the City of Oxford publicly proclaimed and pasted up in several places of the city’ complained John Whistler to William Lenthall, 5 September 1642, *HMC* (Portland I), pp. 59–60. A later declaration forbidding those with the King’s Evil to approach the court until Michaelmas was posted ‘on the Court gates, and all the ports and passages into the Citie’, physically protecting the King and his entourage. *Mercurius Aulicus* quoted Madan, p. 243. *Aulicus* here also indicates a physical delineation within the city of an area that is the court.

¹⁴⁶ 13 June 1643, BL, Harleian MS 6804, fol. 75v. It seems that this is a copy of a published text that has not survived. This Proclamation is one of a number addressed to the army that complicate an understanding of the chain of command. The army was run through the Council of War, and Edward Walker’s correspondence and various manuscript collections in the British Library (BL, Add. MSS 15750, 33223, 33596, 18981) bear witness to the centralised nature of the campaign. In addition to this, Charles published Proclamations, using the press to run the war, but also publicly correcting the behaviour of the troops which had been criticised in the Parliamentary newsletters.

¹⁴⁷ ‘This day at Morning Prayer in all the Churches and Chappels of the University and City of *Oxon*, was published a Paper subscribed by the Lords of His Majesties most Honourable Privie Counsell’, *Mercurius Aulicus the 24 Weeke* (1644), 9 June [TT: E53 (5)]. Bod, Add. MS D.114, a collection of documents relating to the administration of Oxford during the war, includes various entries ordering official information ‘to be declared by the Churchwardens and constables at euey house, and to be proclaymed by the Drummer’, 13 June 1643, fol. 24r.

¹⁴⁸ For distribution in the North see Sessions, William K., *Bulkley and Broad, White and Wayt* (York: Ebor Press, 1986) and Laurence Hanson, ‘The King’s Printer at York and Shrewsbury, 1642–43’, *The Library*, 23 (1943), pp. 129–31.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Endymion Porter’s letter from Oxford to the Earl of Newcastle: ‘I beseech your Lordship not to wonder at this tattered Mercury [...] for we have had such ill-luck in our cavaliers, as we thought this way the

control over the postal system, this was used, and newsbooks would certainly have been covered by the March 1644 Order of the Oxford Parliament that any Declaration or Book published by the King be distributed and read by the Sheriffs and Constables amongst their locales.¹⁵⁰ The structures of the institutional government of the nation were enlisted to facilitate the dissemination of Charles' Proclamations and the propaganda of the court.

The various methods of 'publication' — announced in churches, read aloud to troops, posted on walls — would guarantee a large unlettered audience for the King's Proclamations. They also helped to physically define Royalist boundaries and material spaces. Proclamations and Declarations were reprinted (sometimes solely printed) in *Mercurius Aulicus*, indicating their importance as news but also in generating an image of the Royalist legislation mediated through this populist and polemic newsbook. 850–1200 copies of the Proclamations tended to be printed, a huge physical effort (a relatively popular newsbook would struggle to achieve a significantly greater circulation). In particular, the continuing instructions 'That this Our Proclamation be read in all Churches and Chappells within this Our Kingdome' meant that the structured model of nationally constructed Royalism and obedience would reach a far wider audience than any other printed text.¹⁵¹ The audience for the Proclamations was unique; Charles could address a vast non-elite and

best to secure letters', 2 March 1642[3], *HMC* (Portland I), pp. 98–9. These letters were intercepted by Parliament and the circulating of the 'libel' *Mercurius Aulicus* included with it was enough to cause the House to suspend Porter as an MP, *CJ 1642–44*, II, 997.

¹⁵⁰ *A Order for Publishing Declarations and Books Set Forth by His Maiesties Command* (Oxford, by Leonard Lichfield, 1644) [Wing O373].

¹⁵¹ *A Proclamation warning all His Majesties good Subjects no longer to be misled by the Votes, Orders, and pretended Ordinances of one or both Houses* (1643), Madan #1387, quoted from Larkin #425, p. 918.

uneducated domain.¹⁵² The Clergy gave his words credence and status as religiously and socially important texts:

And Whereas diverse of Our Clergy eminent for their Piety and Learning, because they publish Our lawfull and just Commands and Declarations, and will not, against the known Lawes of the Land and their own Consciences, submit to Contributions, nor publicly pray against Us and Our Assistants, but conforme themselves to the Book of Common-Prayer established by Law, and Preach Gods Word according to the purity thereof, and in their Sermons will not teach Sedition, nor will publish illegal Commands, and Orders for fomenting the unnaturall Warre levied against Us, are some of them driven from their Cures and Habitations, and others Silenced and discharged from the Exercise of their Cures, and Persecuted, and their Curates, if Orthodox, displaced, some others who are Factious and Schismaticall intruded and put in, to sow Sedition and seduce Our good Subjects from their obedience expresly contrary to the word of God, and the Lawes of the Land.¹⁵³

The Proclamation deploys the rhetoric of polemic propaganda disguised as authoritative instruction and monarchical truth. Obedience and loyalty is expressly defined as a binding religious and legal concept. ‘Subjects’ are constructed as those in thrall to the ‘word of God, and the Lawes of the Land’. The subjects have been seduced from their obedience by the persuasion of factious preachers who promulgate the ‘illegal Commands and Orders’ which foster the ‘unnaturall Warre levied against Us’. This passage also illustrates how the conflict was in some measure text-based. Loyal clergymen ‘publish Our lawfull and just Commands and Declarations’, tying the authority of the Royal text to that of the religious by reading Proclamations and decrees out during liturgical ceremonies. They transmit the word of the King, acting as heralds to his wishes. Parliament attempts to subvert this process by publishing ‘illegal Commands and Orders’. The definition of obedience is what is at stake here, and this allegiance can be swayed and defined by printed declarations.

¹⁵² The diary of the Essex clergyman Ralph Josselin bears witness to the fact that the King’s Proclamations were not uniformly read by preachers, *The Diary of Ralph Josselin, 1616–1683*, ed. by Alan Macfarlane (London: The British Academy and Oxford University Press, 1976). This example once again shows how local issues were not factored into the centralised Royalist equation; the King assumed and intended to address a large audience, whatever the material reality of that was.

1.6 Mediation and dissemination: *Mercurius Aulicus*

This final section will begin to consider the transmission of Royalist definitions of behaviour. The process of dissemination and transmission is analysed at length in the rest of the thesis, but here the focus is upon official means of distributing and mediating information. Particular attention is paid to the court newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus* which was published from Oxford under the auspices of the King: ‘who do you think wrote *Aulicus*, the King or Berkenhead?’ complained *Mercurius Britannicus* in August 1645.¹⁵⁴ *Aulicus* presented the Proclamations and Declarations of the King as well as distilling the Royalist project into easily digested prose. It particularly worked by attacking the perceived abnormality of Parliamentary behaviour, satirising the transgressions beyond normality of those in London and thus highlighting the value of obeying the King’s Declarations. *Aulicus* was an extended arm of the court’s control over identity. It was an official information service, containing all the news that was fit to print. It was an official publication, a court-based propaganda newsbook. *Aulicus*’ competitors in London often attacked this aspect of the text:

Though I thought it beneath my pen to *dip* into the *lies*, and follies, and Calumnies of such an *Oxford Pamphlet*, yet because I was informed, it was not the act of one, but many, *viz.* *Berkenhead* the Scribe, Secretary *Nicholas* the Informer, *George Digby* the contriver, and an *assessment* of Wits is laid upon every *Colledge*, and paid weekly for the continuation of this thing called *Mercurius Aulicus*, upon these considerations (*Mercurius Britannicus* 16 [December 7 – December 14, 1643]).

¹⁵³ *A Proclamation against the Oppression of the Clergy* (1643), Madan #1351, text quoted from Larkin, #416, pp. 897–98.

¹⁵⁴ *Mercurius Britannicus* 92 [28 July – 4 August, 1645].

Aulicus dovetailed with the official Proclamations and Petitions to present a united opposition to Parliament.¹⁵⁵

It is generally calculated that the print run for a large and successful newsbook would be somewhere in the region of 1,000 copies, maybe more.¹⁵⁶ *Aulicus* was printed on two presses in Oxford, and probably on the King's travelling press in Shrewsbury and Bristol, although no extant copies survive (Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead*, pp. 49–51). Thomas estimates that 'it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that 5,000 copies of *Aulicus* could have been published in some weeks' (Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead*, p. 52). Even given that literacy outside London was around 30%, the knock-on circulation of *Aulicus* must have been huge: sent out in private correspondence, read out at Church, the copies were disseminated widely, reaching even Ireland and the colonies eventually (Frank, *The Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 244–53).¹⁵⁷ The collection of George Thomason attests to the fact that *Aulicus* was regularly and freely available to buy in London. From when he began to seriously collect in 1641, the number of newspapers bought by Thomason mushroomed to an average of around 180 per year.¹⁵⁸ Despite the ban on trade with Oxford imposed by Parliament, *Aulicus* got through. For lengthy periods of time reprints of *Aulicus*

¹⁵⁵ Of the 836 items printed between 1642–46 considered by Falconer Madan in *Oxford Books*, some 500 are court related, institutional or official documents.

¹⁵⁶ Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 232–38; J. Frank, *Beginnings of the English Newspaper* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 57, 314 n. 54.

¹⁵⁷ The BL copy of *A Letter from a Protestant in Ireland to a Member of the House of Commons in England. Upon occasion of the Treaty in that Kingdome* ([Oxford, by Leonard Lichfield] Printed, 1643) contains a manuscript note on the inside of the title-page which attests that pamphlets and newsbooks were circulated in correspondence: 'with my best respects & services I commend this booke to yor readinge I pray you accept of this service untill I be abell to Pforme some others, I wolde now have sent you an Oxford deyarnall, but thr is but one in the City yt I coolde heare of & that I could not get, if I could I woold haue sent it you'. The names of the recipient and sender have been deleted, but the note suggests that such a 'service' was a multivalent undertaking which had patronage implications as well as being a simple mode of information transmission.

¹⁵⁸ 1641/ 3; 1642/ 80; 1643/ 126; 1644/ 187; 1645/ 188; 1646/ 186, *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661. Vol. II Catalogue of the Collection, Part II Newspapers 1641-1663, Appendix 1658-1661, Index* (London: Printed by Order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1908).

were produced in London: '*Britanicus*, and the comming of the Scots do so worke at *Oxford*, that they think one *Aulicus* cannot lie fast enough nor sufficiently, so they have given a new *Commission* to one in *London*' (*Mercurius Britanicus* 8 [10 October – 17 October, 1643]).¹⁵⁹ *Mercurius Britanicus* gloried in the occasional defeats of the newsbook, figuring *Aulicus* as a physical part of the war effort:

The grand newes is, *Mercurius Aulicus* was surprized on *Wednesday* last by the Militia of the City of *London*, and few onely escaped, and no fewer than five hundred lies were taken prisoners, it is thought as great a losse as befell his Majestie since the late losse at *Glocester*, but we hear they are *recruiting* him fast at *Oxford*, and I can assure you there is a *Presse* there at this very present for that very purpose (*Mercurius Britanicus* 4 [12 September – 19 September, 1643]).

Aulicus was a printed adjunct to the official Proclamations, Declarations, and Petitions published in Oxford and sent around the country as the official voice of the King. The newsbook regularly reprinted official documents and often added an explanatory marginalia, interpreting the jargon for the common subject, reiterating the message. Other than attacking Parliament and reporting Royalist victories, this was the major function of *Aulicus*: a reaffirmation of the directives from Court, an explanation of the official position. Sir Edward Nicholas certainly had much confidence in the newsbook: 'Other news the mercury herewith sent will acquaint you withal'; 'I have written what I had to advise to Lord Hopton, whose letters and to this Mercury I refer you'.¹⁶⁰ This shows the function of *Aulicus* as official news, replacing diplomatic correspondence with authoritative

¹⁵⁹ 'Another feature is that for at least four weeks in 1643, and fifteen weeks in 1644, there is a London reprint of the numbers', Madan, p. 492. Thomas cites another 15 extant London reprints, *Sir John Berkenhead*, p. 49. See also Milton in *Areopagitica*: 'Do we not see, not once or oftner, but weekly that continu'd Court-libell against the Parlament and City, Printed, as the wet sheets can witnes, and dispers't among us, for all that licencing can doe?', *Areopagitica; A Speech of Mr John Milton For the Liberty of Unlicenc'd Printing, To the Parlament of England* (London, Printed in the Yeare, 1644) [TT: E18 (9)], Sig. B3r.

¹⁶⁰ Nicholas to the Earl of Forth, *CSPD 1644*, 21 March, p. 63, 12 April, p. 109.

information. Nicholas' letters underline the primacy of Oxford as a centre for the distribution of information, a centre and focus of Royalist activity.

Parliament is presented throughout *Aulicus* as an appropriating collection of selfish malcontents abusing their positions to enrich themselves.¹⁶¹ Individual cases are highlighted as examples of the innate evil of the institution. There are three linked themes within the coverage of the House of Commons: their avarice is emphasised; this is linked to their seizing of power, supplanting the traditional and implicitly correct ways of running government; they are thence shown to be intentionally misleading the people. *Aulicus*' retort to Stroud's reported assertion that 'All the whole Kingdome is bound to submit to them' is an illumination of his words: 'there meaning is, that a few male-contents having cozened the Kingdome to furnish them with an army, may ruine every man in England for a publicke good, for the enriching those few, whose Authority is greater, then they themselves can yet imagine'.¹⁶² The actions and decisions of Parliament are constantly 'translated' in this fashion and their hidden agenda revealed for the good of the King's loyal subjects. The actions of Parliament are then associated with the behaviour of those that further their cause – the army, the preachers, and the London newsbooks – and a persuasive collage of the opposition is formed: the atrocities of the army, the extremities and blasphemy of the preachers, and the blatant lies of the press, all spring from the legitimacy given their actions by Parliament's rebellion. The opposition has an organic unity which means that vicious characteristics can be traced from MP to common soldier. The

¹⁶¹ This is a regular feature of Royalist manuscript verse on the parliament, for instance 'The Roundhead's psalme of money', Bod MS Rawlinson Poet. 71, pp. 159–61.

¹⁶² *Mercurius Aulicus the 56 Weeke* (1644) 23 January [TT: E32 (17)]. 'And this hope of being Masters of other mens estates, makes their armed Rebels so active and diligent', *the 62 Weeke* 5 March 1644 [TT: E39 (3)].

Parliamentarians forge new Seals to give their actions false credibility, forcibly take the positions of power, steal money from honest and loyal citizens.

Allied to institutional avarice in the form of taxation, the Parliamentarians are also portrayed as the party of theft. They steal mainly from good, loyal people, as 'to plunder one another is somewhat rare with the Rebels, [...] but they fall on in earnest when they rob His Majesties loyall Subjects'.¹⁶³ In addition to plundering *Aulicus* often spiced up the news with tales of Parliamentary atrocities, from iconoclasm and hypocritical behaviour to extreme brutality.¹⁶⁴ The merciless behaviour of Parliament's Army even led some to attempt suicide.¹⁶⁵ Churches were ravaged in the name of a hypocritical and egalitarian religion that allowed Cobblers to preach and common soldiers to destroy holy artifacts.¹⁶⁶ Puritan extremism is inextricably linked with Parliament, the excessive zeal of their supporters intentionally distasteful to any fair minded Englishman. *Aulicus* conflated loyalty to the King (or antipathy to Parliament) with toleration of the Laudian doctrines espoused by his supporters.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶³ *Mercurius Aulicus the 86 Weeke* (1644) 21 August [TT: E9 (5)]. The paragraph continues to relate the case of Lady Falkland: 'And to shew they were perfect Robbers (for there were three Scots Captaines among them) they fell upon the labouring Bees, shooke them out of their hives, and carried away thair honest labour in pots and dishes, which they plundered out of the House.'

¹⁶⁴ 'The very children had their Clothes torne from their backs, and the Gentlewomen were (not by the Common Souldiers, from whom we might expect rudeness, but) by Captaine *Taylor* and other Captaines, stript almost naked, their attire pulled from their heads, shoulders, to the very Gloves, their heads beaten and cut with Mustets, themselves dragg'd about the House, and then made to march up to the knees in dirt, the Souldiers reviling them as they went along, calling them Bloudy *Ammunition Whores*', *Mercurius Aulicus the 62 Weeke* (1644), 5 March [TT: E39 (3)].

¹⁶⁵ 'Others are so worne out by the Rebels mercilesse pillaging and taxes (especially Widowes and Orphans) that they are even ready to lay violent hands upon themselves', *Mercurius Aulicus the 82 Weeke* (1644), 24 July [TT: E6 (25)].

¹⁶⁶ Cromwell at Peterborough 'did most miserably deface the Cathedrall Church, breake down the Organs, and destroy the glasse windowes, committing many other outrages on the house of God which were not acted by the Gothes in the sack of Rome, and are most commonly forborn by the Turks when they possess themselves by force of a Christian city', *Mercurius Aulicus the 17 Weeke* (1643), 28 April [TT: E101 (10)].

¹⁶⁷ 'The importance of loyalty to the church as a motive for loyalty to the King [...] Most of Royston's [London] publications place a strong emphasis on the King's role as head of the English Church', Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 12.

1.7 Conclusion

The official publications produced from Oxford during the 1640s configured a particularly polarised notion of behaviour and constructed a distinctly Royalist identity. These models had a profound influence upon Royalist culture, as is suggested by the widely transcribed manuscript poem ‘Oxford Riddle’:

There dwells a people on the earth
that reckon true Religion treason
call madness zeale & nonsense reason
that finde noe freedome but in slauery
that make lyes truth Religion knauery
That robbe & cheate with yea and nay
riddle mee riddle mee who are they

That hate the flesh yet ferke the Dames
that make Kinges great by curbing Crownes
that quench the fire by kindling flames
that settle peace by plundering Townes
that gouerne with implicit votes
that stablsh truth by cutting throates
that kisse their Majestie and betray
riddle mee riddle whoe be they

That make heauen speake by their Comission
that stopp Gods peace & boast his power
that teach bold blasphemy & sedicon
and pray high Treason by the houre
that dam all but such as they are
that with all Comon except prayer
that Idolize Pim Brooke & Say
Riddle mee riddle mee who are they.¹⁶⁸

Identity has become black and white; there is an answer to this riddle, and the clues or algebraic notifications needed to solve this behavioural formula are distinct patterns of

¹⁶⁸ Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 71, p. 139, other copies at Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 62, Ballard MS 47. It was also printed as part of a brief counterfeit collection of verse supposedly from Oxford gathered together as *The Humble Petition Of the House of Commons* ([?Oxford], 1643)[TT: E69 (24)], pp. 7–8.

action. Riddles were popular in manuscript accounts of roundheads, suggesting an interest in cultural encoding which can be interpreted by loyalist readers.¹⁶⁹

The projection of the King's words was a very controlled process. The methods of publication gained a large audience but this was within very set boundaries: the court newsbook, which contextualised and gave authority to Charles' words; the church service, which lent material and spiritual authority to the Proclamations; the army; even the city-space became civilised and controlled by the intervention of heralds calling the King's words. The reception of texts might vary on the ground, but their transmission and circulation was controlled and orderly. The legal nature of the Proclamations insisted that they be followed, that their message was to be accepted wholesale. This articulated a certain polemically inflected theory of reception predicated upon the unquestionable prerogative of the Royal author. Obedience and loyalty, the cornerstones of the Royalist identity, were predicated upon the unquestioning acceptance of the authority of the text. The spaces into which loyalist texts were projected were idealised locations constructed and inflected by the authority of the King and his agents; audiences were passive receivers, subjected to the authority of the monarchical text. Despite the fact that this was patently not the actual or material case, analysis of the techniques used by those who attempted to maintain and posit such a space is not invalidated. Indeed, the myth-making and self-fashioning of the Royalist project is crucial to our understanding of the civil war. This issue, and those of audience and the construction of an 'intended reader', will be discussed in the next Chapter.

¹⁶⁹ See for instance 'The Eccho' which appears at Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 62, Douce, MS 357, and BL, Harleian MS 6918, or 'The Roundheade' which opens 'What's hee that with his short haire/ his little Beard and his longe Eares/ that this newe faith hath founded', Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 71, ll. 1-4.

Chapter Two

‘read/ All backwards’: The Royalist reader in the English Revolution

Amongst other waies the writing part hath especially been plied, to make good the claimes of the Court, and render the Parliament odious to the People, by which many good men otherwise well inclin’d have withdrawne their service and assistance from their Countrey: New poisons are every week vented from *Oxford*, wherin licence is taken by all opprobrious and scurrilous wayes to defame those Members and others, that remaine faithfull to the *People*, amongst which, that which goes under the Name of *Mercurius Aulicus* is not the least dangerous for though the Man himself be but a Hireling in the business and has undertaken the employment, in hope to be some Gay-thing or other, yet forasmuch as I deem the Court to furnish the materialls, and through him to distill what forgeries and errors they please, into the heads of the People.¹

¹ *Anti-Aulicus. Discovering Weekly the Policies, Deceits, and Erroneous Maximes of the Court* ([London] Printed according to Order, for H. T.), Number 1, c. 6–8 February 1644.

2.1 Introduction

In his presidential address to the Royal Historical Society in 1987, G. E. Aylmer emphasised the importance of using Royalist literature to consider issues of loyalty and allegiance.² He was attempting to answer the question ‘why did people fight?’, and posited that reasons might be found in the pamphlets, broadsides, satires, verses, tracts and sermons published during the 1640s. Of course, the published word alone does not make people take up arms; as has been emphasised earlier in this thesis, national loyalties were in the main overwritten by local issues and rivalries. Aylmer’s notions of loyalty are in many ways too one-dimensional; ‘allegiance’ during the war was a complex, problematic and localised concept. His own discussion of certain works itself highlights the religious complexity and factional politics represented in various nominally ‘Royalist’ texts of the period. However, Aylmer’s thesis becomes interesting if it is conceptually inverted: how were those who produced such literature trying to make people fight? This section will examine some of the methods deployed by the Royalist side to do just this. I argue that the concept of Royalism as established through political theory and institutional reform was deployed throughout Royalist literature.

Chapter One was mainly concerned with the material and political consequences of the relocation to Oxford; however, the final section gestured towards a model of the textual construction of a Royalist identity. The present Chapter extends the analysis of this phenomenon, delineating Royalist control of the presses as a prelude to discussions of cultural encoding and polemic constructions of political identity. It analyses how the composition of Royalist texts was undertaken within a culture of centralised censorship. Textual space was closely controlled, and the integrity of the text became of paramount

importance. This was in part due to a defence of traditional models of hierarchy and authority. In particular, the King and his court were concerned with validating only certain forms of discourse. This was achieved by both institutional censorship and textual self-censorship or construction of the reader. Royalist definitions of private space and public text are analysed with particular reference to the letter-genre. The Chapter contextualises the publication of *The King's Cabinet Open'd* and reviews the consequences this had for Royalist textual identity and notions of public and textual space. It then moves to look at how texts assumed and attempted to create a particular type of audience, an 'intended reader'. Tracts and pamphlets constructed a readership through dedications and polarised argument. Royalist writing attempted as far as was possible to control the reception of texts by configuring and constructing the experience of reading. I will argue that Royalist authors denied their audience access to the multivalent readings that were an integral part of Parliamentary texts.

Royalism refuted humanist notions of education and reasoned discussion, proffering modes which emphasised the didactic authority of a single truth. Charles noted that

It is no new thing among so many wise men to have severall and farre different conceptions; yet none unrepugnant to reason, or dissentions from truth; as in the severall parts and dimensions of the body the limbs move severall wayes, but all to one end.³

The body of state, the spatial extent of Charles' dominions, is multi-discoursed and full of a variety of opinion. However, this is subjugated and subject to the 'one end', the government and authority of the monarch. Royalist pamphlets took elements of dialogic works and were

² 'Presidential Address: Collective Mentalities in mid-Seventeenth-Century England: II. Royalist Attitudes', *Transactions of the Royal History Society*, 37 (1987), 1–31.

³ *His Maiesties Gracious Answer To the Different Opinions of the Earles of Bristol and Dorset concerning Peace and War*, (First Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for John Rivers [1642]) [TT: E83 (21)], p. 3.

fundamentally dialectic, but manipulated these forms to create a closed debate. Loyalist polemic style tended to use a hectoring, answering style. Opposition text was appropriated and rejected. This technique was borrowed from religious pamphlets of the 1620s and 30s, a polemic style deployed to demonstrate or explain a text. The tracts provide interpretations which have the tone and style of religious exegesis.⁴ They demonstrated the problems inherent in the arguments of specific pamphlets, a polemic struggle with a unique and specified interlocutor. This manner of reading opposition text was predicated upon a concept of an absolute truth. Parliamentary fact was seen to be merely subjective, a consistently biased interpretation of events which intentionally ignored reality. This was the basic premise of both sides in the propaganda war, but for the Royalists it had more profound implications, especially for concepts of interrogating texts. Parliamentary theory argued that the King was badly advised and had misinterpreted the Bible; Royalism attacked the Parliamentary project for being wrong and incorrect, a monstrous aberration attacking the foundations of justice and order.

2.2. Royalist Political Theory

This section consists of a brief analysis of political theory during the first civil war. It concentrates on the language of authority conceived of by Royalist writers, and the more populist egalitarianism propounded by those supporting Parliament. Once I have briefly established the positions of either side, I consider two concepts of paramount importance to the conflict: reading, and the public. The section delineates the philosophical and

⁴ Consider for instance *The Grand Question concerning Taking up Armes against the King Answered, by Application of the holy Scriptures to the Conscience of every Subject* ([Oxford] Printed in the Yeare of our Lord 1643) [TT: E70 (17)], which prints the 'Question' and then the detailed refutation as 'A Reply':

intellectual principles underpinning the conflict. The Royalist texts here provide a lengthy apologia for the King and a defence of his position.

In order to understand the print construction of a Royalist identity it is instructive to briefly review the political theories of their opposition. Parliamentary writers articulated positions of resistance predicated on an 'ascending' theory of society.⁵ The populace held the power, which they delegated upwards: 'Power is originally inherent in the people'.⁶ The authority of Kings and magistrates is ceded by the people, their representatives elected or contracted through a covenant:

and it [power] is nothing else but that might and vigour [of the people] which such or such a societie of men containes in it selfe, and when by such or such a Law of common consent and agreement it is derived into such and such hands, God confirms that Law: and so man is the free and voluntary Author, the Law is the Instrument, and God is the establisher of both. And we see, not that Prince which is the most potent over his subjects, but that Prince which is most Potent in his subjects, is indeed, truly potent (Parker, *Observations*, pp. 1–2).

This version of constitutional relations was expressed institutionally in the Grand Remonstrance of 26 May 1642 which made Parliament's position explicit. Princes were only 'intrusted with their Kingdoms' (quoted in Sanderson, *But the people's creatures*, p. 20). As William Prynne wrote in 1643, Kings and Emperors 'were and are subordinate, accountable for their actions to them [Parliament].'⁷ Members of Parliament mediated the people's power and advised the King: 'Two things especially are aymed at in Parliaments, not to be attayned to by other meanes. First that the interest of the people might be satisfied; secondly that Kings might be better counsaild' (Parker, *Observations*, p. 5). The 'interest'

⁵ 'Therefore I have proposed, explained and applied some places of holy Scriptures to this present purpose, that the ignorant may be hereby catechized', Sig. A1r.

⁶ See John Sanderson, *But the people's creatures: The Philosophical basis of the English Civil War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), pp. 17–19.

⁷ [Henry Parker], *Observations upon some of his Majesties late Answers* ([London], 1642) [TT: E153 (26)], p. 1.

of the people was not served by anyone other than the Parliament, and, subsidiary to them, the King: 'The King may safely leave his highest rights to Parliament, for none knowes better, or affects more the sweetnesse of this so well-ballanced a Monarchy than they do' (Parker, *Observations*, p. 22). The Court's attempt to replace these elected representatives as primary advisors to Charles has brought the country only trouble: 'wee have had almost 40 yeeres experience, that the Court way of preferment has beene by doing publike ill Offices, and we can nominate what Dukes, what Earles, what Lords, what Knights, have been made great and rich by base disservices to the State' (Parker, *Observations*, p. 11). Prynne attacked 'illiterate flattering Court-Doctors, Theologasters, Lawyers, Statists', who 'without any shadow of Truth or Reason' argue against the sovereignty of Parliament 'not so much to flatter or seduce their Princes, as to advance themselves' (*The Sovereigne Power*, Sig. A2r). Kings were entrusted with power, and their primary duty was to the subject.⁸ Taylor observed that 'The word Trust is frequent in the Kings Papers, and therefore I conceive the King does admit that his interest in the Crowne is not absolute, or by a meere donation of the people, but in part conditionate and fiduciary', (*Observations*, p. 4). The 'ascending' model allowed Parliamentarian writers to justify their theories of resistance as loyal and defensive: 'For him [Charles], say we; for we will never yeeld, that wee resist the King: we will maintaine a lawfull resistance, which god blesseth: and abhor the contrary, which God curseth'.⁹ Parliament was fighting a defensive war against a misguided and unfortunately tyrannical monarch who, through the agency of self-serving courtiers and prelates, pretended to an absolute power independent of the people.

⁷ *The Sovereigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes* (Printed at London for Michael Sparke Senior, 1643) [TT: E248], Sig. A2r.

⁸ He concedes that there is no 'expresse contract' but depends on this concept of 'trust', p. 4.

Royalist political theory scorned claims that Parliament was fighting a reluctant war in the interests of the people. Dudley Digges mocked such propaganda: ‘for His Majesty had not granted one commission to raise a man, when they began their *defensive warre*’.¹⁰ Instead, Royalist commentators saw the King as the aggrieved party. His concessions during the early 1640s were proof of his lack of aggression. Charles was God’s anointed, and not dependent on the whim of the people’s support. Tracts concentrated upon defence of the established institutional and constitutional life of the nation by deploying theories of Order. Polemicists such as Ussher and Bramhall emphasised that hegemonic or hierarchical monarchical order was the only true model endowed by God (Sanderson, ‘*But the people’s creatures*’, pp. 55–57). Royalist theory was predicated upon the inflexible authority of the King. This was due to his status as the Lord’s conscious choice for the throne.

Royalist tract writers and theorists interpreted the fifth commandment in a general way, arguing that the King was political father to the nation and therefore any challenge to his authority was blasphemous. The use of a traditional familial model predicated upon patriarchal infallibility is a common trope for Royalist theories of society, and, as will be seen, particularly important in Royalist constructions of gender roles. A manuscript poem ‘Anagrammes of ye PARLIAMENT 1642’ emphasised the familial transgressions of the House: ‘Am il Parent/ I part al men’.¹¹ Henry Ferne was in no doubt as to the reason for the present troubles: ‘Tis the spirituall whoredome of Lay-Preachers, and Shee-Divines that hath procreated these monsters in Religion, that hath engendered this Viporous Brood of

⁹ *Powers to be Resisted: Or A Dialogue arguing The Parliaments lawfull Resistance of the Powers now in Armes against them* (London: Printed for Henry Overton in Popes-head-Alley, 1643) [TT: E79 (15)], p. 2.

¹⁰ Dudley Digges, *The Unlawfulnesse of Subjects taking up Armes against their Sovereigne* ([Oxford] Printed in the Yeare 1643) [TT: 29 (1)], p. 5 (italics original).

¹¹ Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 26, fol. 137v, ll. 3–4. *Mercurius Aulicus* caricatured the social and gender inversions of the enemy, declaring ‘The Parliament is ruled by the citizens, and the citizens by their wives’,

Schismaticall Tenets, which like the Ægyptian flies darken the aire, blind the eyes of the vulgar with sencelesse ignorance'.¹² Ferne's carefully polemic syntax expresses the horror at social and gender experiment found in all Royalist literature of the first civil war. The language of monstrous feminine creation allied with apocalyptic and serpentine imagery caricatures recognisably Parliamentary egalitarian roles and identities with destructive and abnormal characteristics.¹³ The flawed magistracy of 'ignorant and mechanick Divines' (Sig. A1v) has allowed the 'vulgar' and ignorant populace to become powerful and begin to intervene in the political life and debate of the nation.¹⁴ This new social order threatens to 'darken the aire' and 'blind the eyes of the vulgar'.

This last sentiment betrays a concern regarding the fickle sentiments of the common populace. Despite certain nods toward popular genres and hybrid modes inherent in the use of ballads or newsbooks and the employment of writers such as John Taylor and Martin Parker, the Royalist project rejected any empowerment of the population. Encounters with populist genres and modes looked to control them, for instance in the 'official' ballad satires of Taylor and Parker, or to deploy a rhetoric of pre-capitalist pastoral harmony.¹⁵ Taylor and Parker deployed their skills in robust defence of the King and the discourses of privilege. Taylor in particular mocked the pretensions of commoner preachers and ignorant

quoted in David Underdown, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 87.

¹² *The Sovereignty of Kings* (Printed at London, 1642) [TT: E244 (17)], Sig. A1v.

¹³ Poets physically figured Parliament as exotic and other: Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 71 describes the house as an 'Afrique Monster' (p. 104) and devotes a whole poem to 'A strange & prodigious sight of a monster to be seene at Westminster' (pp. 84–89). Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 26 includes a poem 'The true Puritan w'out disguise' (109r–110v) that begins 'A Puritan is such a monstrous thinge/ that loues Democracies, and hates a kinge/ for Royall issue never making praiers', conflating Otherness with egalitarian politics and focussing this through loyalist poetic practice of the 1630s (panegyrics on Royal issue).

¹⁴ See Sanderson, 'But the people's creatures', pp. 71–2 for Royalist fear of 'popular' politics and their use of examples such as Wat Tyler and Jack Cade.

¹⁵ See Bernard Capp, *The world of John Taylor the Water-Poet 1578–1653* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

Parliamentarian apologists.¹⁶ Whilst Taylor is meant to be a ‘popular’ poet he does crop up in more middle-class places, for instance National Library of Wales MS 5390D where ‘The Conventicle’ is included along with poems by Denham and Donne in an anthology collected by Sir Thomas Salisbury of Llewenni, Denbighshire.¹⁷

Dudley Digges recognised the populist appeal of Parliamentary theories of accountability and the innate authority of the people:

He that will endeavour to make the yoke of government more easie, by setting a people loose from the restraints of positive lawes, upon pretence, they may justly use their native liberty, and resume their originall power, if civill constitutions, which were agreed upon for their good, be not effectual to that end, but prove disadvantageous to them, Shall be sure to meet with many favourable readers (*The Unlawfulnessse of Subjects taking up Armes against their Sovereigne*, p. 1)

Digges understood the temptation of specious freedom. For him, civilised society depends upon the structure of laws and institutional restraint of the individual and collective will. Popularist notions that empower the nation must be addressed but refuted. Digges’ formulation polemically categorises the readership of a text. In terms of reception theory, Digges’ words seem to imply that the text will only be positively constructed by the reader who is predisposed to agree already. Readers ‘meet’ with a text, a physical encounter which takes place in a material space. This space, for Royalists, was controlled and mediated through the authority of the King and his language.

¹⁶ See for instance the lay preaching satirised in *Some Small and Simple Reasons, Delivered in a Hollow-Tree, in Waltham Forrest* ([Oxford, 1643]) [TT: E64 (14)]: ‘My Dear-beloved, and Zealous Brethren and Sisters here Assembled in this holy Congregation, I am to unfold, unravell, untwist, unty, unloose, and undoe to your uncapable understandings, some small Reasons, the Matter, the Causes, the Motives, the Grounds, the Principles, the Maxims, the whyes and the wherefores, wherefore and why, we reject, omit, abandon, contemne, despise, and are and ought to be withstanders and opposers of the Service-book’, p. 2.

¹⁷ NLW, MS 5390D, p. 6. Denham’s *Elegy on Strafford* is on p. 5 and Donne’s ‘Goe and catch a falling star’ is on pp. 7–8, following Taylor’s poem. The Salisbury circle were moneyed and well connected: the MS also contains ‘A Masque as it was prsented at ye right honble ye Lord Strange his at Knowsley on Twelfth night

1.3 Royalist Readings

The texts that I have been surveying deploy polemic strategies outside of the rhetorical construction of political argument. Generically, for instance, they utilise what are recognisably polarised models. The Parliamentary tract *Powers to be Resisted* presents itself as a 'Dialogue', a humanistic debate through which the common reader can come to understanding. The features of the dialogue form implied an interaction with the text and an intervention in public life.¹⁸ Such confidence in, and enfranchisement of, the popular reader is anathema to Royalist writers. Where Prynne dedicates his *Sovereigne Power of Parliaments* to the reader using the language of patronage ('Courteous Reader, I Here present thee', Sig. A2r) and Joseph Boden composes *An Alarme Beat up in Sion* at the request of the Committee of the County of Kent ('Your approbation, and request (which is command enough) encouraged me to, and in the publication'), Henry Ferne addresses his *Conscience Satisfied* to a specific and controllable group: 'To the Conscientious Readers among the People'.¹⁹ Susan Wiseman illustrates the liberating generic renegotiations of the print market in London:

Readers, also consumers, were addressed as individuals and invited to participate in public debate. The genealogy of what must be called the pamphlet dialogue (sometimes the pamphlet playlet) in the market of news and its possible performance contexts suggests that it offered an invitation - issued from a variety of political perspectives - to rethink public roles. The dialogic and rhetorical nature of the form located even the private, individual purchaser and reader as participating in public events and ideas (*Drama and Politics*, p. 20).

1640 Christmas day yt year lighting on Friday. Designed & written in six howres space by Sr. Th: Salusbury. The Prologue to bee spoken by Mr Abraham L'Anglois: who speaks very broken English', pp. 35-40.

¹⁸ See Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 20.

¹⁹ *An Alarme Beat up in Sion, to War against Babylon* (London: Printed by I. L. for Christopher Meredith, at the signe of the Crosse in Pauls Church-yard, 1644) [TT: E10 (3)], Sig. A3r; *Conscience Satisfied That there is no Warrant for the Armes now taken up by Subjects* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1643) [TT: E97 (7)], p. 2.

However, the overwhelming tenor of Royalist genres is of a controlled dialogue. Royalist writings presuppose a theory of reading which is supine and passive. The text has authority, predicated upon the language of the monarch. Digges' conception of reading allows his public to be multivalent in their loyalties, but his point rests on the fact that they are a community wrongly led rather than actively misinterpreting. The texts, rather than their responses, rouse them to wrongful action. The remainder of this Chapter will analyse the measures, both material and conceptual, deployed by those at Oxford to impose or implement this theory of reception and to construct an idealised or 'Royalist' reader. This section will briefly describe Royalist theories of reading.

Humanist theories of textual engagement encouraged a certain interaction, although crucially they also insist on the sanctity of the text as an authority.²⁰ As Kevin Sharpe has recently pointed out, the experience and practice of reading is important to an understanding of the early modern period.²¹ He argues that 'authority and meaning are constituted through language and texts' (*Reading Revolutions*, p. 17). This thesis is not primarily concerned with the physical action of reading as delineated by Sharpe or William Sherman. Instead it addresses intentionalism and authority - attempts to control readerships and construct interpretative communities. The manipulation of the material and paratextual tools of reception – constructions of printed space, dedications, censorship and licensing – during the 1640s implies a concern with constructing a readership. As Sharon Achinstein has argued, 'many pamphlet writers made rhetorical constructions of their audiences as reading publics [...] they created the idea of a revolutionary public' (*Milton and the*

²⁰ See Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, "'Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy', *Past and Present*, 290 (1990), 30–79. Harvey was not a passive receiver of texts, but his proactive 'use' of literature implied a faith in the authority and sanctity of the text which was a set of rules for conduct.

Revolutionary Reader, p. 4).²² Royalist writers and cultural producers reacted against this newly enfranchised audience and worked to re-establish older hierarchical notions of readership. The authority of the text was redefined in the 1640s by Royalist writers keen to suppress multivalent texts and polyvocal readings.²³ They themselves ‘created’ a non-revolutionary public, a supine and loyal ‘Royalist Reader’.

For Royalists, the authority of the text was in part established by the innately monarchical nature of the English language. This will be shown through a discussion of the anonymous linguistic treatise *Vindex Anglicus*, printed in 1644.²⁴ Where it has been discussed, this pamphlet has been dismissed because it plagiarises R[ichard] C[arew]’s contribution to Camden’s *Remaines concerning Britaine*.²⁵ The perceived plagiarism is an important part of the work’s purpose; the fact that the text finds its roots in an earlier text is consonant with its emphasis on continuity and tradition in language and expression. The writer attacks the importation of vulgar foreign phrases, claiming that English is ‘golden’ and cannot be further refined: ‘I believe the most renowned of other Nations, to have laid the very *Elixir* of their Tongue’s Perfections in Trust with our Island’ (pp. 36–37). The piece constructs an idealistic and even imperialistic version of nation that is intricately tied

²¹ *Reading Revolutions: the Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).

²² ‘The writers of the civil war period differed from their forbears, however, in their conceptions about their audience and also in their intentions towards politically engaging that audience [...] As Samuel Hartlib wrote in 1641, “the art of Printing will so spread knowledge that the common people, knowing their own rights and liberties will not be governed by way of oppression”’, Sharon Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 13.

²³ An example of the kind of investigative and interpretative reader Royalist texts were attempting to exclude is witnessed in the marginalia of the BL copy of Henry Parker’s *Observations upon some of his Majesties late Answers and Expresses* ([London, 1642]), now callmark 100.D.56. As well as highlighting many passages the annotator debates and attacks some of the text’s defences of the King: ‘this comparison may bee allowed, but not ye inference’ highlights perceived flaws in Strafford’s application of the Law of Prerogative (p. 17), and the reader shows his parliamentarian colours by deploying the rhetoric of defensive theory to comment upon a passage excusing Charles’ actions ‘nor doe wee find in ye Parlt wch first began these warrs yt they would have inured the King or people till ye Maiority were excluded by force’, p. 22.

²⁴ *Vindex Anglicus, Or The Perfections of the English Language* [Oxford, by H. Hall, 1644], reprinted in *The*

to language. England is the apogee of all lesser countries, taking what is beautiful and suborning it to a greater purpose: 'Our Language hath long been in the Ascendant, together with our Monarchy, and at last, by excellent Artists, is even brought to the Height, which already our over diligent and intruding Spirits, with their Botching, seek to bring to the Wane' (p. 36).

The tract thus conflates the power and perfection of language with the King. Those 'intruding' writers who would violate the linguistic conventions of the state attack the authority of the King when they use his language to any other purpose than the apotheosis of the monarch and his nation. Similarly, the tract rejects new, 'foreign' constructions and neologisms. They are attempts at creating a language that is not controlled by the King:

I seek not to compass any such Miracle as to convince the prepossessed Judgements of Foriegners, but shall think to retreat with Victory enough, if I can but foil those unnatural Domesticks, who degenerately do either with a certain fond affected Idolatry adore the Language of other Nations, contemning their own; or else imperiously (as if Censors in this Particular) do add, detect, mangle and transform her, according to their weak Fancies; vainly spoiling the best of vulgar Languages (p.33).

The 'vulgar' acknowledges the language's status as inferior to those of classical antiquity. One of the more intriguing aspects of the treatise is its emphasis on English and a vernacular tradition. Classical poets are given their modern equivalents; whilst this suggests a consciously secondary imitation of ancient societies, it also celebrates the poetic heights achieved with the English tongue. The section quoted above appropriates the language of the Parliamentarian newsletter, castigating those idolators who worship at a Foreign shrine. The author identifies an element of disunity and treasonous intent within those who seek to

Harleian Miscellany (London: Printed for T. Osborne, in Gray's-Inn 1744).

²⁵ John T. Curry, 'A Seventeenth-Century Plagiary', *Notes and Queries*, (1901), 457–59.

change the language from its golden perfection, who seek to destroy the idol constructed through centuries of linguistic abstraction. This reading is confirmed when the writer asks

What matchless and incomparable Pieces of Eloquence hath this Time of Civil War afforded? Came there ever from a Prince's Pen such exact Pieces as are his Majesty's Declarations? Were there ever Speeches, uttered in better Language, or sweeter Expressions, than these of the noble and learned Lord *Digby*, and some other worthy Personages? Did ever Nation expose choicer, more honourable or eloquent Discourses, than ours hath done in our Sovereign's Behalf, since these unhappy Divisions? There is no sort of Verse either Ancient or Modern, which we are not able to equal by Imitation; We have our *English Virgil, Seneca, Lucan, Juvenal, Martial, and Catullus*: In the Earl of *Surry, Daniel, Johnson, Spenser, Don, Shakespear*, and the Glory of the rest *Sandys and Sydney* (p.35).

The anonymous writer portrays Royalist discourse of the early 1640s as the very ultimate in eloquence. Royalist works of the war period are hailed as 'matchless and incomparable', the height of expression and eloquence. The model of Englishness that is suggested through the invocation of great national writers emphasises the King's cultural and linguistic importance. The King's Declarations are identified as the primary output of this golden age of language, the apex of a language with a rich poetic heritage. These exact and precise statutes are the index of all linguistic expression, and from them develops a model of Royalist identity based on language: from formal speeches to the basest propaganda, anything taking its lead from the King's mode of expression (and beyond that, the policies and theories expounded in the declarations) is worthy of the highest praise. The structure of this passage illustrates the hierarchical model of Royalist discourse, moving from the King's words through the learned nobility, to the faceless masses sharing in a vague discourse of loyalty. The polemical significance of *Digby* is that his published speeches related to the Earl of *Strafford* in the main (and his *Apologie* was little more than an extended attack on the House of Commons). 'Don George *Digby* that old Incendiary of about thirty' also figured large in the imagination of the Parliamentary newsletter writers

as part of the Oxford junta that controlled the King.²⁶ He represented published and acknowledged Royalist defiance through his connection with the newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus*. It is significant, also, that the anonymous writer chooses to emphasise the King's declarations and Digby's speeches as the most important elements of Royalist discourse. The former created institutional stability and harmony, whilst the latter (and their generic counterparts) established a cultural identity for the nation.

The written language is a set of rules and boundaries which delineate and establish a particular discursive space. Involvement within this space, for the Royalists, meant an ongoing dialogue with the absolute space of monarchy. The space is inflected and created by the authority of the King. If language is the only means of mediation with the physical world, and this language is innately hierarchically structured as part of absolute space, all texts using this language will be subject to the hierarchical impulses of those whom control the language; the authority in this case being the King. Language itself is a controlled space, doubly so when rendered in print. As the tract states, the works produced in support of the King are part of a superior and ultimate expression of loyalty: 'Did ever Nation expose choicer, more honourable or eloquent Discourses, than ours hath done in our Sovereign's Behalf, since these unhappy Divisions?'. Those works not 'in our Sovereign's Behalf' are negligible, disloyal irrelevancies not worthy of comment. The Parliament was mocked for attempting to address this issue in an anonymous 1642 ballad, '1642. A Song of y^e Parliamentarian Occurents of the tyme' which mocks the House for attempting 'To quitt [quiet] Digby & Deering, whome they don't understand:/ to frame, not new Lawes, but new Words, (if well skann'd)'.²⁷ The loyal works published from Oxford were inflected and

²⁶ *The Spie*, 20 [June 20 – June 25, 1644].

²⁷ Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 26, fols. 124v–125r, ll. 27–28.

controlled by the King's language. Parliament is mocked and attacked for trying to create a new language.

The following section will establish the physical control of texts, in particular through censorship and licensing. The combination of Royalist hierarchical theory of language and strict control of the means of production established work of the war period published from Oxford as working within and creating a particular Royalist textual space. Both the conceptual building blocks (the words) and the material renderings (the texts) were controlled and inflected by the authority of the monarch.

2.3 Censorship and Licensing

Edward Walker records the punishment meted out to texts that pretended to supplant

Charles's authority:

His Matie haueing taken notice of a Pamphlett pretended to haue been printed at Oxford, Intitled (His Mat declaracon and finall resolution concerning the petion of the hoble Citty of London to the Lords of the privy Councill, wherein is sett downe his Mate determinacon by way of an absolute answer to the said peticon) Hath thought fitt not only to declare the said Pamphlett to bee false scandalous and not his Mat but an act of the highest and greatest presumption of such Libeller to make use of his Mats name and [...] to deceive and abuse his people and hath therefore caused the same to bee publikly burnt by the hand of the Hangman.²⁸

Such a draconian measure was rarely used, but it highlights the importance to the crown of controlling public discourse. Unauthorised texts were to be cast out of civilised society, consigned to a very physical and destructive form of censorship. Their physical space was to be consumed by fire, punished by the hangman as if they were themselves criminals. This spatial model of textuality invokes Royalist notions of the printed space but also

²⁸ BL, Harleian MS 6851, fol. 66r.

highlights the Royalist approach to such unauthorised and uncontrolled loci: complete destruction and exclusion.²⁹

Throughout the 1630s Charles' administration had sought to impose a strict programme of invasive censorship upon printed and manuscript texts. In the Star Chamber decree of 1637 can be seen the impetus to control and contain the flow of information. The number of approved printers was restricted, and the decree was intended to prohibit 'seditious, schismatical or offensive books'.³⁰ The order was designed to prevent the publication of such works as Prynne's *Histrio-Mastix* and the growing number of increasingly political religious works by introducing stricter arrangements for the licensing of works. It buttressed the monopolies of discourse enjoyed by the Church, Court and University. Sharpe argues that the policy of state intervention was motivated by a desire to construct a religious controlled text: 'the decree of 1637, it has been said, reads like a statute, and was clearly intended to strengthen the ecclesiastical commissioner's jurisdiction over the press which had hitherto rested on letters patent' (*Personal Rule*, p. 649). Laud's exertions in the mid-1630s to control the scope of Oxford's press supported his work on the 1637 decree: the means of production were to be well regulated, and would produce works which would contribute towards the vision of state uniformity articulated in the University statutes.³¹ The Stationers' Company, who were to execute the Star Chamber's instructions,

²⁹ The paranoid atmosphere of surveillance and mercenary information exchange at Oxford give an insight into the movement to control print: 'My husband grew much in the Prince's favour, and Mr. Long, not being suffered to execute the business of his place, the Council suspecting that he held private intelligence with the Earl of Essex; which when he perceived, he went into the enemies quarter's, and so to London, and then into France, full of complaints of the Prince's Council to [the] Queen Mother. When he was gone, your father supplied his place', Ann Fanshawe, *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann, Lady Fanshawe*, ed. by John Loftis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 37.

³⁰ Quoted in Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 650.

³¹ See Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573–1645* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), pp. 274–77. 'It was to be a University printing by contract, the agents being tightly controlled tradesmen, who were bound, at least part of the time, to produce what they were told and run the risk of selling it', Bernard Capp, *Astrology*

were supportive of the King and had actually requested many of the changes, not the least the limitations on the number of working presses in London.³² The effectiveness of censorship and print control is difficult to define and measure; certainly, as Sharpe has mentioned, ‘the mechanisms for censorship were unsophisticated and largely ineffective’ during the 1630s (*The Personal Rule*, p. 645). However, Annabel Patterson has argued that the hermeneutic value of censorship communicated itself to authors and printers; texts collaborated with the censor and evolved strategies with which to avoid official censure.³³

An unlicensed and freer print marketplace evolved in London after the collapse of the Star Chamber broke the monopolies of discourse which had been enjoyed by the Crown, the Church, and the Universities.³⁴ These institutions depended upon a notion of hierarchy and structure which was now being undermined. Their power was being slowly eroded through the questioning and discursive models of space and nation expressed in the burgeoning print marketplace. The expression and practical application of such freedoms were assimilated into Royalist political theory as ‘rebellion of the tongue’, second most important aspect of the progressive nature of rebellion after ‘heart’ and before ‘hand’:

a malicious defaming of the person, actions, parts, and government of those Sovereigne Princes to which the Lord hath made us subject, of purpose to disgrace them amongst their people, to render them odious and contemptible [...] many times

and the Popular Press, pp. 35–36. See also Harry Carter, *A History of the Oxford University Press* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), pp. 26–35 and Sheila Lambert, ‘The Printers and the Government, 1604–1637’ in *Aspects of Printing from 1600*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987), pp. 1–30.

³² Lambert, ‘Printers and the Government’, p. 11. See also Ian Gadd, ‘The Mechanics of Difference: a study in Stationer’s Company Discourse in the seventeenth century’ in *The Stationer’s Company and the Book Trade 1550–1990*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St. Paul’s Bibliographies, 1997), pp. 93–113.

³³ *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (London and Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).

³⁴ See David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and Ian Gadd, ‘The Mechanics of Difference’.

this and the other of the heart, are but the ground and preparations to the Rebellion of the hand, or actual Rebellion, as they call it commonly.³⁵

In contrast to London, the ideological creation or textual construction of a Royalist identity by printed works emanating from Oxford was very strongly controlled — more so than had been the case in the 1630s. Two printers, Leonard Lichfield and Henry Hall, working in tandem with the officials of the court, printed everything to emerge from Oxford.³⁶ That which was reprinted in the localities was undertaken by loyal men.³⁷ London reprints were likewise controlled, although this aspect of Royalist print circulation is more complex.³⁸ This was not a crude form of censorship and licensing, but near-total control of the printed word. In contrast to the 1630s, therefore, censorship was incisive and effective. In many ways, the definition of a ‘royalist’ writer is publication at Oxford. Using the presses within the city gave a text polemical resonance no matter how ambivalent the matter discussed.

Those seemingly royalist writers who published from London often did so because of

³⁵ Peter Heylin, *The Rebels Catechisme. Composed in an easy and familiar way* ([Oxford] Printed, 1643) [Wing H1731], p. 3. This tripartite model was an important aspect of parliamentary theory also, and is illustrative of the political similarities between the two sides during the early part of the war, particularly in relation to control of discourse, see for instance *A Sad Warning to all Prophane Malignant spirits who reproach True Protestants with the name of Roundheads* (London, Printed for H. U. 1642[3]) [TT: E151 (8)].

³⁶ It may be that this account overestimates the importance of the press to the King. Ashburnham’s accounts list ‘to the Printing Press 0005 00 00’, but this payment pales next to ‘For Lynnen for your Matie 0009 00 00’ and ‘To the Duke of Richmond for money lost at play by your Majestie 0012 00 00’, *A Narrative by John Ashburnham of his Attendance on King Charles the First* (London: Payne and Foss, Pall Mall; Baldwin and Cradock, Paternoster-Row, 1830), Appendix 1, pp. xx, xxvi, xxxi.

³⁷ Royalist printings in the major cities during the period that Oxford was the institutional centre of the country are thus: Bristol - 9/ of which 9 are Oxford reprints; York - 6/ 5; Newcastle - 2/ 2; Shrewsbury - 6/ 4; Exeter - 3/ 2; Newark - 5/5; Salisbury - 1/ 1. Figures taken from *A Short-Title Catalogue arranged Geographically of Books printed and distributed by printers, publishers and booksellers in the English provincial towns up to and including the year 1700*, compiled by E. A. Clough (London: The Library Association, 1969). These numbers are probably incomplete; there are, for instance, one or two more things reprinted in Newcastle than this study identifies, see William K. Sessions, *Bulkley and Broad, White and Wayt* (York: Ebor Press, 1986). In May 1643, Dr Holdsworth, vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge, was imprisoned for licensing the reprinting of Proclamations given by Charles at York, F. J. Varley, *Cambridge during the Civil War* (Cambridge: W Heffer & Sons, 1935), p. 55. This suggests that reprinting was more common than has hitherto been thought. Furthermore, Ashburnham’s *Accompt* records a payment ‘To Cocken a printer by Mr Jones 0200 00 00’, p.xxvi. Both these names are unidentified.

³⁸ See Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), Chapters 1–2, and Madan, Appendix F ‘Counterfeit Imprints’, p. 542 for a list of Oxford imprints actually printed in London.

constraint (James Howell, for instance), political ambivalence (the Cambridge poet Thomas Phillipot), or financial expediency (Wenceslaus Hollar). As will be seen in the discussion of Cowley and Denham in the final chapter, the Oxford imprint lent texts a renewed or intentionally politicised inflection.

As was argued in the Introduction, literary critics have seen the *collapse* of censorship as a decisive moment, suggesting that the restrictions upon print had been an important aspect of the monarchical regime. The great deal of critical work in this area testifies to this also. Certainly, control of the presses was of particular importance to Charles's notions of government: 'In all the King's negotiations with Parliament in 1641–2 he insisted upon a restoration of censorship to suppress seditious pamphlets and sermons. Charles was especially outraged by the fact that the lower orders could not be prevented from reading such pamphlets'.³⁹ Censorship was an attempt to suppress publication and therefore to end the transmission and reception of texts. It was in particular a need to curtail and control the involvement of the 'lower orders' with political and textual discourse. As such it was an attempt to define the space of subjection, to create a Royalist reader who was allowed only to read work that had been first mediated by the King or his government.

The smaller size of Oxford as a city-court allowed Charles far greater control of print media, and so royalist cultural expression in print was closely controlled by the court. Works were licensed, and the entire Royalist print industry was in thrall to the King. The content of the texts published from Oxford was monitored. Therefore, those works *not* published at Oxford, unless they had a good excuse, were not loyalist or Royalist; they were

³⁹ Christopher Hill, 'Censorship and English Literature' in *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill: Volume I – Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), pp. 32–73 (p. 41). For Charles' control of printing prior to his arrival in Oxford, see Joyce Lee

tainted with the corruption of the London presses, or a lack of engagement which sprang from ambivalence or lack of commitment to duty. Leonard Lichfield's poem 'THE PRINTERS CONCLUSION To Her MAJESTIE', which closes *Musarum Oxoniensium Serenissimæ*, is unequivocal about the important role of the press in the conflict: 'Presses of Old, as Pens, did but incite/ Others to Valour, this It Selfe did fight:/ In Ranks and Files these Letters Marshall'd stood'.⁴⁰ The poem opens by figuring the printing press as a loyal fountain:

That Traytrous and Vnletterd Crew
Who fight 'gainst Heaven, Their Sovereigne, and You,
Have not yet stain'd my Hallowed FOUNTS, The spring
Must needs be Cleare that issues from the King
(ll. 1–4).

The press is seen as an integral part of the war, and is a conduit for the King's words to spread throughout the Kingdom. During the 1640s, the crown attempted as far as it was able to control the dissemination of the printed word.⁴¹ That which was not part of the Royalist project was therefore against it and excluded from it. In this way, the controlling censorship deployed at Oxford fits into Judith Butler's concept that censorship is productive rather than repressive; the mechanism of censorship is 'actively engaged in the production of subjects, but also in circumscribing the social parameters of speakable discourse, of what will and will not be admissible in public discourse'.⁴² Control of the

Malcolm, *Caesar's Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642–1646* (London and New Jersey: Royal Historical Society/ Humanities Press, 1983), pp. 124–25.

⁴⁰ *Musarum Oxoniensium, Serenissimæ Reginarum Mariæ ex Batavia Feliciter Reduci Publico Voto D.D.D.* ([Oxford] 1643, by L. Lichfield) [TT E62 (14)], ll. 5–7. This poem is discussed extensively in Chapter Four, below.

⁴¹ Consider for instance the possibly apocryphal story regarding the title of Peter Hausted's poem *Ad Populum: Or, a Lecture to the People* related by Wood: 'the title of it was given by King Charles I who seeing it in manuscript with the title of *A Sermon to the People*, he alter'd it, and caused it to be called *A Lecture, &c.* being then much pleased with it', quoted in Madan, p. 345. This passage argues a particular sensitivity to the significance of different print registers, and also that Royal influence over texts was often intricate and direct.

⁴² *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 132–33.

presses was creative insofar as it brought into being a particular discourse of Royalism. It validated one model of the text and a particular identity for the reading subject who deployed the language of the King: 'Censorship is a productive form of power: it is not merely privative, but formative as well [...] To become a subject means to be subjected to a set of implicit and explicit norms that govern the kind of speech that will be legible as the speech of a subject' (Butler, *Excitable Speech*, p. 133).

The one common characteristic of all the texts printed and published in Oxford is that they were published under the censorious eye of an official licenser. Lois Potter emphasises that 'printing in Oxford was actually under tighter control during this period than it had been even during Laud's chancellorship' (*Secret Rites*, p. 8). As will be seen, the role of the censor at Oxford was far more creative than models of 1640s textuality have suggested. Bodleian, Add. MS C. 209, the autograph draft of John Taylor's *Causes of the diseases and distempers of this Kingdom*, is annotated 'Imprimatur J Berkenhead Octob. 5 1645'.⁴³ Berkenhead had been part of Laud's licensing committee in Lambeth prior to the war, and took on the role of official court censor in Oxford. He was at Oxford as part of the circle congregating around Brian Duppa when war broke out, and his eagerness to serve led him to be appointed first Heylin's scribal assistant on the newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus*, and soon afterwards to take control of it himself. Berkenhead had become very close to the more extreme followers of Laud, and his subsequent involvement, along with Heylin, in the editorship of *Mercurius Aulicus* meant that 'the Royalist propaganda machine was still linked with the policies of the prelate whose power had seemingly been destroyed' (Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead*, p. 21). His influence over the press meant that printing was

⁴³ 'Causes of the diseases and distempers of this kingdom, Fownd by feeleing of his Pulse, and Casting his Water', printed (with the gendered pronouns changed to feminine) at Oxford in October 1645.

regulated, and maintained Laudian control over the allocation of cultural space.⁴⁴ Thus, along with the King's travelling press, Royalist print culture was tightly managed.⁴⁵

Censorship was as integral a part of the Royalist project as the polemic information and propaganda contained in the official newsbook.

The manuscript which bears John Berkenhead's imprint is an important example of the Royalist censorship-propaganda process at work, showing how writers were complicit in the production of texts that sustained certain aspects of the Royalist project. The text includes various suggestions and marginal comments by the 'censor' which suggest that the relationship between the licenser and the work was fluid and far from combative; quite literally, the censor influenced and directed the tenor and tone of the work.⁴⁶ The physical conjunction between the official propaganda machine and the polemic artistry of Taylor's work which can be traced on the pages of this manuscript is a paradigm for Royalist cultural expression; informed, rather than ruled or destroyed, by consideration of official opinion.⁴⁷ Writers colluded with the institutional procedures for censorship. James Loxley, discussing the work of Lois Potter and Nigel Smith, writes 'this kind of work insists that we look on a contextualised literature as a knowing agent of the cultural processes to which it is also, at another level in thrall' (Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 3). He continues, 'The

⁴⁴ Licensing was bound up with University procedure: on 6 February 1644 Convocation appointed a committee consisting the Chancellor, vice-chancellor, and the Regius professors of Divinity, Medicine and Civil Law to 'examine books before they are printed', Madan, pp. 313–14. This conflation of academic and political figures in the role of censorship illustrates the new hybrid structures of the Oxford court.

⁴⁵ For the travelling press, see William K. Sessions, *The King's Printer at Newcastle upon Tyne in 1639, at Bristol in 1642–1645, at Exeter in 1645–1646* (York: the Ebor Press, 1982) and Laurence Hanson, 'The King's Printer at York and Shrewsbury, 1642–3', *The Library*, 23 (1943), 129–31.

⁴⁶ Even during the 1620s and 30s the relationship had been ambiguous. Sir Henry Herbert termed his interference with texts 'reformation', and Annabel Patterson's central thesis is that the acknowledgement of state control was integral to poetic composition, see *The Control and Censorship of Caroline Drama: The Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels 1623–73*, ed. by Nigel Bawcutt (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 50, and Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*.

⁴⁷ For definitions of censorship and an analysis of official attempts to control discourse, see M. Lindsay Kaplan, *The Culture of Slander in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

practice of writing which they describe is both shared and self-conscious, a participant in the broad and equally collective — if inequitable — business of cultural production' (p.3).

The works published at Oxford conform to Loxley's paradigm. They are produced within, influence, and are influenced by, the overarching discourse of Royalism as created and patrolled by the official censor.

Berkenhead's additions are generally extensions of Taylor's thought, in particular attacking John Knox's religious innovations as being merely superficial and based on appearance.⁴⁸ At one point Taylor writes of Prynne: 'And if it be true that the people do make Kings, (as yo^r Apostle Prin sayes) therefore they may unmake them, if they please: then by the same Rule, may we not say we will haue no more Knights, Cittizens and Burgesses, for if not the people make them? yea Verily, truly and truly verilye' (p. 4).

Berkenhead annotates 'Prin' thus: 'the first Apostle that euer lost his eares twice for libelling'. Prynne's seditious political theory is implied to be malicious libel rather than reasoned debate. In 1633 Prynne's body had been the physical topos on which the establishment had inscribed its conception of the purposes and limits of expression.⁴⁹ Hermeneutically, it is instructive that Prynne lost his ears rather than his tongue: the nature of his crime was libel, but the importance was that it was a published libel. Symbolically, then, the action of publishing is not an oral but an aural phenomenon, and public space is in many ways constructed by the spoken word as much as the printed. The King himself

⁴⁸ John Knox is 'a moderne patriarch who brought <- - -> calders and little ruffs in fashion in Scotland'; his countryman Mr Henderson 'Another moderne Patriarch, who handed short hayre to Dr Knoxes Reformation', p. 3. This emphasis on the hermeneutically superficial nature of religious reform is a recurring motif of the Royalist portrayal of Parliamentary religious sympathisers.

⁴⁹ See Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* trans. by Alan Sheridan (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977, 1991), especially 'The body of the condemned', pp. 3–32. Sir Humphrey Mildmay's diary records that the cropping of Prynne's ears took a few days: 'I saw Prynne Jn the Pillory & loste a peece of an eare/', 7 May 1633, and 'this fatall Morneinge Prynne, loste the other pte of an eare Jn

commented on the printing of the Grand Remonstrance that 'we are many times amazed to consider by what eyes these things are seen, and by what ears they are heard', highlighting both the importance of visual and aural elements in the creation or addressing of a public space, especially with reference to low or non-elite culture.⁵⁰ In mocking Prynne Berkenhead reaches back into the 1630s to defend his King, reusing and revitalising tropes of censorship and violence in order to emphasise the importance of literary and literal obedience.

Furthermore, the emphasis on the nature of Prynne's crime is unusual. Attacks on Prynne were in the main concerned with his zealous religious proclamations and especially his appearance.⁵¹ Annabel Patterson conflates the physical punishment meted out to Prynne in 1633 with an understanding of the hermeneutics of censorship. Berkenhead's note emphasises the importance of subjective truth (that being perverted by the crime of libel) and also the defence of an established hierarchy through physical and violent symbolic actions, be they censorship, auricular divestment, or battle. Patterson sees the physical signs of censorship imposed onto Prynne as representing 'a breakdown of the communicative strategies and conventions' (*Censorship and Interpretation*, p. 107) that characterised the relationship between establishment and artist. Berkenhead's note confirms that these communicative strategies, the 'indeterminacy inveterate to language' (p. 17), were now in

Cheap', 10 May 1633, Folger, MS W. b. 600, pp. 7–8. Mildmay's account attests to the fact that Prynne's punishment was publicly exhibited.

⁵⁰ Quoted by Christopher Hill, 'Censorship and English Literature', p. 41.

⁵¹ See for instance, *The Fallacies of Mr William Prynne, Discovered and Confuted: In A short View of his late Bookes intituled, The Sovereignty of Parliaments, Opening of the Great Seale, &c.* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1644) [TT: E253 (3)], which concludes by listing the techniques used to attack Prynne: 'hee himselfe is now traced through all his Treatises, to have falne so foully, by False Quotations, and calumnious Falshoods; by wresting the Scripture, and points of Popery; by grosse Absurdities, and absurd Contradictions; by plain passages of palpable Treason', p. 33.

thrall to the King and his purposes. With them the court in Oxford would try to create a new language of England, focused through allegiance to the King.

Taylor's manuscript highlights the mutually creative nature of the institutional control of publishing during the early 1640s. The Oxford works are unique as a corpus because they were produced within this atmosphere of control. As Potter has suggested, this censorship is not the invasive and judgmental work of a paranoid state mechanism but in the main self-imposed and integral to a Royalist concept of the role of the presses:

'Royalists never embraced freedom of the press as a doctrine; rather, their argument was that the established authority, Parliament, was not a true authority. It is likely that unauthorised publication, as they practised it, was a carefully managed affair' (*Secret Rites*, p. 7). Berkenhead's marginal intervention into Taylor's text establishes that censorship was often a mutually constructive and creative practice. Poets and pamphleteers in the first Civil War were conscious of their role as ambassadors and print-soldiers for Charles, and their collaboration with licensing and print control emerges as much from an acknowledgement of public duty to the King as any sense of ideological subjection. Their submission to the authoritative control of the court was a natural extension of their obedience and loyalty to the King. The presses in London, 'Released from the bonds of censorship', were looked on with horror by Royalist writers who condemned the monstrous progeny of such unauthorised printing houses (Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*, p. 3).

Works produced by the presses at Oxford, as Lichfield's poem attests, were the King's subjects, foot soldiers in the ongoing battle against the seditious inversions and radical social experimentation of the Parliament. They had a corporate reality and martial function. Some writers chafed at the control of print, and obviously there are problems in any attempt to map such an idea of homogeneity onto such a huge expanse of texts. Certainly

many artists retain their ambiguous stance, their independence and their own voice.

However, the majority of texts were written within a context of Royalist censorship which prompted writers to write within certain limits and boundaries.

2.4 'not altogether publique': print, manuscript, and the ownership of the text

In early 1645 Sir Robert Stapleton consigned his translation of Musæus nervously to publication with the conditional preface:

I held it my safest course, rather to venture upon the Printers pardonable errors, then to runne the hazzard of grosse mistakes in ignorant Transcribers. Yet, as I could not make it altogether private, so I resolved it should not be altogether publique, and have therefore suffered no more to be printed, then the just number promised; which coming into friends hands I cannot feare any rigid censure.⁵²

This passage allows us to argue that coterie manuscript publication of intellectual or scholarly works was still prevalent at Oxford during the war. Stapleton's seeming confidence in the control he would be able to exert over printed versions of his text suggests an introverted circle desirous of privacy; not actually part of the war effort, simply indulging their scholastic interests.⁵³ He trusts to the relative safety of print rather than the instability of manuscript. This preface highlights the fact that the court still retained a lively if necessarily slimmed down internal culture. It furthermore articulates the worry of many authors that manuscript transcription and transmission of their texts would permit 'ignorant' intermediary scribes to make 'grosse mistakes'; to disrupt and fracture their work. Stapleton has a conception of his text as an entity which has a fixed status and corporal nature. This

⁵² 'The Epistle DEDICATORY', *The Loves of Hero and Leander* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall, 1645) [Wing M3132], Sig. 1v.

⁵³ Stapleton did circulate a limited amount of manuscript verse as well during the war, see his lyric 'Loues Art memoratiue' in BL, Egerton MS 2725, fol. 113v. The poem takes part in a recognisably courtly space and suggests that courtly activities still influenced lyric poetry: his cruel love takes part in 'French dances' and wears 'Toyes or rich Jewells' (ll. 6, 11).

implies a subtle shift, too, of notions of reading and of authorship, which the following section will analyse by discussing the status of Royalist manuscript publication and circulation during the war period.

The manuscript commonplace miscellany of the 1630s and 40s had emphasised a multivalency of context and content, as John Kerrigan has pointed out.⁵⁴ During the 1640s the drive toward single-author editions or printed edited collections masquerading as miscellanies was based in part on a model of the text which emphasised the power of the author and the responsibility of the printer to create a clean and perfect text. The reader has no agency in creation of meaning; this is inherent in the volume already. It is no coincidence that the publisher most responsible for producing single-author volumes was the Royalist Humphrey Moseley. Stapleton moves away from the coterie distribution of miscellanies, from the fragmentation and uncertainty of manuscript, to the assurance and control of print.

An example of the unfettered potential for error and misinterpretation inherent in manuscript culture is John Denham's elegy for Strafford, a much anthologised poem.⁵⁵ In Bod, Douce MS 357 it is followed on the same page by a parody (fol. 8r):

Upon my Lo Straford [*'original' text*]
Great Strafford worthy of that name though all
Of him could be forgotten but his fall
How greate thy ruine when no lesse a weight
Could serve to crush thee then three kingdoms hate;
Yet single they accounted thee (although
Each had an army) as an equall foe.
Thy wisdome such, at once it did appeare
Three kingdomes wonder, and three kingdomes feare,

⁵⁴ 'That manuscript variation should offer itself under the scheme of dialogue suggests how deeply the principle ran [...] Our habit of reading Caroline poetry in author-shaped parcels obscures the quality of its disagreements', 'Thomas Carew', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 74 (1988), 311–51 (pp. 329–30).

⁵⁵ The poem appears in Bod, Ashmole MS 36/37 (2 copies), Douce MS 357, Locke MS e. 17, Rawlinson Poet. MSS 26 and 147, BL, Egerton MSS 2421 and 2725, National Library of Wales, MS 5390D. The elegy is often paired in manuscript with that on Strafford ascribed to Cleveland.

Joyned with an eloquence so great to make
Us heere with greater passion then he spake;

Wentworth's fatall fall [*parody*]
Poore Strafford worthy of no Name att all
Amongst the Liueing; who forgetts his fall
How just his Ruine when No Less a weight
could press him Down; then Charles & three Kingdom's hate
for Single he Esteem'd himselfe all tho
Each had an Army, as an Equall foe
his wisdom such att Last it did appeare
Three Kingdome Scorn and not three kingdome feare
his Eloquence was great ^{indeed} to make
his hearers passionate when once he speake
(ll. 1–10)⁵⁶

The poems are paired by their format, and the parody uses the same metrical system and rhymes as Denham's original text. They share phrases and extensive vocabulary. The author uses Denham's words to inflect the parody and to disrupt the apologist discourse which produced the first poem. The manuscript collection as a whole is overly concerned with mirroring and the relationship between texts; the contents include answer poems and echo poems. Following the Denham poem and its parody are 'Dr Pryn's also St Pym's verses on the Ld Strafford' (fol. 11v), Cleveland's 'Epitaph on ye Earle of Strafford Beheaded on Tower-Hill May 12-1641' (fol. 12r), and 'Ode upon ye Ld Strafford and Answer', a 2 part answer poem in columns (fol. 12r).

What is notable about the Civil War is that Royalist poets who had previously been circulated in manuscript began to publish: Waller in 1645, Lluellyn in 1646, Cleveland in 1647, Fane, Herrick and Fanshawe in 1648, Lovelace in 1649.⁵⁷ The motivations for

⁵⁶ A variant text of the parody appears as a separate in the composite Beinecke, MS fb. 106, number 9. This indicates the parody had a manuscript life apart from Denham's original poem.

⁵⁷ Furthermore, Carew and Suckling were published posthumously during the 1640s. For Fane see T. G. S. Cain, "'A Sad Intestine Warr': Mildmay Fane and the Poetry of Civil Strife' in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 27–52. Herrick's dedication of *Hesperides* to the Prince of Wales expressly tied the emergence of his work into the public domain to a Royalist motive: 'Well may my Book come forth like

publication were manifold and various, but many poets wished the assurance of controlling their texts:

This parcell of exquisit Poems, have pass'd up and downe through many hands amongst persons of the best quallity, in loose imperfect Manuscripts, and there is lately obruded to the world an adulterate Copy, surruptitiously and illegally imprinted, to the derogation of the Author, and the abuse of the Buyer. But in this Booke they appeare in their pure originals and true genuine colours.⁵⁸

Humphrey Moseley's motivation for printing Waller is to provide a 'true', unadulterated and 'pure' text that is quantified and mediated by the controlling medium of print.⁵⁹

Previously, Waller had happily circulated his verse in scribally published form to 'persons of the best quallity'.⁶⁰ Some of these manuscript texts had mimicked the physical attributes of print: catch-words, title-pages, contents and page numbers. Waller's move to print suggests a worry about the sanctity of manuscript; it is a belated attempt to control texts.⁶¹

The authoritarian and authorial censorship governing the creation of texts is not just institutional. Writers themselves attempted stricter control of their works than had previously been the case. The ideology underpinning such a rigid definition of the text is particularly conservative and based in rights of property and therefore resists the invasive

Publique Day,/ When such a Light as You are leads the way', *Hesperides, or, the Works Both Humane & Divine of Robert Herrick Esq* (London: Printed for John Williams, and Francis Eglesfield and are to be sold by Tho: Hunt, Book-seller in Exon. 1648) [Wing H1596], 'To the Most Illustrious, and Most Hopefull Prince CHARLES, Prince of Wales', Sig. A1r, ll. 1–2.

⁵⁸ 'An Advertisement to the Reader', *Poems, &c. Written by Mr Ed. Waller of Beckonsfield, Esquire; lately a Member of the Honourable House of Commons* (London: Printed by T.W. for Humphrey Moseley, at the Princes Arms in Pauls Church-yard. 1645) [Wing W513], Sig. A2r. Even in 1656 Abraham Cowley was complaining of editions published 'without my consent or knowledge, and those so mangled and imperfect, that I could neither with honour acknowledge, nor with honesty quite disavow them', *Poems* (London: For Humphrey Moseley, 1656) [Wing C6683], 'Preface', Sig. A1v.

⁵⁹ *Hesperides* was so concerned about such issues that the first edition included a list of errata.

⁶⁰ See in particular Bod, Don MS d. 55, a presentation edition for Henrietta Maria of c.1640–42.

⁶¹ Compare, for instance, the relatively 'clean' and authoritative texts of Cowley's poems, see Chapter 4. See also Arthur Marotti on Cowley and the influence of Moseley's single-author editions, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993), pp. 263–65.

transgressions of the interrogative reader.⁶² The control of text is an expression of ownership. The text has a spatial or material dimension and the boundaries are heavily guarded lest the Parliamentary reader storm the barricades and deny the authority of the author. Not all writers were comfortable with publication; the Royalist distrust of print is expressed by Dudley, Lord North who reluctantly submitted to the ‘prostitution of the Presse’ when publishing his *Forest of Varieties* in 1645 (Cited in Marotti, *Manuscript*, p. 259). However, Dudley’s very metaphor betrays a conception of the text which is corporate and spatial; he fears the physical violation of his property and the possibility of misreading. His reasons for publication are the worries attendant upon writing owning textual property in ‘this plundering age’.

A measure of the textual control imposed by the situation at Oxford, and the importance of clean, authoritative text, is the great care taken over content and clarity during printing. In *Musarum Oxoniensum Serenissimæ*, John Dale’s name is annotated ‘^{Junior} Fellow of Magd: Coll.’ (Sig. C3r).⁶³ This suggests that status within the University was an important inflection for these poems.⁶⁴ Throughout the text poets are identified by their full titles as well as their colleges, and the collection emphasises the importance of institutional hierarchy. The emendation also indicates a care for the finished printed text which suggests a specific conception of the physicality of print. In an example with greater consequences for poetic interpretation and consideration of ‘immanent’ texts, Robert Grove’s poem ‘Is Grenvill dead, or Valour’ from pp. 2–3 of *Verses on the Death of the*

⁶² See for instance the discussion of the ‘author-function’ in Michel Foucault, ‘What is an Author?’ in *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* ed. by David Lodge (London and New York: Longman, 1988), pp. 196–211.

⁶³ I have compared the editions kept at the British Library and the Bodleian Library.

⁶⁴ James Loxley argues that this annotation may have differentiated between two John Dales, although it appears that the younger Dale was a Parliament man, *Royalist Poetry in the English Civil War* (Ph. D., Royal Holloway, University of London, 1994), p. 136. He only considers the Thomason version, however; as this comparative discussion illustrates, the annotation was not that of a reader but the printer.

Right Valiant Sir Bevill Grenvill has the manuscript correction: 'Both by his Patterne Live,^{both} in his Person Dy'd.'⁶⁵ Lichfield obviously had an interest in producing a correct and unambiguously definitive text. The integrity of the text is paramount, and in itself an expression of Royalist models of controlled space and meaning. Parliament was the party of error and inaccuracy, of treasonous sophistry and poisonous confusion, of rupture and destruction. Their views and facts lacked credence, and they denied true authority.

In conclusion, it is clear that Stapleton's appeal to a fit and particular audience is part of a general tendency within Royalist literature of the Oxford period to attempt to control and construct their audience. The undertone of courtly disunity is made abeyant by Stapleton's deployment of the Royalist rhetoric of inclusion and exclusion and the control of audience. His distinction of an audience which is 'not altogether publique', a collection of those who think similarly and will not censor or censure his work, is a working definition of the Royalist reader, or at least the interpretative community of audience writers appeared to be addressing. Stapleton uses his dedication to define the domain in which his work will be read and received. This location was greatly important to Royalist definitions of textual authority and property.

The court could not deny the existence of Parliamentary tracts and texts, and obviously it was difficult to limit the influx of works produced in London to the city. Often Parliamentary proclamations and tracts were reprinted by Leonard Lichfield at his press in Oxford as a way of mediating and inflecting the reception of such texts.⁶⁶ However, there is

⁶⁵ *Verses on the Death of the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenville, Knight. Who was slaine by the Rebels, on Landsdown-hill neare Bath, Iuly. 5. 1643* ([Oxford: Leonard Lichfield] Printed, 1643) [TT: E65 (6)]. I have compared the editions kept at the British Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Bodleian Library and the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester.

⁶⁶ See for instance *The Late Letters From both Houses of Parliament, Concerning their purpose of delivery of a Petition to His Majesty* (Printed by His Majesties Command at Oxford, and now re-printed at London for R. Royston, 1642) [TT: E127 (11)] which publicly reprints the correspondence and debate regarding the

evidence that puritan tracts were readily available in Oxford itself. Booksellers in the city had them in their stock, and the Bodleian purchased various parliamentary tracts in 1644 and 1645.⁶⁷ Royalist control over textual production and constructions of an ‘intended reader’ had to engage with the material and physical nature of the opposition. They had to theorise and conceptualise the freedoms and subversions inherent in the marketplace of print and find some way of negating them. The remainder of this Chapter will analyse their strategies for doing this.

2.5 *Areopagitica* and the Banquet of Mice: consumption and the marketplace

The construction of the ‘Royalist reader’ or the ‘intended reader’ is based in part upon notions of how these readers interacted with texts, and the imagined spaces in which this occurred. In order to illustrate Royalist notions of the marketplace of print and its reconfigured characteristics, it will be useful to compare two very different tracts. Both John Milton’s *Areopagitica* and John Taylor’s *A Preter-Pluperfect* figure the text as a physical entity and discuss the ramifications of a more open print market and the consequences for public discussion and interaction within a physically defined textual sphere. The two tracts have profound consequences for analysis of the construction of the public and models of society. They differ considerably in their approach and conclusions.

As will be argued, Milton conceives that his readers are intellectually enfranchised and able to interact with their texts. Milton has an utopian ideal of reception, as Achinstein notes: ‘He made a powerful political statement by asking Parliament to consider censorship

petition, the petition itself, and concludes with the King’s answer. Parliamentary discourse is controlled and presented in a safely sanitised version.

⁶⁷ I. G. Philips and Paul Morgan, ‘Libraries, Books, and Printing’ in *The History of the University of Oxford*, 5 vols, ed. by Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), IV, 659–85 (p. 666). For a record of Royalist

an insult to English citizens, on the grounds that [they] possessed consciences and reasoning faculties that made them capable to withstand the evil that might be found in printed matter' (*Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*, p. 58). Readers participate in public political debate. In contrast to this radical new theorisation, Taylor's tract shows the problematic assimilation of the newly democratised sphere of public textuality into Royalist thinking. Royalism had a very fluid notion of public space as an entity which moved continually between the textual, physical, material and metaphorical. Taylor's work highlights this, and gestures towards some of the consequences this model had for Royalist concepts of text and the construction of identity.

Parliament and Parliamentary writers were not totally enthusiastic about the end of licensing: the Commons reimposed censorship in 1643, after lobbying by the Stationer's Company.⁶⁸ Even Milton has been found to evince some worries over an inability to control the meaning of one's text once it has been published.⁶⁹ However, his 1644 speech-text *Areopagitica*, written 'in a manner of an Oration, to vindicate the Freedom of the Press from the Tyranny of Licensers', was a direct response to the reintroduction of strict licensing.⁷⁰ As such, it articulates the position of those who attacked the monopolies of discourse.⁷¹ The Licensing Order of June 1643 was in addition to 'divers good Orders'

engagement with Parliamentary text, see the extensive collection of 1644 London newsbooks collected by John Harrington of Kelston, a Colonel in the King's army, BL, Add. MS 46375.

⁶⁸ For the conservative nature of the Company and the renegotiation of its 'traditional relationship with authority, now Parliament rather than the Privy Council' in the 1640s, see Gadd, 'The Mechanics of Difference', p. 94. Gadd points out that in the *Humble Remonstrance of the Company of Stationers* (1643), a text central to this new relationship ghost-written by Henry Marten, 'the Stationers argue that printing is essential to the cultural hegemony of the state', p. 96.

⁶⁹ See Lucasta Miller, 'The Shattered *Violl*: Print and Textuality in the 1640s', in *Essays and Studies 1993*, ed. by Nigel Smith (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993), pp. 25–39. Compare also Sandra Sherman, 'Printing the Mind: The Economics of Authorship in *Areopagitica*', *English Literary History*, 60 (1993), 323–49.

⁷⁰ Milton's earliest biographer Skinner, quoted in *The Riverside Milton* ed. by Roy Flannagan (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1998), p. 987.

⁷¹ Nigel Smith compares Milton's position with that of Henry Parker and various anonymous defenders of press freedom, *Literature and Revolution*, pp. 30–31.

made by both Houses ‘for suppressing the great late abuses and frequent disorders in Printing many false forged, scandalous, seditious, libellous, and unlicensed Papers, Pamphlets, and Books to the great defamation of Religion and government’.⁷² Whilst aware of the potential dangers of unlicensed printing, Milton argues that imprints and licensing destroy reasoned debate and provide stability for the traditional hegemonic structures of the nation.

The repressively ideological function of state-controlled information had come under increasing attack by a number of leading Parliamentary intellectuals, notably Samuel Hartlib and John Dury. Their espousal of a free trade of information, an ‘uncensored flow of ideas’, granted information value as a commodity whilst attacking traditional hegemonies, and was a radical expression of economic and political autonomy: ‘such an ideology requires the rewriting of older notions of the state in which information was hierarchically distributed and controlled.’⁷³ Deploying such ideas, Milton writes within a humanist tradition of educational debate and reasoned oration. Open discussion will lead to greater freedoms and reforms:

Wherof what better witness can ye expect I should produce, then one of your own now sitting in Parliament, the chief of learned men reputed in this Land, Mr Selden, whose volume of naturall & national laws proves, not only by great authorities brought together, but by exquisite reasons and theorems almost mathematically demonstrative, that all opinions, yea errors, known, read, and collated, are of main service & assistance toward the speedy attainment of what is truest.⁷⁴

⁷² Quoted in *The Riverside Milton*, p. 987. The Order continues, ‘It is therefore Ordered by the Lords and Commons in Parliament, [...] [that] Book, Pamphlet, paper, nor part of any such Book, Pamphlet, or paper, shall from henceforth be printed, bound, stitched or put to sale by any person or persons whatsoever, unlesse the same be first approved of and licensed under the hands of such person or persons as both, or either of the said same Houses shall appoint for the licensing of the same’, p. 988.

⁷³ Kevin Dunn, ‘Milton among the monopolists: *Areopagitica*, intellectual property and the Hartlib circle’ in *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, ed. by Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 177–92 (p. 180).

⁷⁴ *Areopagitica; A Speech of Mr John Milton For the Liberty of Unlicenc'd Printing, To the Parliament of England* (London, Printed in the Yeare, 1644) [TT: E18 (9)], Sig. B3r.

A Parliamentary exemplar shows how the circulation of information leads to understanding through a rigorous quasi-legal sifting of evidence and opinion. Even thoughts which err can be included in this polyvocal debate.

There is a certain ambivalence, however, in the phrase 'truest'. As Christopher Hill comments of *Areopagitica*, '[it] starts from the assumption that, given freedom of debate, the reason which is common to all men is likely to lead them to recognise the same truths'.⁷⁵ Milton does not pretend to authoritative knowledge through debate, but merely a better and more enlightened conception. He emphasises the material value of text, and articulates a spiritual theory of controlled reception:

For Books are not absolutely dead things, but doe contain a potencie of life in them to be as active as that soule was whose progeny they are; nay they do perserve as in a violl the purest efficacie and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. I know they are as lively, and as vigorously productive, as those fabulous Dragons teeth; and being sown up and down, may chance to spring up armed men. And yet on the other hand unlesse warinesse be us'd, as good almost kill a Man as kill a good Book; who kills a Man kills a reasonable creature, Gods Image; but hee who destroyes a good Booke, kills reason it selfe, kills the Image of God, as it were in the eye. Many a man lives a burden to the Earth; but a good Booke is the pretious life-blood of a master spirit, imbalm'd and treasur'd up on purpose to a life beyond life (*Areopagitica*, Sig. A3v).

Books can attain a life of their own, quite separate from that which was intended for them.

As Lucasta Miller has argued,

Ironically, *Areopagitica*'s image of the 'violl' already contains covert fears as to the author's ability to control the text's production of meanings [...] Once the textual brainchild is circulating in the promiscuous world of the marketplace, there is the anxiety that it might indeed spring up an armed man, capable, if reconstructed by hostile critics, of parricide' ('The Shattered *Violl*', p. 28).

However, Milton also conceives that texts carry 'the purest efficacie and extraction of that living intellect that bred them'. This expresses a notion of realised immanence, and the image of the text as an instrument being played reinforces the agency of the single authorial

figure. Milton's elegant analysis synthesises authorial intention and audience actualisation, granting both interlocutors a role in the interpretation and meaning of a text which itself has innate power. Such a conception was extremely different from that held by those in Oxford. Indeed, Miller's notion of reception being the hostile reconstruction of works neatly categorises Royalist concepts of reading and audience rather than that perceived to be held by the Parliamentary side. What her analysis highlights is that Parliamentary writers were often as worried as their Royalist counterparts about the effects of the 'promiscuous world of the marketplace' upon their textual property.

Milton's discussion of the public nature of printed books is situated within a Ciceronian discourse of advice and reasoned persuasion. The forum for debate has a literal and conceptual pertinence; books have a concrete and material status as carriers of thought and opinion, and they inhabit and create a particular space. Milton's conception of the power of this space, the forum for reasoned debate which will encourage a movement to right government and the perfection of the species, is predicated upon a humanist notion that all books are good and that reason is paramount. It also rests on a notion of free market economics which emphasises that the marketplace will settle according to the demand of informed and intelligent consumers.

Royalist writers were not as certain about the importance of debate. They figured the domain in which books were, quite literally, consumed as subject to problematic economic imperatives not gestured at by Milton's idealistic speech. John Taylor's satirical mock-newsbook *A Preter-Pluperfect, Spick and Span New Nocturnall* includes a sequence describing the shop of the Oxford bookseller George Chambers, 'who since these distracted

⁷⁵ Christopher Hill, *Milton and the English Revolution* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1977), p. 150.

Troubles hath bought and sold many Pamphlets of divers and contrary subjects'.⁷⁶ Taylor eschews the humanist intellectual or Ciceronian discourses deployed by Parliamentary apologists for the marketplace of print in favour of broad allegory and fable. The last page of the piece claims it was 'Written at *London* by *I. T.* for those that will reade and are bought where they are to be sold', although this may be intended to add to the confused status of the text and the last words mock the standard conventions of publication (p. 20). The phrase 'for those that will reade' also suggests that Taylor is addressing a specific audience; moreover, an audience that share particular reading habits. The tract is 'for' them, directed towards a group who will receive it in the correct fashion.

The text articulates the confused nature of the print marketplace. Chambers' stock is presented as a '*Chaos of Confusion*':

some of them being of His Majesties part, and printed at *Yorke*, and at *Oxford*; many of them were of the Parliament partie, and printed at *London*, so that there remained unsold in the said Shop of such sorts (as were stale and past sale) to the number of 160, or thereabouts; these small Trifles were laid one upon another confusedly (like a pack of Cardes shuffled together) so these Books were intermingled together, friends and foes, Truthes and Lyes, all in a heape, one amongst another, tied in a bundle with a pack-thred, the Owner intending to have every sort of them bound by themselves afterwards. All these Divisions being thus accorded with a cord, (or parcell of Hempt, which will end all Divisions) were laid upon a shelve in the Shop' (p. 2).

The passage shows how important topicality was for pamphlets, tracts and newsbooks; anything old is 'stale' and unmarketable. Taylor emphasises the importance of situating expression firmly within the contemporary political moment. The sheer number of these cast-offs is testament to the sudden explosion in print culture during the early part of the war. The shop falsely creates a confused '*Babel*', the marketplace mixing together loyalist

⁷⁶ *A Preter-Pluperfect, Spick and Span New Nocturnall, or Mercuries Weekly Night Newes; wherein the Publique Faith is published, and the Banquet of Oxford Mice described* ([Oxford][1643]) [TT: E65 (1)], p. 2. Thomason annotations: 'Oxon. Aug: 11 1643'.

and rebellious texts (p. 2). As Sharon Achinstein has argued, Babel is an important image in the ideological as well as cultural and religious conflicts of the 1640s, for both revolutionary pamphleteers and Royalist apologists ('Politics of Babel', p. 39). Royalists saw the proliferation of unauthorised texts as creating a monstrous variety of opinion and instrumental in mounting a subversive attack upon the authority of the King. They attacked the creation of what they termed a new Babel, defending traditional models of discourse and publication.

Taylor's passage highlights how very polarised texts were; there is no common ground but right and wrong, 'Truthes and Lyes'. It is impossible to distinguish friend from foe, a fear that motivates much Royalist reception theory. As Digges argued above, the populace were easily led to wrong, and the confusing intermingling of discourse would dissipate the true message and possibly encourage some to rebel. Rather than allow the readers to exercise their reason to attain truth, as Milton would have it, Royalist writers would prefer their audience not to have the option of reading seditious or revolutionary works for fear they might be tempted. Censorship and propaganda control and regiment a society; freedom of the presses just leads to the social chaos figured in the state of the shop. Disturbingly, this economically-led confusion can strike at the heart of the city-court; Chambers' shop is situated 'within a quoytes cast of *Carfax*', the exact centre of Oxford (p. 2). Taylor makes no claim that this canker in the midst of the courtly body should be actively cast out. Indeed, his work shows the nature of Royalist engagement with the new mechanics and economics of publication. They did not deny the occurrence and existence of an opposition. Rather, they emphasised the profoundly evil effects of this enemy discourse. *Mercurius Aulicus*, for instance, spends increasing amounts of energy refuting and attacking Parliamentary newsbooks in an attempt to derogate and obviate their appeal.

The print market throws foes together, but the discerning mice from the shop only consume Parliamentary work: 'all this while they touched not any Book or Paper that concerned the King, or wherein any thing was exprest either for His Majesties Service or Honour' (p. 3). This loyalist preference is their downfall. The mice make the mistake of eating three of Pym's treasonous speeches: 'no Rats-bane could be more poysonous [...] [it] choaked them' (pp. 4–5). The message is clear: ingesting Parliamentary texts, whilst maybe superficially more tasty or appealing, will make you physically sick and may even kill you. They taste 'as sweet as *Sugar Carrion*' but now carry a government health warning. The mice are figured as the populace of the nation, poisoned by the saccharine words and sophistry of the Parliamentary usurpers. The body of state is diseased and corrupted by the unauthorised publication and uncontrolled consumption of these seditious texts. The theory of reception articulated here is that consumption of texts is a very physical and mechanic action. Whilst the reaction of the audience to the volume is unstable (sickness and death), the text is inviolate, a powerful entity. Readers do not intervene with the text or interrogate it, they quite literally swallow it whole. Texts have a physical presence and their content a material nature; it is enough to poison creatures, to work a physiological effect upon a corporeal body.

The use of animals to represent human caricatures and arguments was not unusual during the war.⁷⁷ Prince Rupert's dog, particularly, was the subject of various tracts and a poem by John Cleveland. This transmutation serves to give the debate or textual exchange a certain metaphoric quality; the space inhabited by the mice as they interact with the books is simultaneously material and conceptual. They are at once actual mice devouring the

pages of texts, and symbolically representative creatures reacting to poisoned volumes. The tract considers that involvement with the London print marketplace involves a transgressive action which tends to dehumanise the participants. The domain or sphere in which the mice ingest these tracts is a physically capitalist space. Interaction within this demand-led marketplace is destructive and the unauthoritative texts made available affect society conceptually and materially. Taylor uses the feast to satirise the cacophonous multitude of Parliamentary works:

they fell upon *Remonstrances, Letters, Messages, Passages, Treatises, Animadversions, Exprobations, Exclamations, Objections, Questions, Answers, Replies, Replications, Reduplications, Quadruplications, Detractions, Distractions, Rebellions, Intelligences, Observations, Decrees, Orders, Lyes, Libels, Diurnals, Execrations, Resolves, Proofes, Disproofes, Extravagancies, Delinquencies, Cases, Causes, Clauses, Articles [...]* Briefes, Breviates, Approbations, Amplifications, Transcriptions, Massacres, Petitions, Repetitions, Supplications, Reservations, Degradations, Iustifications, Manifestations, Declarations, Molestations, Condemnations, Advertisements, Remembrances, Pamphlets, Sermons, Seditious, Fights, Battailes, Skirmishes, Suspicious, Submissions, Triumphs, Firings, Plunderings, Advices, Intelligences, Newes, Expositions, Propositions, Impositions, Transpositions, Acquisitions, Despositions, Suppositions, Compositions, Inquisitions, Commissions, and the Devill and all (pp. 3–4).

The product of the Parliament is disordered and confused whereas the work printed for Charles is homogenous and loyal. Parliamentary texts are multitudinous and cacophonous, their dissonant number including ‘Lyes’, ‘Libels’, ‘Distractions’, ‘Questions, Answers’, ‘Molestations’ and ‘Seditious’ amongst the more recognisable genres. The work of the King is somewhat steadier and briefer: ‘there were many printed Bookes, wherein His Majestie had Declared his Gracious intention to all His loving Subjects, as *Expressions, Declarations, Exhortations, Admonitions, Protestations, Imprecations, Proclamations, Demonstrations*’ (p. 3). None of these genres are mentioned in the Parliamentary list; the

⁷⁷ See Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*, pp. 118–21, where she considers the tracts *A Dialogue, or Rather a Parley between Prince Rupert's Dog and Toby's Dog* (1643) and *A Dialogue betwixt a*

King has his own unique models of expression. His works have a didactic, imperative quality where the Parliamentary texts have a monstrous variety and multiplicity of meaning. The works are the King's words and express his authority; they contrast profoundly with the unauthored chaos produced by 'these villanous scandalous Pamphlet mongers' (p. 4).

The opening up of the print marketplace has led to an ungodly proliferation of texts, a literal city of Babel. The mice eat their way through what is described as a city, figuring the urban space as the location of unauthorised debate: 'they entered the papyreall Suburbs, and never left undermining till they had made way, tyrannically tearing through the Territories of that *Babel*, gnawing and eating their passage with their sharpe fanges' (p. 2). The pun on 'passage' emphasises the physical ingestion involved in reading and consuming a text. The texts create a material urban topography, a modern capitalist city through which the mice rampage, consuming and destroying simultaneously. They are situated within an newly created absolute space of capitalist hegemony, cleansed only by the aggressive intervention of Royalist readers who physically 'undermine' and erode the boundaries and limits of these new territories.

The shop highlights the uncharted and uncontrolled nature of the creeping marketplace. The relative freedom of the presses and the mercantile importance of London foregrounds the movement away from a Copernican model of society, focused on the person of the King, towards the 'space of capitalist patriarchy'.⁷⁸ It is essentially the replacing of one spatial orthodoxy with another structured model for society. The proto-capitalist space of England was highly contested, and, as Taylor's tract shows, for the first

Horse of War and a Mill-Horse (1644).

⁷⁸ Neil Smith and Cindi Katz paraphrasing Henri Lefebvre, 'Grounding Metaphor: Towards a Spatialized Politics' in *Place and the Politics of Identity*, ed. by Michael Keith and Steve Pile (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 67–84 (p 78).

years of the war the Royalist camp attempted to configure it to their own specifications. The print marketplace in London fed a rapacious demand for news and debate which figured an increasing bourgeois involvement and investment in the government of the nation. Taylor's pamphlet articulates a Royalist worry about the power and purpose of the newly inclusive spaces. *Mercurius Aulicus* continually refers to inaccurate or invalid reports by emphasising their published status: 'a Pamphlet which tels us in print'; 'This is the truth, which how it will agree with their admirable fine Relation printed at *London*'; 'Now though they at *London* have no Intelligence from their Brethren, yet their servants in print must not want newes, and therefore they tell us'.⁷⁹ *Aulicus*' tone and reputation for accuracy imposed what Louis Althusser termed 'the ideological *recognition* function', the 'obviousnesses as obviousnesses, which we cannot *fail to recognize*.'⁸⁰ The construction of London as Other and assumed inclusion of audience in the discourse of the newsbook cloaked the message and function as the 'practical denagation of the ideological character of ideology by ideology' (pp. 163–4). *Aulicus* fits loosely into Althusser's model for ideology and the imposition of ideology by conceptual and cultural structures: individuals/ audiences are interpellated as both individuals and abstract notions, and the final message is that 'the absolute guarantee that everything really is so, and that on condition that the subjects recognize what they are and behave accordingly, everything will be all right: Amen – "So be it"' (p. 169). The Royalist construction of a Parliamentary identity often rests on an interpretation of the specious publications produced in London. The demand-led economics of the market as figured by London led to the printing of tracts which disseminated

⁷⁹ 15 January, *The third Weeke* (1643), [TT: E30 (21)]; 1 February, *The fifth Weeke* (1643) [TT: E33 (20)]; 9 March, *The tenth Weeke* (1643) [TT: E39 (3)].

⁸⁰ 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)', in *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays* trans. by Ben Brewster (London: NLB, 1971), pp. 121–77 (161).

falsehood and dissented from traditional models of subjection by encouraging and enfranchising an active reading public, creating a 'political subject'. This freer printing was anathema to Royalist concepts of subjection and authority, as will be further shown in the following section.

2.6 The King's Cabinet Opened

The greatest textual challenge to these concepts faced before the end of the first civil war was the publication of Charles' private letters seized at Naseby as *The King's Cabinet Opened* in 1645.⁸¹ The reaction to this volume illustrates how notions of public space, privacy and text intersected in Royalist thought. The editors claimed that they were simply presenting a text which would allow readers to come to truth: 'we affirm nothing necessary to be beleaved, but what the printed papers will themselves utter in their own language' (*Kings Cabinet Opened*, Sig. A4r). This sarcastic nod to the supposed authority of the King's words and Royalist expressions of textuality ignored the material changes made by the annotation and republication of letters which had been intended for a very different audience. The comment supposes that each printed text has an individual language, an unique mode of expression. The volume is not fact or dogmatic myth 'necessary to be beleaved', but one of many conflicting discourses. The King's words have become just another text which can be edited, inflected, typographically refashioned. The physical authority of the King's expression is ruptured.

⁸¹ *The King's Cabinet Opened: or, Certain Packets of Secret Letters & Papers, Written with the King's own Hand, and taken in his Cabinet at Naseby-Field* (London: for Robert Bostock at the Signe of the Kings-Head, 1645) [TT: E292 (27)].

Even the title of the tract invokes transgression of boundaries and invasion of once personal space. The 'cabinet' is both the chest or closet which was seized at Naseby and the private rooms of state inhabited by the King. The publication of the letters implied that the people demanded Royal privacy be opened to public scrutiny; that they be P/privy to Charles' innermost diplomatic thoughts, brought into his council chamber, given access to his unguarded moments. They gain proximity to the King and through this political power. The triumphant rupturing and invasion of the spaces of political power echoes the worries of Royalist theorists who saw popular enfranchisement as a physical invasion: 'they must be entring into Kings Chambers, entrenching upon the Prerogative of Princes' (Henry Ferne, *The Sovereignty of Kings*, Sig. A1v). The authority of the King and the mythology of Royalism depended on the sanctity of particular spaces; on locations defined by exclusion and inclusion.

An index of the significance of *The King's Cabinet Opened* is the great number of publications refuting, denying or attacking it.⁸² It was a test case for Royalist concepts of the public, an insult that could not be ignored or tolerated. Various strategies were used to attack the volume. One allegedly parliamentarian response to the publication worried that

for though discoveries of this nature have upon the persons they concerne somewhat in them of a ridiculous infelicity, yet withall they have very much of advantage too, because they deeply worke into all wise men an exceeding strong beleife of those things which were let fall in so great secrecy. So that it should have beene well weighed before such Bookes had beene made publicke, whether, though they conteine some truths that make for our turne, they are not withall a full prooffe of some others which are downe-right destructive to us.⁸³

⁸² See Loxley on poetic reactions to the publication, *Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 130–38.

⁸³ *A Letter, in which the Arguments of the Annotator, And three other Speeches Upon their Majesties Letters Published at London, are Examined and Answered* ([Oxford] Printed in the yeare 1645) [TT: E296 (15)], pp. 1–2.

Other pamphlets decried the outrage of printing private letters, of invading the personal space of the monarch and rupturing the sanctity of his image. The textual foundations and representations on which Royalism had built itself were threatened by this volume. The Christ Church poet Martin Lluellyn published a verse defence of the King which opened by decrying the times in terms which echoed Royalist political theorists: 'When Lawes and Princes are despis'd, & cheape'.⁸⁴ Lluellyn deplored the invasion of the private space of the monarch, emphasising the sacrosanct divide between public and private:

Nature gave Reason power to finde a way,
Which none but these could venture to betray.
Two close safe Paths she did bequeath to men,
In Presence, Whisper; and at Distance Penne.
Publicke Decrees and Thoughts were else the same,
Nor were it to Converse, but to Proclaime.
Conceipts were else Records, but by this care
Our Thoughts no Commons, but Inclosures are:
What bold Intruders then are who assaile,
To cut their Prince's Hedge, and breake His Pale?
That so Unmanly gaze, and dare be seene
Ev'n then, when He converses with His Queene? (ll. 31–42).

The publication of the King's words has betrayed nature and reason; it is an insult to both. Lluellyn's verse explicitly figures the exclusivity of private, mediated space as the natural inverse of the vulgar and uncontrolled Commons. Privacy is accorded a financial status; just as access to political power through Parliament was predicated upon ownership of land, access to this idealised private space is through property and the exclusion of the poor. Lluellyn's use of a language which evokes the structures and expressions of the court ('Presence'; 'Converse'; 'Proclaime') emphasises that the space of privacy and meditation is the court or the private house whereas the space of the public is an uncontrolled common ground, unenclosed and open.

⁸⁴ *A Satyr, Occasioned by the Author's Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, the Kings Cabinet Opened*

Lluellyn assumes that modes of public and private are based on status and property. The publication of the King's letters, and the concomitant inclusion of the people within the domain of government is expressed as a violent invasion, a trespass which destroys possessions and private land. Physical limits and boundaries — hedges, fences — are destroyed and bypassed in order to gain unsolicited presence and petty voyeurism. The material space of government and monarchy is violated. Traditional spatial models which established structure and order onto society — the space of absolute monarchy and hierarchical subjection to property and rank — are destroyed by the increasing public involvement in government and a method of invasive reading which allows an audience to debate and query the monarchical text. Thus it becomes clear that Royalist theories of reading and the immanence of the text are deployed to suppress the innovative and destructive spatial models described in the tract *Oxonii Lachrymae* (see Conclusion). The authority and inviolability of Royalist textual space is a metaphor for the authorial structures of the nation and as such is used by Lluellyn to express a material desire to prevent actual debate and questioning of the King's authority, expressed on the battlefield and in the House of Commons.

Illustrating this point with reference to language, the anonymous tract *Some Observations upon Occasion of the Publishing their Majesties Letters* claimed that the manner of the publication was the most problematic issue about the volume by highlighting the sanctity of the text: 'he is neither Papist nor Jesuit that dares say, If there be not forgery in some part of the King's Letters, (for a word or two varied, or omitted, may make a new

(Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645) [TT: E296 (1)], l. 1.

matter) yet the inferences on them, are neither perspicuous, nor modest'.⁸⁵ This nuanced model of reception and reaction postulates an imagined audience which is not religiously extreme but 'normal' and mainstream. The reader deplores the invasive strategies deployed by the editors of the letters, which inferred and implied a subjective meaning which was not lucid or clear but false and lying. The Parliamentary model of reading implied by the editing of the volume is of a questioning, debating and intervening nature. A normal or unbiased reading would apprehend that the text has an immanent meaning and authority; this is ruptured and turned into falsehood by the method of presentation. Text has an objective meaning which is made problematic by the annotations and interventions. This is particularly true of the King's words; they have an innate power or value which may not be disrupted. This passage figures the publication of the letters as the final act of Parliamentary inversion. By changing and interpolating the words of the monarch they disrupt and subvert the structures of society and normality. They interfere with his textual presence and authority; conceptually, by questioning and interrogating his meaning, and physically, by changing the material nature of his text. The use of the word 'forgery' implies the creation of something physically new and crucially false. The conceptual space of authority inhabited by the King's words has been invaded and inverted.

In some ways Charles himself could not complain about the publication of his letters. His presses had printed various intercepted correspondence, interfering with the boundary between private and public epistle.⁸⁶ 'Official' letters were fair game in the propaganda wars. However, Royalist printings of intercepted texts tended to respect their

⁸⁵ *Some Observations upon Occasion of the Publishing their Majesties Letters* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645) [TT: E292 (2)], p. 1.

⁸⁶ See, for instance, *Two Intercepted Letters from Sr William Brereton to the Earle of Essex, and M. Pym; concerning the Rebels affaires in the North* (Printed Verbatim according to the Originalls, by Leonard

status; what makes *The King's Cabinet Opened* unusual is the interpolation and interpretation of the King's words which distinguishes the volume. The authority of Charles' words have been queried and the absolute space which they created subverted and questioned. He has been revealed without his assent or control. *The King's Cabinet Opened* had utilised a theatrical image itself: 'the traverse Curtain is drawn, and the King writing to Ormond, and the Queen, what they must not disclose, is presented upon the stage' (*The King's Cabinet Opened*, Sig. A4v). The text articulates the difference between Royalist and Parliamentary modes of writing and theories of reception. Whereas Royalists denied access to truth and mediated their message through hierarchical structures of debate, Parliamentary tracts attempted to allow full disclosure by allowing less restricted access and interaction with a public theatre. Parliamentary reading emphasised the transactive nature of texts, a theatre which reveals the truth and allows participation within the innermost corridors of power.⁸⁷

Charles' only semi-official response came in a letter addressed to Sir Edward Nicholas, published as one of a pair of Royal letters.⁸⁸ The material nature of this publication itself raises issues of privacy and veracity, forcing the reader to consider different levels of discourse. As a private letter the piece is addressed to Nicholas, but as a public text the implied readership is far greater. Charles' words are italicised, implying that

Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1643) [Wing B4373]. The addition of 'Verbatim' highlights the fact that the letters were not interfered with but simply represented within a Royalist textual space.

⁸⁷ As Susan Wiseman has pointed out, the theatrical nature of London tracts emphasised widened participation in political debate, 'Pamphlet Plays in the Civil War News Market: Genre, Politics and "Context"' in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* ed. by Joad Raymond (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 66–84.

⁸⁸ *Two Letters Of His Sacred Maiesty, One, In Vindication of Him, touching the Irish Affaires; The other, Concerning a late Mis-interpretation of one maine Passage in his late Letters* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the Universitie, 1645) [TT: E298 (31)]. The original text of the second letter was actually sent to Nicholas, see *Letters*, pp. 804–07.

they are 'exact quotation' rather than simply a reprint of the primary source.⁸⁹ The letters in *The King's Cabinet Opened* had also been printed italicised, with editorial notes added in normal typeface. Charles comments upon the nature of the public print forum by complaining about the invasion of his privacy:

and though I could have wished that their paines had been spared, yet I will neither denie that those things are mine which they have set out in my Name (onely some words here and there mistaken, and some Commas misplaced, but not much materiall), nor as a good Protestant or honest man, blush for any of those papers: indeed, as a discreet man I will not justifie my Selfe, and yet I would faine know him who would be willing, that the freedome of all his private Letters were publikely seen as mine have now been. However, so that one clause bee rightly understood, I care not much though the rest take their Fortune [...] the intention of that phrase ['Mongrel Parliament'] was, That his Faction did what they could to make it come to that, by their raysing and fomenting of base Propositions (pp. 5–6).

The ambiguous status of this text as published comments upon the issues of privacy discussed by the King. It is a letter designed for public consumption because it concerns matters of state; furthermore, at a more implicit level, the important characteristic about the information contained in this letter is that it can be controlled. Charles claims that his letters to Henrietta Maria were never intended for anything other than an intimate correspondence, and therefore they need not be apologised for. He links privacy with a certain unlicensed 'freedom' which should not be looked upon by censorious eyes. The passage shows that the King conceived of a very distinct boundary between 'personal' and 'private' texts. Charles' '*private Letters*' have been '*seen*' and brought to public inspection. They were never for consumption by any other than him and those he saw fit to include within his private space. Charles' words indicate a Royalist distinction between private space and public life. That which is brought into the public domain is mediated; the process of preparing work for public consumption implies this movement to control the image portrayed to the wider

⁸⁹ Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 133.

audience. Private individuals have their own unique coterie space, based upon property, economic status and traditional sociological models of hierarchy and inheritance. Their intervention in public life is predicated upon these hegemonic structures; the invasion and disruption of this model threatens the very fabric of the state as conceived of by Charles, and refutes the myths of loyalty and identity that he and his court had been fashioning throughout the war period.

2.7 Inclusion and Exclusion: the letter as genre, dedications and the intended reader

As has been seen, throughout the war Royalist writers addressed issues of private and public textuality. They explored the relationship between the two domains or modes, especially after the publication of *The King's Cabinet Opened*. This concluding section considers the Royalist letter-genre, in order to analyse Royalist attitudes and representations of the interaction between print culture and public space. It ends with an analysis of Royalist dedications. The section shows how both genre and paratextual trope contributed to the construction of a 'Royalist reader', an intended or implied interlocutor whose relationship with the text was structured upon hierarchical and feudal notions of subjection to authority. Letters assumed a readership in dialogue with a debate which was undertaken in private spaces — studies, chambers and rich houses. Invitation to this conversation was strictly controlled. Dedications attempted to create an image of a reader as passive and accepting, subjected to the authority of the text. Royalist notions of public debate were therefore highly complex; predicated upon controlled entry to specific spaces and the unproblematic acceptance of the authority of statement. The two modes analysed in this section illustrate the difficulties that Royalist texts had with a notion of 'audience' and the various strategies deployed to create and construct a loyalist subject, a Royalist reader.

During the first civil war the Royalist presses at Oxford printed many texts purporting to be letters from scholars and courtiers in the city, normally addressed to MPs or Lords in London. These texts emphasised their status as private epistles addressing a specific reader. The titles confirm that the 'original' documents were sent from Oxford.

They open 'Sir' or 'Dear Brother', and refer to earlier parts of a fictional correspondence:

I have received your Lordships Letter of the tenth of this instant, with much more trouble and sadnesse of mind then any thing you have sent me this whole ill yeare: All your Declarations, Votes, Ordinances, and Orders with your Generalls powerfull Commission to kill and slay all good people, made not halfe that impression in mee (though I have not beene ender in letting you know what I thinke of the best of those) as your *Sacred Vow and Covenant* (as you call them) which with Mr Pym's Speech at the Common-hall of the discovery of the great Plot (I received inclosed in your Letter) hath done.⁹⁰

These openings vary slightly but the pretence is always kept up.⁹¹ They knowingly comment upon their own metatext, rejoicing for instance that the King has once again allowed carriers to deliver letters to London for Oxford.⁹² There is sometimes a poignancy in the personalising of the texts: 'for when the foundation of publique order is subverted, we may soone expect the factions of families and friends, (bonds sacred in all ages) the late strangenesse betweene us arising from our different wayes in the present distractions is one instance'.⁹³ This elision of the private and the public illustrates how the genre consciously crosses the barriers between discourses.

⁹⁰ *A Letter to a Noble Lord from a Friend at Oxford: Upon occasion of the late Covenant taken by both Houses* ([Oxford] Printed, 1643) [TT: E60(20)], p. 1. The letters are also often signed and dated.

⁹¹ The format of the texts marks the difference between this letter-genre and the more informative kind of which Montague Bertie's *A Declaration and Justification; of the Earle of Lindsey, Now prisoner in Warwicke-Castle* [...] *As it was sent in a letter to the Right honourable Henry, Earle of Newarke, now resident with His Maiesty at Oxford* (Oxford printed by Leonard Leychfield, Printer to the Universitie of Oxford [1643]) [TT: E88 (10)] is an example.

⁹² *The Examination and Confession of Captaine Lilbourne and Captaine Viviers* [...] *Being sent in a letter from Mr Daniel Felton, a Scholar of Trinity Colledge, to one Mr Tho. Harris in Lincolne Innes Fields* (London printed for T. Wright, 1642) [TT: E130 (33)], Sig. A2r.

⁹³ *A Letter From a Member of the House of Commons, To a Gentleman now at London, touching the New Solemne League and Covenant* (Oxford: Printed by H. Hall, 1644) [TT: E45 (8)], p. 1.

The texts are standard polemic tracts, expanding or refuting points and delineating positions. Sometimes the letters are given a grander title on their first page such as ‘A Letter of Loyalty’.⁹⁴ The ‘intended’ recipients were mainly staunch Parliamentarians, or stock figures in need of advice or persuasion.⁹⁵ Royalist supporters were used to transmitting information and political debate in letters, and so the letter-format gives the tract an individual character. Rather than being an amorphous collection of arguments, they have a point and a personal resonance. They are speciously straightforward. They emphasise a closed, controlled discussion between civilised correspondents. Political debate is still undertaken at a ‘private’, enclosed level, the economically inflected space that Lluelyn had attempted to define.

The letter-genre illustrates the profound formal difference in polemic approach between London and Oxford. Susan Wiseman’s work has illustrated how the Parliamentarian pamphlet-play genre commodifies news, and encourages participation in political debate. An instance of this strategy is the Parliamentarian text *Plaine Truth*, ‘Being a Dialogue between Mr. Thrivewell a Citizen, and Mr. Sharpwit a Schollar, upon the Road between Oxford and London’.⁹⁶ The protagonists debate in a liminal space that emphasises the mutual relationship and connection between the two cities. They meet in an non-urban, uncivilised and uncontrolled environment, their only landmarks the twin poles of allegiance. Their dialogue is extensive and transcribed as a playtext, concluding with

⁹⁴ *A Letter sent from a Private Gentleman to a Friend in London, In Justification of his owne adhereing to His Majestie in these times of Distraction* ([London] Printed for V. N., 1642) [TT: E128 (24)], p. 2. The piece opens ‘In your last letter I received nothing but chiding invectives. I wish you to examine your selfe how farre the profession of so much faith (as those of your opinion are full of) can stand with so little charity’, p. 2.

⁹⁵ See for instance *No Peace ‘till the King prosper. A Letter writ from a true lover of Peace. To one that is both, modestly inquiring, and Discovering the true and false Paths to a present Peace* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645) [TT: E298 (7)].

Thrivewell's decision: 'I am converted an will henceforward practice to be an instrument of Reformation [...] and] joyn with the Parliament in the defence of Religion' (p. 6). Their names recall the casts of Caroline city-comedies, and their debate is rendered in dramatic terms. The scholar is used as a mouthpiece for Parliamentary ideas, persuading his acquaintance to turn from the King's side. The subtitle, *Being a Case of Conscience tryed at Oxford*, enables the tract to incorporate the drier arguments of other texts that had argued about the legality of the current situation.⁹⁷ The playlet is full of questioning ambiguities from the vague location to the inconclusive ending.

In contrast, the Royalist piece *A Letter from a Scholler in Oxfordshire to his Unkle a Merchant in Broadstreet* allows the figure being persuaded only a brief note at the end explaining his conversion delineated in the title: *Sent to the Presse by the Merchant, who confesseth himselfe converted by it*.⁹⁸ There is no debate, rather a one-sided argument on behalf of the King which ends with the physical publication of the text. The scholar persuades his somewhat duller merchant uncle that his contact with members of the court gives his words authority:

What with my acquaintance with some Exeter Colledge men, Chaplaines to some of the Kings Regiment (men even till now rather esteemed Puritans, then Popishly affected) and by being often present by their meanes, where some discreet Officers of the Kings have often met; I am confident, I am so well inform'd, that what I shall say is come to mee by very good Conduit pipes, though I had it not from the Spring head (p. 3).

The framing narrative of the Royalist letter-genre means that even in texts where there is a dialogue, debate is rendered as reported speech. Discussion and interaction is therefore

⁹⁶ *Plaine Truth, without Feare, or Flattery Being a Case of Conscience tryed at Oxford* (Printed for H. I. and Ro. Smith, 1642[3]) [TT: E89 (30)], Sig. A2r.

⁹⁷ See, for instance, Robert Holborne *The Reading In Lincolnes-Inne, Feb. 28. 1641. Upon the Stat. Of 25. E. 3. Cap. 2. Being the Statute of Treasons* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. Anno Dom. 1642[3]) [TT: E246 (14)].

physically mediated and controlled by the material structure of the tract, the textual boundaries of the piece. In *A Letter, in which the Arguments of the Annotator, And three other Speeches Upon their Majesties Letters Published at London, are Examined and Answered*, a response to the publication of *The King's Cabinet Opened*, the pseudo-Parliamentarian writer worries about the publication of the letters.⁹⁹ He consults with a Royalist friend of his, and their dialogue is reproduced more as Socratic dialogue than dramatic interchange, ending

And truly, Sir, I must confesse to you that he left me in a great perplexity; for I know him a most honest man, and I find it to be true, that reason then gaines extreamely in the weight, when it hath once passed through such a furnace. I assure you he hath much troubled me, I would not say converted me, but I cannot divine how my Conscience will hold out, for this appears to me so much reason that if you have not somewhat to satisfy me with, Believe me, I am much afraid how long I shall continue a friend to our present Cause (pp. 21–22).

This pamphlet is theatrical insofar as the author is a caricatured cipher, his debate with both his Royalist friend and his parliamentarian correspondent a dramatised piece of rhetorical and generic manipulation. These 'dialogues' are closely controlled; far from Wiseman's conception of a widened public interest in political debate, the specious theatricality of the letter-genre refuses to enfranchise the reader or audience.

Wiseman sees Parliamentarian tracts as inviting interaction and response, a public theatre which enfranchised the audience and encouraged participation in government and debate. The purpose of this model of expression was to shape an imagined readership and encourage the creation and dissemination of opinion:

⁹⁸ *A Letter from a Scholler in Oxfordshire to his Unkle a Merchant in Broadstreet, upon occasion of a Book Intituled A Moderate and most Proper Reply to a Declaration* (Printed in the Year 1643) [Wing L1436].

⁹⁹ *A Letter, in which the Arguments of the Annotator, And three other Speeches Upon their Majesties Letters Published at London, are Examined and Answered* ([Oxford] Printed in the year 1645) [TT: E296 (15)], p. 2.

The playlets of the 1640s, then, do suggest the ways in which *form* is being used by the newswriters to shape the imagined reader as a political subject and make opinion [...] Ultimately, the circulation of political debate in the pamphlet play consists in the texts imagining of a reader, a political subject, which it seeks to create and manipulate ('Pamphlet Plays', p. 79).

Wiseman's formulation of a 'political subject' suggests an audience with an active role in public debate. This is echoed by the work of Sharon Achinstein in analysing the creation of the reader as a political entity. Royalist tracts, conversely, emphasised the hierarchical relationship between authoritative speaker and passive reader. Royalist theory criticised the way that Parliamentary readers interpolated their own meanings onto and into texts, engaging and intervening within their textual discourse. This sundering of the exclusive boundaries between authority and subject was anathema to the Royalist propaganda project. *Mercurius Aulicus* highlighted the misreading inherent in this activity by analysing the reception of a particular text:

There was lately printed at *London*, a booke called *The Reading of Robert Holborne of Lincolnes Inne Esquire, on the Statute of Treason*; which booke the most charitable Reader must at least thinke to be broken and imperfect notes taken by one who was (it seemes) no competent Auditor; for therein are many things false, most mistaken, and all imperfect, much dissonant from the sense of the learned Author, who will not acknowledge this for his owne.¹⁰⁰

Royalist writers were keen to situate and locate their readership, to culturally encode and identify them with the King's cause. Their texts emphasised certain modes of behaviour, expressions of loyalty, religious convictions and codes of obedience. Broadsides and tracts caricatured and anatomised the opposition whilst laying down a set of rules for loyalist actions. Edward Symmons defines the characteristics of those the 'enemies' call 'Cavaliers [...] or at least the Character of such a man as everie of you ought to be, and as we your friends and servants in Christ desire to conceive of you':

¹⁰⁰ *Mercurius Aulicus the seventh Weeke* (1643), 18 February [TT: E246 (39)].

A complete Cavalier is a Child of Honour, a Gentleman well borne and bred; that loves his King for conscience sake, of a clearer countenance and bolder looke then other men, because of a more loyall heart: He dares neither oppose his Princes will, nor yet disgrace his righteous cause, by his carriage or expressions: He is furnished with the qualities of Piety, Prudence, Iustice, Liberality, Goodnesse, Honesty; He is amiable in his behaviour, couragious in his undertakings, discreet and gallant in all his executions: he is throughly sensible of the least wrong that is offered to his Sovereigne, and is a professed enemy to all Rebels: the aimes of his sword are onely to dissever the malignity of those forces that have conspired the ruine of Monarchy and Innocency: he feares no evill thing to come upon himselfe, but contemns all dangers that look towards him: he dares accept of deaths challenge to meet it in the field, and yet can embrace it as a speciall friend when it comes into his chamber, where he is alwayes making provision for its better entertainment: in a word, he is the only Reserve of English Gentility and ancient valour, and hath rather chose to burie himselfe in the Tombe of Honour, then to see the Nobility of his Nation vassalaged, the Dignity of his Countrey captivated by any base domesticke enemy, or by any forraigne fore-conquered foe.¹⁰¹

Symmons ends by admonishing his audience ‘This is a compleat Cavalier, and if any of you be not according to this Character, believe me you are not right, nor the men you ought to be’ (p. 16). This listing of virtues and modes of behaviour has echoes of courtier advice literature.¹⁰² Certainly, the texts were designed to affect and change the behaviour of their audience for the better. They emphasised a ‘right’, correct and civilised manner of acting in comparison with the libertine and socially unstable activities of the opposition.

In her study of Aemilia Lanier’s relationship to her intended readership, Jacqueline Pearson emphasises the importance of dedicatory material in constructing a model of this audience.¹⁰³ Dedications to texts assumed and implied a certain interlocutor, and their

¹⁰¹ *A Militarie Sermon, Wherein By the Word of God, the nature and disposition of a Rebell is discovered, and the Kings true Souldier described and characterized* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall in the Yeere 1644) [TT: 53 (19)], pp. 16–17.

¹⁰² Lichfield reissued Sermonetta’s *Instructions for Young Gentlemen* in 1644, affirming the notion that texts were often intended to be read in this fashion, Madan #1757.

¹⁰³ ‘Women Writers and Women Readers: the Case of Aemilia Lanier’ in *Voicing Women: Gender and Sexuality in Early Modern Writing* ed. by Kate Chedgzoy, Melanie Hansen and Suzanne Trill (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), pp. 45–55.

cultural encodings working to create an 'intended reader'.¹⁰⁴ In dedicating their work writers immediately constructed a certain status for their text.¹⁰⁵ Dedications allow the writer to 'identify and construct a community of readers' and were undergoing revolutionary change: 'During the Civil War the dedication was poised between the old world with its claims to truth and unity and a new culture of civilised political division and party in which books and their dedications would become the sites of contest' (Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p. 55). Royalist texts assume a particular Reader/s. Their initial audience is whomever the work is dedicated to - normally a member of the Royal family, or at least the aristocracy. They asked for protection and patronage, and emphasised their supine and lowly status:

Be pleased, then, to cast your Princely eye, upon this undigested lump of Virgins waxe, and do but grace it with one Royall smile, and then you Arme, and make him able to incounter with that triple headed Monster, base ingratitude (at this present your Majesties greatest and heaviest enemy) [...] and so upon the bended knees of my heart, praying for your Majesties long and happy Raigne over us, I humbly kisse your Royall hand.¹⁰⁶

Dedications to a more general readership or amorphous 'public' audience used a different language which was more dogmatic and didactic. Tracts were often not dedicated, but the dialectic style of polemic pamphlets located and situated their arguments.

Whilst a dedication to a general readership had been a staple of works during the century, constructions of a public audience became more polarised and politically motivated in the light of Parliamentary appropriation of popularist discourse. Dedications to Parliamentarian tracts tend to privilege the general reader, using diction more familiar to a relationship based on patronage: 'all I shall adde is onely this request, courteously to accept

¹⁰⁴ For discussions of the 'intended' reader, see Sharon Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* and also Nicholas von Maltzahn, 'Milton's Readers' in *The Cambridge Companion to Milton* ed. by Dennis Danielson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 236–53.

¹⁰⁵ Mildmay Fane, for instance, did not dedicate his book but defiantly wrote in an opening poem 'Ad Libellum Suum': 'Goe without Dedication, for that might/ Imply I sought to shelter what I write/ Under some Patronage', *Otia Sacra* (London: printed by Richard Cotes, 1648) [Wing 1476], ll. 1–3.

my weake labours: And how ever you please to censure, I wish you a contented life, and an honourable death'.¹⁰⁷ The unknown reader has an active role in constructing and judging the text. The audience participates in the discussions and arguments laid out. William Prynne dedicated his long political tract *The Sovereigne Power of Parliaments* to his audience: 'Courteous Reader, I Here present thee with [my work]'.¹⁰⁸ Royalist publications were more interested in control. Often texts were dedicated to a specific patron *and* the general reader.¹⁰⁹ Whilst they did often address a public audience, the language of such dedications contrasts with that of personalised dedications:

And good Readers (if you be true Christians, and right borne Englishmen) I beseech you, let us all strive together with God by our teares for the softening of these mens hearts (if it be possible) Our Saviour wept for the sins and ensuing miseries of those that sought his ruine, we have the like object at this time, O let us discover in our selves the minde of Christ, God expects it from all his Saints. Farewell.¹¹⁰

Royalist pamphlets constructed a notion of a fit audience; they were 'true Christians, and right borne Englishmen', included within a specific community that excluded those who would attempt to interpret or subvert the meaning of a text. The textual space that the reader is invited to enter is one of fixed boundaries; of set social rules and practices, of hierarchical rituals and structures. Tracts address a particular audience whilst attempting to construct and define that readership. Henry Ferne's political tract denying the legality of the Parliamentary armies, *Conscience Satisfied That there is no Warrant for the Armes now taken up by Subjects*, was dedicated to 'the Conscientious Readers among the People',

¹⁰⁶ *No Post from Heaven, Nor yet from Hell* (Oxford: [Leonard Lichfield], 1643) [TT: E101 (9)], Sig. A2v.

¹⁰⁷ J. B., 'To the Reader', *The Oxonian Antipodes, or the Oxford Anty-Parliament* (London, Printed for Richard Lounds, and are to be sold at his shop neere Ludgate, 1644) [TT: E31 (8)], Sig. A3v–A4r.

¹⁰⁸ *The Sovereigne Power of Parliament and Kingdomes* (Printed at London for Michael Sparke Senior, 1643) [TT: E248 (4)], Sig. A2r.

¹⁰⁹ For instance, Symmons' *A Militarie Sermon*, is dedicated 'To the Honourable Sir Michael Woodhouse, Governour of Ludlow, and Colonell to the Life-guard of the Prince of Wales' (Sig. A2r) and 'To the Readers' (Sig. A2v). Symmons privileges his aristocratic and military reader over the generalised audience.

¹¹⁰ Edward Symmons, 'To the Readers', *A Militarie Sermon*, Sig. A2v.

emphasising that such a work was aimed at a specific readership.¹¹¹ Dedications of tracts and treatises illustrate how they worked to educate or change their readership. There is an element of the instructive treatise about their purpose and drive. The pieces are printed to definite educational purpose:

Forasmuch as I was at this Sermon among other auditors, who judged it very divine like for the matter and the manner of handling of it, and afterward understood that divers which heard it preached, and more which did onely heare of it by the reports of others, were very desirous to have the view either written, or rather printed: therefore having obtained a copy of it for mine own use, I thought it expedient to commit it to the presse, for the publick good of all such as will vouchsafe to read it with patience and judge of it by the rule of charity.¹¹²

This passage shows a keen sense of the increased importance of print. It emphasises the physical moment of the sermon's delivery, and considers how the significance of the piece changes in its different formats. The anonymous writer acknowledges the sermon's multivalent status as oral/ aural religious demonstration, private devotional manuscript, and instructive public text.

Royalist dedications show an awareness of how print culture can affect and change the opinions of the population: 'It is a time, wherein many are become rather wilfully rather than really ignorant, and more conceitedly then truly desirous of Peace with Truth, to rectifie (if not satisfie) whom, this little treatise is communicated unto publique view'.¹¹³

The tracts have an assured, controlled tone. They strive for a unity of thought and empathy with the reader.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ *Conscience Satisfied That there is no Warrant for the Armes now taken up by Subjects* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University, 1643) [TT: E97 (7)], p. 2.

¹¹² K[illigrew?], H[enry?], 'To the Christian Reader', *A Sermon Preached Before the Kings Most Excellent Majesty at Oxford* (Oxford, Printed for W. Web. 1643) [TT: E93 (13)], Sig. A2r-v, unsigned.

¹¹³ W. J., 'To the Reader', *Obedience Active and Passive due to the Supream Power, By the word of God, Reason, and the Consent of divers moderne and Orthodox Divines* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, Anno 1643) [TT: E90 (19)], Sig. A2r.

¹¹⁴ 'As for you (good Christian Reader) his hope is, that he shall not need the use of the Apostles Expostulation, saying *Am I your enemy, because I tell you the truth?* And his prayer to God shall be to protect

2. 8 Conclusion

As was argued in the Introduction, for Royalists meaning is dependent upon the reader sharing with a set of conventions with the text; an understanding of a text implies the awareness of a specific language. Texts demand and expect a 'fit' or 'informed' reader who interprets meaning by responding to the systematic deployment of recognisable signs. At the more extreme end this is manifested in an assumption that the truths are so self-evident that the constructed reader must understand them:

In the designes we see the end aimed at: In the pretences, the way by which they have travail'd towards the end: And in their proceedings, their progress in that way. We shall decline that exact method used in handling every Discipline; because what are præorgnita to them (as all designes are to the contrivers) are post regnita to us. We can deduce them but by way of inference, and therefore having laid downe the other, as the two prentices, we shall draw these into the conclusion.¹¹⁵

The tract deploys a legal language to define correct methods of reading. Dedications ignored and expelled those who thought differently, creating a spatial metaphor for society which rested upon inclusion and exclusion, the respecting of barriers. Royalist texts attempted to create or construct their readership, assuming a shared ideological sympathy inherent in the very language. As the discussion of the grammatical tract *Vindex Anglicus* which figures England as the new Babel establishes, Oxford writers conceived of a particularly Royalist and hierarchical system of language and expression. The text was a space which constructed and represented a particular identity; interaction with the public or

and blesse you, to the Glory of his saving Grace in Christ Jesus, that he also will distribute to this our lacerated Church some portion of that his peerlesse Legacy left unto his Apostles, when he said *My peace I leave with you*, by vertue whereof we may with one Heart and Mind faithfully Worship God in Spirit and in Truth', *Confessions and Proofes of Protestant Divines of Reformed Churches, That Episcopacy is in respect of the Office according to the word of God, and in respect of the Use the Best* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall, in the Yeare 1644) [TT: E52 (23)], 'To The Pious and Religious Reader, Grace and Peace in Christ Jesus', Sig. A2v.

¹¹⁵ 'A Preface to the Reader', *Sober Sadnes: Or Historicall Observations Upon The Proceedings, Pretences, & Designes of a prevailing party in both Houses of Parliament* (Printed for W. Webb Book-seller, neer Queens Colledge, 1643) [TT: E94 (28)], p. 2.

published domain was controlled. The conceptual and cultural space of Royalism was heavily mediated and censored. The next Chapter will explore Royalist constructions of physical or material space.

Chapter 3

‘the limbs move severall wayes, but all to one end’: Public space

3.1 Introduction

In a letter of 1637 to Lord Viscount Wentworth, William Laud described various libels against them both which had been found ‘at the south door of St Paul’s’.¹ They align Laud’s church reforms with devilish acts, and address licensing and freedom: ‘it concludes thus: “This I write to honour God, and because no man says I must not”’ (*Works*, VII, 371). Religious freedom becomes intertwined with the freedom of the public domain. What is significant about these libels is their positioning; not simply at St. Paul’s, newly restored centre of Laudian reform, but specifically at the south door.² The altar controversies of the past few years had focused on the north-south/ east-west positioning of the communion table. The posting of these libels implies that the words are inflected by their physical positioning.³ Complicating the status of the texts even more, one is ‘part in verse, and to be sung to the tune of “Here’s a health to my Lord of Holland”’ (*Works*, VII, 371). It is not performed, however, and the libel is given extra force by virtue of its being published into a particular material space, rather than sung; it has a physical dimension.⁴

Laud continues on the subject of libels, noting that ‘at this very instant while I was writing this, my Lord Mayor sends me a board hung upon the Standard in Cheap’ (*Works*,

¹ William Laud, *Works*, 7 vols, ed. by P. Bliss (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847–60), VII, 371.

² Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 322–28. ‘The rebuilding of St Paul’s suffered, in some men’s minds at least, from its association with Laud’s programme for the beauty of holiness; there was an unfortunately direct link between them when the restoration necessitated the demolition of St Gregory’s, the church where [...] the disputes over the position of the communion table became a test-case’, pp. 326–7. Cp. also Waller’s poem ‘Upon His Majesty’s repairing of St. Paul’s’ in which he compares the church to a ‘temple’ (l. 3), in particular those of Solomon (ll. 43–46), and celebrates Charles’s ‘grand design/ To frame no new church, but the old refine’ *Poems* (London: Printed by T.W. for Humphrey Moseley, at the Princes Arms in Pauls Church-yard, 1645) [Wing W513], ll. 35–36.

³ For an analysis of similar spatially-inflected texts see Christian Jouhaud, ‘Readability and Persuasion: Political Handbills’ in *The Culture of Print: Power and the Uses of Print in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Roger Chartier, trans. by Lydia G. Cochrane, (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, 1989), pp. 235–61 and Max W. Thomas, ‘Urban Semiosis in Early Modern London’, *Genre*, 30 (1997), 11–29.

VII, 371). This new piece of defamation elaborately mimics the punishment meted out to

William Prynne:

a narrow board with my speech in the Star Chamber nailed at one end of it, and singed with fire, the corners cut off instead of the ears, a pillory of ink with my name to look through it, a writing by – ‘The man that put the saints of God into a pillory of wood, stands here in a pillory of ink’ (*Works*, VII, 371).

The pillory was designed for ritual humiliation, and this libel seeks to degrade Laud in a similarly public fashion by inscribing a published or printed punishment onto his name. As the Caroline establishment had inscribed their power onto Prynne, so the libeller heralds a shift towards an emancipated and questioning public domain constructed by print and ink. The text takes on the physical characteristics of the imprisoned man. Publication becomes a highly public act in which meaning is conferred by association, physical inscription, nomenclature, and topographical location. Laud — or rather the inked name which signifies his person — is arraigned and punished in print.⁵ His speech, inflected by its position in the Star Chamber, is physically assaulted as Prynne was.

The visual print arraignment of a perceived malignant in the pillory forms the title-page frontispiece of a London pamphlet from 1645, *Newes from Smith the Oxford Jaylor*.⁶ The figure in the stocks is a cavalier, his loyalty and identity signified by his pique devant beard, crown-like hat, cloak and ostentatious gloves. Those watching him wear austere puritan collars and hats, have thinner beards and simpler clothes. The ‘arraignment’ is

⁴ For notions and concepts of libel in the period up to the late 1620s, and official attempts to control discourse, see M. Lindsay Kaplan, *The Culture of Slander in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

⁵ Cp. Martin Lluellyn’s elegy for Laud, ‘Was he Apostate, who your Champion stood,/ Bath’d in his Inke before, as now in Blood?’, *Men-miracles, with other Poems. By M. Ll. St. of Christ Church in Oxon* ([Oxford][Henry Hall), 1646 [TT: E1163 (1)], ll. 103–04.

⁶ *Newes from Smith the Oxford Jaylor. With the Arraignment of Mercurius Aulicus, who is sentenced to stand in the Pillory three Market dayes, for his notorious Libelling against State and Kingdome* (London, Printed for J. B. 1645) [TT: E27 (13)]. The frontispiece is used for a newsbook printed by J. B., *Arraignment of*

discussed as taking place in Oxford, but the audience, both as portrayed on the frontispiece and physically presumed to be reading the piece, are located in London. Identity is conceived of as being inextricably linked to external appearance, modes of behaviour, polemic engagement with a particular print dialogue, and specific location. The conceptions of public space and the interaction between print and location illustrated in those who libelled Laud are here translated into the pamphlet wars of the early 1640s.

This Chapter explores such notions of public space in texts produced at Oxford. In particular, I discuss the phenomenon of the printed speech and the sermon. The delicate negotiations between the court and the marketplace are analysed.⁷ Royalist speeches attempted to root published texts in a significant or politically inflected space. They offer a deliberately structured alternative to the freer public space being constructed by the unlicensed presses in London. Texts attempted to control their reception by conceptually reconstructing the spaces into which they were originally ‘published’; these significant spaces inflected and influenced the meaning of a work. Speeches and sermons also attempted to control the space of discussion, figuratively and literally. They denied the fluid and open debate posited by Parliament and argued that discussion was simply part of a negotiation undertaken within the confines of the King’s dominions; all discursive location was his space.

The Chapter considers the cultural expressions of the court, and how new genres were mapped onto old structures. I look at how panegyric speech and sermon to an extent replaced the masque as the main court entertainment and platform for critical discussion,

Mercurius Aulicus who is sentenced to stand in the Pillory (Madan #2052), which was produced at roughly the same time.

but argue that this was necessarily inflected by an acknowledgement of the propaganda role of published texts. My discussion illustrates how the Oxford court created a spatialised semiotic which, by rooting texts to particular and particularised locations, attempted to control their reception and transmission. The burgeoning public domain, which has been described by Smith, Norbrook, Achinstein and others solely in terms of the generic negotiations of Parliamentary texts, was portrayed as producing licentious and slanderous works, as twisting meanings, as corrupting and sinfully inverted. The freer space of such works was attacked; Royalist texts emphasised that they were part of a semiotic which saw space as influencing and defining meaning. Public space was not at liberty but part of the conceptual and absolute dominion of the King. The move toward the opening up of discourse threatened the stability of the state, and the Oxford court moved to staunch the haemorrhaging monopolies of discourse. This reparation had been started by licensing of the press. A second strategy was to control the spaces into which those texts moved.⁸ Public space in the early 1640s was delicately nuanced, and on the cusp of revolutionary conceptual change. As I will show, the King and his party attempted to invoke a notion of spatial relations based on an hierarchical interpretation of the work of Copernicus and Harvey; increasingly, however, Cartesian and capitalist notions of space were turning

⁷ For notions of the marketplace and a theorised model of the relationships between state and market see Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

⁸ For the increasingly private nature of Caroline court culture during the 1630s see R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), p. 238. Both Charles and James had ventured into the public domain previously, printing their own texts; this move has been seen to compromise Royal claims to absolutist power 'because the "transparency of print" rendered the King a subject whose text can be read and evaluated like any other', Lucile G. Appert, 'Towards a British Academy: The Poet and the King in the Commonwealth of Learning' in *Renaissance Papers 1998* ed. by T. H. Howard-Hill and Philip Rollinson (Rochester, NY, and Woodbridge: Camden House, 1998), pp. 115–25 (122).

knowledge into commodity and replacing antiquated hierarchical systems with a mixed market.

The majority of recent work on Civil War notions of the public has deployed the social theories of Jürgen Habermas, particularly his study *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*.⁹ In this text Habermas argues that from the late 1600s onward social forces and new communications technology created a newly open public forum: ‘with the emergence of early finance and trade capitalism, the elements of a new social order were taking shape’ (p. 14). He describes the process by which ‘the emergent bourgeois gradually replaced a public sphere in which the ruler’s power was merely represented *before* the people with a sphere in which state authority was publicly monitored through informed and critical discourse *by* the people’ (p. ix). Critics have found his model of the public sphere particularly useful when applied to the culture of the early modern period. In particular, Halasz, Norbrook, Achinstein, Raymond and Smith have utilised his theories. However, there are problems inherent in using Habermas’s concept of the ‘public sphere’ too freely; he himself has criticised those that apply his model as a unified sociological theory rather than an historically specific case-study. Studies often avoid the fact that Habermas very carefully defined the historical moment of his work: ‘We conceive of the bourgeois public sphere as a category that is typical of an epoch [...] we treat public sphere in general as a historical category’ (p. xviii). For example, Achinstein claims that her findings show that the Civil War period ‘anticipate[s] Habermas’s scheme by a century or so’ (*Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*, p. 9). At the end of a paragraph describing the problems inherent in using Habermas to analyse the early modern period, she claims ‘I seek to understand the

⁹ *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* trans. by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, 1992).

public sphere as it was imagined by seventeenth-century actors, not through our later sociological concept' (p. 9). Such application of Habermas' theories has been critiqued by Joad Raymond who claims that 'the theory is as vulnerable to historical as theoretical disproof'.

Furthermore, most contemporary considerations of the public sphere assume that the end of censorship meant a 'free press', notwithstanding the thorny ideological constraints and economic issues this phrase necessarily implies. In particular, those who have discussed the nature of the public or the 'public sphere' during the war have concentrated nearly exclusively upon Parliamentary versions and constructions of these places and contexts.¹⁰ The collapse of the Star Chamber in 1641 and the subsequent cessation of licensing led to an unprecedented increase in the publication of texts, principally in London.¹¹ Smith cites the end of 'Royal censorship' as one of the 'central literary transformations which had a lasting impact on the nature of literary activity' (*Literature and Revolution*, p. 11). David Norbrook sees the downfall of governmental licensing as a decisive point in the erosion of the monopolies of discourse enjoyed by the Church, the Monarchy, and the Universities: the end of censorship facilitated the emergence of a 'bourgeois public sphere' for the 'critical discussion of public issues independent of the traditional monopolies of discourse held by the church, the court, and the professions.'¹² However, as the discussion of censorship and printing in Chapter Two

¹⁰ With the brief exception of Sharon Achinstein's discussion of Royalist reactions in 'The Politics of Babel in the English Revolution', in *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution*, ed. by James Holstun (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 14–45. For the political biases of contemporary civil war history see Alastair MacLachlan, *The Rise and Fall of Revolutionary England: An Essay on the Fabrication of Seventeenth-Century History* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996).

¹¹ For studies of pre-war publishing see Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print*, and Kaplan, *The Culture of Slander*.

¹² David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 13.

has highlighted, print culture and definitions of the public were much more complex than these critics allow; far from such straightforward binary notions of freedom and oppression, the situation was full of ambiguities and local conflict. Achinstein, Norbrook and Smith model society upon an 'either/or' concept of freedom of expression and censorship; as is shown throughout this thesis, and in Chapter Two particularly, the situation was complex and ambiguous, more akin to the models of a 'productive' and subtle mode of censorship outlined by Judith Butler. Royalist textuality and identity depended on and assumed a central control and subjection. Such measures were not repressive, but productive; they excluded much but validated particular concepts of controlled identity and meaning. The discussion in Chapter Two illustrated the productive relationship between the censor and the Royalist writer. This section of the thesis is crucial to the new model of textuality posited in the present Chapter, as it offers an alternative reading to current theories of the public during the period. Royalist authors and poets wrote within a culture of textual control that was politically acceptable and at times proactively creative. These publications work to define allegiance and loyalty and national identity within a strictly controlled hermeneutics of censorship.

Joad Raymond's critique of Habermas concludes that 'material culture is signally absent from Habermas' idealist account of a public sphere', emphasising the need for the study of empirical evidence and reception ('The Newspaper, Public Opinion and the Public Sphere', p. 133). The following section will steer somewhere between the two poles, offering an account of 'reception' that puts other applications of Habermas' theories to the test. Susan Wiseman's study shows how performance pervaded printed discourse during the war, from pamphlets to dramatic playlets to dialogues which 'reactivate and reshape old

genres to occupy the cultural ground between political theory and conversation, imitating public political speech in an attempt to create and influence opinion'.¹³ 'Cultural ground' was a heavily contested area, both metaphorically and materially. Attention was concentrated on the spatiotemporal dimensions of texts; they were closely defined and controlled. Wiseman shows how populist dramatic pamphlets in London mimicked political speeches in order to influence the public sphere; this section will discuss how such speeches used the vocabulary and structures of the drama in order to achieve a similar goal. Particular spaces and locations contributed to meaning; the court during the first years of the war attempted to create an equivalent spatial semiotic in print in order to appropriate or control public discursive space.

3.2 Speeches in Parliament

Between 1640 and 1642 there was an unprecedented increase in the printing of political speeches. Mainly restricted to manuscript circulation previously, during these two years more than 100 speeches were published; after March 1642, however, this flood of paper seems to dry up. The ephemeral nature of the phenomenon has been analysed by several historians of print culture; Joad Raymond, for instance, considers that 'Newsbooks were a partial *substitute* for political speeches, and when conflict discouraged the latter, it encouraged the former.'¹⁴ This model ignores the fact that during the winter of 1642 and most of 1643 the Royalist court at Oxford experimented with the medium whilst configuring the official propaganda machine.

¹³ *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 32.

¹⁴ *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641–1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 62; David Norbrook considers the importance of newsletters in 'republicanizing' the public sphere, *Writing the English Republic*, p. 99.

The political speech-print-manuscript triangle grew more fraught and complex between 1639 and 1642 than had been the case in the previous two decades. Governmental figures, mainly MPs, increasingly printed their speeches rather than circulating them in manuscript.¹⁵ This appeal to a wider and more populist audience reflected a politicised change in the use of rhetorical declamation. The expansion of the franchise of political debate was due to what Nigel Smith has identified as the effect of the presses: ‘the enhanced use of print made possible the exchange of views in a public forum.’¹⁶ That forum was in some ways a metaphorical extension of the Commons chamber into the popular consciousness. The early high water mark of this extension in Parliamentary terms was the trial of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. His trial and eventual execution was carried out, at least conceptually, in the public domain: whilst the procedures took place largely behind closed doors, the arguments rehearsed were officially printed, and the trial and beheading were recorded vividly and popularly by Wenceslaus Hollar.¹⁷ The exchange of political views became increasingly text-based and performative; MP’s awareness of their audience advanced their self-consciousness and turned the procedure of the trial into a controlled theatrical confrontation. It is difficult to divine whether Parliament was worried about this trend; certainly the House of Commons made little attempt officially to censor or

¹⁵ ‘[By 1642] more than 100 purported speeches of named members were in printed circulation. Orations attributed to 45 M.P.s had been published.’, A.D. T. Cromartie, ‘The Printing of Parliamentary Speeches November 1640–July 1642’, *The Historical Journal*, 33 (1990), 23–35 (p. 23). Cromartie notes that after March 1642 this phenomenon was all but over. Certainly MS circulation continued, as is attested by the number of MS collections that contain extensive material relating to the trial of Strafford, for example BL, Add. MS 24863, fols. 1–60.

¹⁶ *Literature and Revolution* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 26. Smith’s use of the term ‘forum’ of course has a spatial dimension to it.

¹⁷ See Anthony Milton and Terence Kilburn, ‘The Public Context of the Trial and Execution of Strafford’, in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641*, ed. by J. F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 230–52, and Cromartie, ‘The Printing of Parliamentary Speeches’, for discussion of the ‘official’ speeches, p. 29. Hollar’s pictures emphasise the procedure of justice, contrasting the civilised interior space of Parliament with the huge crowds watching the execution. In the

limit the printing of such speeches. Indeed Parliament sponsored various of the publications attacking Strafford. However, it would be precipitant to map Smith's 'exchange of views' too fully onto this printing phenomenon. Whilst the publication of speeches contributed to a form of public debate, the works themselves rarely interacted. Commons procedure fostered an atmosphere more of strained dialogue than progressive debate: 'Each member could speak only once, and there is little sign, in printed speeches, of MPs picking up points already made by previous speakers' (Cromartie, 'The Printing of Parliamentary Speeches', p. 31).

In his *Apologie* published from Oxford in 1642, Digby claimed that the key speech of his career had been misrepresented in print: 'Copies went abroad of it so falsely, and maliciously collected, as made the whole Speech a justification of my Lord of *Straffords* innocence.'¹⁸ Digby argued that the speech had passed censure in Parliament, the forum for which it was intended, and that only when it was in the public domain that the work became speciously interpreted:

a Speech made in the House of Commons, a Speech so narrowly, and severely sifted, and examined there, and yet let passe without the least censure, either on the Speech itself, or the Author; that the Printing of such a Speech should rise so high a nature as to make me for ever incapable of any Honour or Employment in the Commonwealth, I professe could hardly have falne within my Reason or feares to suspect (p. 5).

Digby represents his clash with the Commons over the trial of Strafford as a reasoned debate misunderstood by the reading public through publisher's intention and populist ignorance. When his words were taken out of their original context their power became turned upon the author. Digby's metaphoric description of the process of debate figures his

debating chamber, Strafford's fate is undetermined and bound by the physical justice of Parliament; once outside, justice is unbending, brutal and swift.

¹⁸ *The Lord George Digbys Apologie for Himselfe* (Printed at Oxford, 1642) [Wing B4761], p. 5.

words as somehow physically present within the chamber, filtered and examined by the sitting members. The ritual and discipline of Parliamentary debate allows both sides to contain and control the power and implications of the language. The location of the speech contributes to, and controls, the meaning of the piece. Digby argues that the specific physicality of the moment of the speech is ruptured by unauthorised printing and the orator loses his control and powers of redress. To repair his reputation he too must resort to the public forum, and justify himself in print; to engage, unwillingly, in public debate.

Parliamentary majority condemned the printing of Digby's original speech, decreeing that 'this Book, thus printed, deserves the Brand of this House; and shall be burnt publikly, by the hands of the common Hangman [...] on *Friday* next; some in *Cheapside*; and some in the *Smithfield*.'¹⁹ Both the spaces utilised for this public humiliation are prominent and important marketplaces. This is an example of the physically invasive nature of reading and textual intervention allowed by the marketplace of print; where Dudley, Lord North had worried about sexual violation of his text (see previous Chapter), Digby's work is physically destroyed. This treatment of the speech shows how interaction with the market enfranchises the receiver of text and denies the author any redress, just as Digby had feared. The power and authority of the text is diminished. This public humiliation and destruction of the text echoes Laud's 'pillory of ink' discussed above. Information in print form has taken on a status whereby it can be tried and punished independently of an author. Parliament emphasises that it is the book 'thus printed' that deserves their retribution. Institutional interaction with the published domain has reached a highly significant symbolic level.

The reaction to Digby's speech has led A. D. T. Cromartie to suggest a Parliamentary print consensus: '[such] speeches did not set out to be controversial; certainly they were not designed as propaganda for any particular party' ('The Printing of Parliamentary Speeches', p. 35). This is an awkward generalisation to defend; whilst the early speeches are not doctrinaire or dogmatic propaganda, they certainly persuade with political motive, not least in fostering the idea of the importance of the Parliament in the governmental life and institutional identity of the nation. The speeches of the early 1640s create a corporate identity for the House which it had been unable to sustain during the period of the personal rule. Pym published speeches that the King objected to, especially in 1641, but Parliament closed ranks and supported the Speaker in defiance of Charles.²⁰ Furthermore, their engagement with a tradition of classical rhetoric made the speeches far more dangerous than Cromartie allows.²¹ The polarised political situation added a distinctly republican flavour to the rhetorical declamations of the House.²² The combination of rhetorical trope with proto-republican thought lent them an aggressive edge that much political discourse during the 1620s and 30s had seemed to lack. As Digby points out, these new speeches took on a different and greater significance by being out of Parliamentary bounds, and, as such, not defined or controlled by Commons procedure. Their very publication establishes a new forum for debate. Their rhetoric is now in the public domain

¹⁹ *CJ 1640–42*, II, 13 July 1641, p. 209. A Committee set up by Parliament 'condemned the printing of the speech as a criminal act', Kilburn and Milton, 'The Public Context of the Trial and Execution of Strafford', p. 243. The speech itself went through two editions very quickly.

²⁰ 'the Commons [...] do acknowledge [that the speech] was printed by their Order; and that what was therein delivered was agreeable to the Sense of the House.', *CJ 1640–1642*, I, 8 February 1641, p. 420.

²¹ For the engaged political aspect of renaissance rhetorical style see Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) and Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

²² 'By the winter of 1642–43, even publications with official Parliamentarian sanction were exploring the possibility of deposing the King.', Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, p. 93.

and, far from arguing arcane points of privilege, the speeches address constitutional issues. Their very publication establishes a new forum or location for debate. By seeking to move an audience to thought and action by mobilising the will, classical rhetorical theory ‘emphasised the public implications of all speech, whether in verse or prose.’²³ These speeches republicanised contemporary political discourse through their content and their genre. The burning of Digby’s speech indicates that the Parliamentary body was aware of the consequences of their actions in printing and circulating their works.

3.3 Speeches at Court

With the outbreak of the war the Royalist side experimented with various limited forms of propaganda in order to create a culturally mediated national identity focused through the King. These printings of formal speeches during early 1643 was in many ways an attempt to answer and subvert the Parliamentarian trope. David Norbrook has recently identified a palpable fear of republicanism in court writings of the 1630s and 1640s (Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, pp. 13–15). In the present case the republican flavour of the newly charged debate seems to have led the King and his entourage to attempt to defuse and distort the Parliamentary mode.²⁴ Furthermore, the desire to control the dissemination and mediation of politicised information can be traced throughout the activities of the Oxford court as an aspect of both propaganda and polity. Digby’s earlier complaint should be read in this light, as he in many respects supervised the Royalist propaganda effort. His fear of

²³ Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, p. 11; Brian Vickers, ‘On the Practicalities of Renaissance Rhetoric’ in *Rhetoric Revalued: Papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric*, ed. by Brian Vickers (New York: Centre for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1982), pp. 133–43.

losing control of his work offer a paradigm for reading Royalist speeches and the majority of what may be termed 'official' Oxford propaganda. Parliamentary and courtly spaces contextualised and contributed to political meaning; once in the public domain texts were uncontrollable. As Lucasta Miller has written of *Areopagitica*, 'intentionality might not, after all, be immanent in the text'.²⁵

Royalist discourse attempted to create a polemic form of the panegyric speech which recreated the discursive space in which it was delivered. This would control the flow of information by imposing structure and ritual ceremony onto public texts, and would emphasise the centralised power of the King and his particular topographical location, Oxford. The public nature of the city itself was physically controlled and protected by the extensive fortifications and earthworks surrounding the garrison; spatial control was not just confined to print, but extended to the reality of day to day life. The garrisoning and protecting of Oxford created a nexus for particular types of behaviour and identity, a topography of spatial and public control which ranged from institutional bodies to the streets of the town. The court of the 1630s had been focused through the importance accorded particular locations. Charles was a King to whom the court was as much a spatial concept as an institutional construct or collection of personnel. Westminster was mediated through spaces and locations, from the Banqueting House to the Bedchamber. The court was an example of order and decorum to the realm, the location of stable government and

²⁴ For other examples of the Stuart defusing of republican classicism see Alan T. Bradford, 'Stuart Absolutism and the 'Utility' of Tacitus', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 46 (1983), 127–55.

²⁵ Lucasta Miller, 'The Shattered *Violl'*: Print and Textuality in the 1640s', in *Essays and Studies 1993*, ed. by Nigel Smith (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993), pp. 25–39 (p. 28).

harmony. One had to have reason or status just to enter the building.²⁶ Equally, much of the doctrinal controversy of the 1630s was the result of the symbolic importance of place or space. The arrangement of chapels and churches, in particular the status and position of the altar, became an issue over which Laud was constantly attacked and criticised.²⁷

The extent to which the performative or more theatrical nature of all Royalist propaganda was intended to have anything other than a coincidental effect can be measured by a manuscript note added to Thomason's copy of the King's Declaration to the City of London.²⁸ The note is in a neat scribal hand, addressed to 'Our trusty and Welbeloved the Master and Wardens of the Company of Haberdashers/', and signed by Charles. It seems probable that this is just one copy of a circular epistle that was sent to all the mercantile companies in the city.²⁹ The King bids the Master and Wardens of the company:

Our Will and Pleasure is, that you forthwith cause all the Members of your Company, and all the Freemen and Apprentices (who are soe much concerned in the Peace and happynesse of that Our City) belonging to the said Company, to appeare at your comon Hall, and before them, that you read the Peticon lately presented to Vs from the City of London, and Our gracious Answer thereunto, together with Our Letter to Our Sherriffs of that City, and Masters and Wardens of the several Companyes, Hereof you must not fayle as you tender Our Service, and the Peace of that Our City. And for soe doing this shall bee your Warrant.³⁰

²⁶ 'The Knight Marshall and porter at the gate were ordered to scrutinise carefully those entering the precincts of the court and to check all names against a list to be kept at the lodge', Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, p. 211. These rules were redrafted for the Oxford court, see Appendix I and discussion in Chapter One.

²⁷ See Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 333–45 and James Cannon, *The Poetry and Polemic of English Church worship c.1617–1640* (Unpublished Ph.D., Cambridge, 1998).

²⁸ *His Majesties Letter and Declaration to the Sherriffes and City of London. January 17. 1642* (Printed, by His Majesties Command, At Oxford, By Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University 1642[3]) [TT: E85 (20)].

²⁹ *HMC Portland I* describes a warrant from the King to the Master and Wardens of the Company of Watermen: '1642[3], January 18. Oxford. –Warrant ordering them to assemble all the Members, Freemen, and Apprentices of the Company at their Common Hall and to read to them the Petition lately received from the City of London with the King's Answer, and his letter to the Sherriffs and the Masters and Wardens of the several Companies', p. 91. The report also records two more warrants 'of the same date, identical *mutatis mutandis* with this, addressed to the Master and Wardens of the Barber-Surgeons' and Carpenters' Companies respectively', p. 91.

³⁰ The MS note is now on microfilm at BL, Mic. B58/ 260 E2089 (6). 'Given att Our Court att Oxford this 18. Day of January. 1642', single folio MS.

Charles pinpoints the importance of the mercantile companies to the political situation in London.³¹ The King asks that his words be given public utterance and importance. He requires the Master and Wardens of the various companies to take part, however unwillingly, in a performance complete with script, location and audience. Despite his absence, the figure of the King is still central to the structure of the event, conferring a masque-like atmosphere on proceedings.³² The structure of the ‘performance’ itself fleetingly suggests a crude movement from antimasque to masque: the arrival of the King’s words dispels the forces of disorder and dispute. Furthermore, the mercantile setting has affinities with London entertainments of the earlier part of the century.³³

The Common Hall had already featured as a Parliamentarian space, and Charles moved to negate this influence.³⁴ In attempting to frame and control space which already had ritual and ceremonial significance, Charles’ proclamation strives to map his own discourse onto another, potentially harmful one; to destroy the power of that location.³⁵

Similar motives lie in the institutional reforms undertaken at Oxford. By denying the

³¹ For the extensive influence of the mercantile companies on London’s conduct during the war see Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London’s Overseas Traders, 1550–1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). For the loyalties of the apprentices, see for instance *The Protestation and Declaration of the Well affected young men and Prentises, in and about the City of London, and other parts adjoining. Wherein they declare their resolutions to live and die in defence of the true Protestant Religion now profest* (London: Printed for Henry Gibson, Febr. 13 Anno Dom 1643) [TT: E89 (12)].

³² The throne was literally and figuratively central to the performance of a court masque, Cp. Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1975).

³³ For instance the marriage of trade and compliment described in *the Key Keeper*, see James Knowles, ‘Cecil’s shopping centre: the rediscovery of a Ben Jonson masque in praise of trade’, *Times Literary Supplement*, 7 February 1997, pp. 14–15. There is the text of an urban or city masque of c. 1640 concerning a citizen merchant and his wife in National Library of Wales, MS 5390D, pp. 59–67.

³⁴ *Two Speeches spoken by the Earl of Manchester and Jo: Pym Esq; As A Reply To His Maiesties Answer to the City of Londons Petition, sent from His Majesty By Captain Hearn, And read at a Common-Hall on Friday the 13th of January 1642* (London: Printed for Peter Cole and are to be sold at his shop at the sign of the Glove and Lyon in Cornwall, near the Royall Exchange, 1643) [TT: E85 (7)].

³⁵ The guild halls had already been used as important locations by Parliament, see for instance *A Declaration of the Proceedings of the Honourable Committee Of the House of Commons, At Merchant-Taylors Hall, For Raising the People of the Land as one Man. Ordered by the Committee to be printed* (London: Printed by T. Pain and M. Simons. 1643) [TT: E175 (5)].

legality of London government and executive, and by supplanting them, Charles created a set of new spaces, most importantly the Oxford Assembly, which inflected official discourse. It is informative that such a struggle be taking place in a significantly capitalist space. The King, protector of monopolies of discourse enjoyed by the church and the aristocracy, perceives the threat of the new capitalist spaces created in London by the opening of the markets and freeing of the press. The Proclamations are an attempt to negate this movement towards greater and wider interaction in discourse. By controlling public space the monarch can control the dissemination and meaning of his words. Oaths of allegiance were also to be spoken out loud, and it was important to be aurally demonstrative in one's defence and support of the King.³⁶ Furthermore, the performative nature of the declarations and proclamations facilitated a larger audience and forced a public and theatrical dialogue. These manuscript notes suggest that the court had a very clear sense of the public that they were addressing, and their means in doing so. The party was very concerned that the spaces they were addressing be controlled and stabilised, and that the information they were giving out was not public in the sense John Dury and other Parliamentary writers desired.

A speech by Alderman Garroway, published a week after Charles' petition was read, bears witness to the fact that the King's text was performed at the Common Hall.³⁷ Or rather, it would if it were not a fake speech written by Edward Hyde, who at this point was

³⁶ For instance, *An Oath to Be Administred Unto all Officers, Souldiers, and such other persons as are or shall be within the Garrison of Oxford. Published by Authority.* ([Oxford] by Leonard Lichfield, 1645) [Wing O79].

³⁷ *A Speech made by Alderman Garroway, At a Common-Hall* ([Oxford], Printed in the Yeare 1643).

closely involved in the running of the institutional court at Oxford.³⁸ The tract is therefore a uniquely important text; it shows how important speeches were to Royalist propaganda and is an index of the important elements of the genre. Furthermore, the speech articulates Royalist notions of space from deep within the court. Garroway talks of the importance of significant space in framing and inflecting words: 'And though they [Parliament] have a great liberty of language within their owne walls, I never heard that they might speak what they list in other places' (p. 2). He considers the importance of reception:

upon the receipt of our Petition, His Majesty spake very graciously of the City, very affectionately of the most considerable part of it; when his Answer is read (an Answer I must tell you, worth another manner of debate) Strangers are admitted to make bitter invective Speeches against it, and the King that sent it; Whilst no honest Citizen, who have onely right to speak here, durst speak his Conscience for feare of having his throat cut as he went home (p. 2)

Garroway sees the King's words being demeaned through contact with this unworthy, egalitarian manner of debate. Charles' speech is not granted the rhetorical authority it deserves, and the consequence of this polyvocal debate is that the forces of disorder and misrule are allowed ascendancy. Garroway reports at the end of his text that his own speech was interrupted. The dissonant and dissident voices deploy an animalistic language unfamiliar to normal society: 'Whilst the Alderman was speaking this Speech, severall great interruptions were made with Hissing, and other such noyses' (p. 6). The breakdown of a structured hierarchy of expression leads to the disintegration of ordered society: the text describes how the debate moves into the street, and the humanist pinnacle of civilisation, the city, is demeaned by violent clashes. Uncontrolled public intervention in the sphere of government leads to fear of attack and physical violence. This text shows how

³⁸ The text is attributed and discussed by Graham Roebuck, 'Cavalier' in *The English Civil War in the Literary Imagination*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 9–27 (p. 9).

Parliament's heedless inversion of the social rules, in questioning the King's rightful authority, leads to the liminalisation of space: where before structures and boundaries had been well observed and had controlled society, now there is only moral and social chaos.

Charles and his court used the format of the printed speech regularly during the first months of their time in Oxford. They were reprinted in London (indeed, often Madan finds no bibliographic trace of the Oxford original). After April 1643 the trope became less important.³⁹ Whilst in some ways ceding ground to a popular audience and loosening control over expression and reputation, the speeches exhorted control and stability, safety and surety of purpose through allegiance to the King. They emphasised the physicality of the moment of their delivery. In his *Declaration* from prison in London, Montague Bertie linked oratorical eloquence with martial excellence, emphasising the role of Oxford as the cradle of Royalism:

I have the leisure to peruse and contemplate sometimes on those excellent speeches, delivered by the Lord Digby and the Lord Falkland, men of admirable faculty, who can conquer with their pen, as well as with their swords; and I do congratulate the happiness of Oxford that in their age he doth now againe enjoy those wits which in their infancie He did nourish.⁴⁰

The speeches were engaged texts in the pamphlet war. They emphasised location and occasion, and represented notable ceremonial dates; speeches were recorded from the Council chamber and the Cathedral.⁴¹

³⁹ The only speech of practical import printed after 1643 was Laud's address from the Scaffold, which was printed individually and with Heylin's additional *Life* in February 1645. The occasion is grimly emphasised, and the martyrdom of the speaker important to a notion of wronged Royalism. Laud's speech is modelled along the lines of Foxe's *Booke of Martyrs*; his suffering was portrayed as a touchstone for those persecuted (or rebelled against) for religious reasons.

⁴⁰ *A Declaration and Justification; of the Earle of Lindsey, Now prisoner in Warwicke-Castle* (Oxford printed by Leonard Leychfield, Printer to the Universitie of Oxford) [TT: E88 (10)], p. 8.

⁴¹ See, for instance, *His Maiesties Last Speech, To the Lords of his Privie Councill* (First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for Iohn Rogers [1643]) [TT: E83 (44)]. Also, *His Maiesties Last Speech, and Protestation, which hee made on Sunday. the fifth of this instant February, in the*

Many of the published Royalist speeches emphasised the theatrical or performative nature of their occasion and delivery. Theatrical space and performance had become institutionally politicised in September 1642 after the Commons' ordinance suppressing 'publike stage-playes throughout the Kingdome'.⁴² Parliament also destroyed Royal theatrical spaces: 'Ordered etc. That the boarded Masque House, the Masque House at St. James, and the Courts of Guard be forthwith pulled down and sold away; and that the Proceed thereof shall be employed towards the Payments of the King's poor Servant's Wages'.⁴³ The Commons were physically destroying the loci of Royalist culture, invading the spaces of the court in the manner envisaged by Royalist theorists. In response, most of the Royalist speeches published during 1642 and 1643 emphasised the nature of their occasion and delivery.

In late December 1642 Don Alonso de Cardenas complained on behalf of his government about the hijacking of the Santa Clara. His official speech was printed along with a Royal proclamation forbidding any looting of the ship.⁴⁴ This proclamation had already been published and was included in the first edition of *Mercurius Aulicus*.⁴⁵ The later reprinting of the proclamation along with de Cardenas' speech may reflect an attempt by the court to further placate the Spanish government, and also neatly coincided with

Cathedrall Church of Oxford, the Lords and the cheife of the University being present (Oxford Printed for W. Web, and since reprinted at London for R. Sutton [1643]) [TT: E89 (32)].

⁴² *CJ 1640–42*, II, 749, 750; passed 2 September 1642.

⁴³ *CJ 1644–46*, I, 632; passed 16 July 1645. This occasioned a complaint poem, 'The Ballad of Charring Cross' which was extensively circulated see for instance Bod, Douce MS 357, fol. 15v, Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R 5.5 item 85, BL, Add. MS 47111, fols. 66r–v.

⁴⁴ *A Speech, Or Complaint, Lately Made by the Spanish Embassadour to his Majesty at Oxford, upon occasion of the taking of a ship called Sancta Clara in the Port of Sancto Domingo, richly laden with Plate, Cocheneal, and other commodities of great value* (London, Printed for Nathaniel Butter, 1643) [TT: E245 (12)]. The speech was given on December 30, 1642.

⁴⁵ *Mercurius Aulicus The first Weeke* (1642 [3]), 2 January [TT: E244 (30)].

Aulicus' report that the Commons had defied the King's command.⁴⁶ The speech as printed reflects the continued importance of ritual and ceremony to the Oxford court:

This Speech, or rather Complaint of the Embassadors ended, the King withdrew him unto the window in his presence-chamber at Christ Church; there spake certaine words in private, and after (before certain Lords there about him) told him, that unto his message or complaint some time tomorrow he would by his Secretary or some other, send him an answer;
(p.5).

The masque stage-direction tone of this passage injects an air of theatricality about the proceedings as well as emphasising the continued diplomatic importance of the ceremonial structures of the court Charles had instigated (and their relocation within the Colleges of Oxford). The movement from presence-chamber to a more private space highlights the hierarchy of location at court with particular reference to the person of the King. The representation of utterance in this printed speech is complex. The ambassador's declamation is an official complaint; de Cardenas is simply a mouthpiece for his King: 'an affront of this kind hath never been committed against him' (p. 5). Charles replies in private, and then sends Lords Mowbray and Falkland 'to returne this Answer' (p. 5), which in terms of the physical content of the pamphlet is the official proclamation that had already been printed independently. Issues of proclamation and declamation are blurred by ceremonial layering, as official utterance is contracted with personal speech.

This mixing of performance and text is also present in another of the December speeches, that given by Charles, Prince of Wales. His declamation is respectful, learned and earnest, pleading for some move toward peace: 'should the wars continue, what insufferable daily miseries must this wretched Kingdome expect, when all places shall

⁴⁶ *Mercurius Aulicus The third Weeke* (1642 [3]) 19 January [TT: E30 (21)].

only be, as it were, constant scenes where Tragedies are daily acted.’⁴⁷ In figuring the battlefields as theatres he vividly conflates the performative pomp of war with the reality of death. Using a standard contemporary metaphor he elucidates worries about the wrong type of metaphorical space being mapped onto the battle-field; not the idealised machinery of the masque, but the death and misery of tragedy.⁴⁸ The prince’s words conceive of public space as a theatrical location, a place which moves rapidly between reality and idealised drama, the metaphorical and the material. The battlefield is a space in which public actions have far-reaching material consequences, but it is also where distinctions between metaphorical and material space should collapse.

What makes this speech intriguing and multi-levelled, however, is that it was actually physically delivered by Brian Duppa. Furthermore, the Bishop’s involvement is elaborated upon and exaggerated; the printed text is full of references to Duppa’s role as the Prince’s mouthpiece. Charles ‘commanded’ his words to Duppa, who ‘now imployed [as] an inelegant Orator’ repeats them to the King (pp. 3, 8). As the Prince’s tutor Duppa must have been involved in the composition of the speech, but it is represented as Charles’ own work. Duppa is simply a herald, the conduit through which the words flow. The ritual nature of this process echoes Parliamentary speech-making (nominally on behalf of constituent members) and once again recalls classical advocacy.

⁴⁷ *Prince Charles His Gracious Resolution Concerning the present Affaires of this Kingdome, presented to His sacred Maiesty by Doctor Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury, in a Speech delivered in the Princes behalfe, for a sudden Accommodation of Peace between His Majesty, and His High Court of Parliament* (First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for John Rivers [1642]) [TT: E83 (31)], p. 7. This is the third of the December speeches published by Rivers, who obviously specialised in the genre: he only published one other work, a Royal proclamation for 26 December 1642.

⁴⁸ ‘Theatre became a central metaphor for vying political regimes; metaphors of tragedy and play-acting were two of the dominant ways in which contemporaries spoke of the war’, Wiseman, *Drama and Politics*, p. 5. However, for the Royalists the vocabulary was deployed according to a model of authority and mediated reception, as was discussed in Chapter Two.

Politically the speech is naïve and histrionic; the Prince claims that in the event of his father's death he would not be able to hold the country together, a potentially dangerous and worrying notion to be voiced at this stage. In some ways Prince Charles is the only figure with the authority to be able to consider this prospect in public. By reappraising and reinventing the procedures of the court, Duppa creates a situation in which he can criticise through a nominally complimentary activity. Seen in this light the speech can be read as a very crafty and shrewd piece of factional propaganda on Duppa's part; certainly, the printing of the speech forces the concept of the death of the King into the public domain. The significance of Duppa's role in the delivery of the speech is unclear, however. Certainly it adds a dramatic edge to the printed version and emphasises the importance of the moment of the declamation. Duppa and the Prince hark back to the atmosphere of the court of the 1630s in which performance became part of a cautionary dialogue whilst celebrating and flattering the monarch. By using a familiar technique within a very different context, Duppa creates a dissonance that highlights the urgency of the situation, the inversion of normality that has been created. Such a reading also suggests that speech-making and declamation replaced masquing as the language of entertainment and political or factional discourse in the court at Oxford. Certainly the speeches examined here would suggest that on at least one level this was the case; the emphasis on the place and time of the speech echoes the structure the masque, and the process is similar, if involving less finery and dancing. However, the speeches also performed a very public role in the ongoing struggle with Parliament.

Prince Rupert delivered a typically robust and blunt speech in late December 1642, claiming tartly that 'though I cannot like an Oratour in excellent English expresse my

intentions I shall nevertheless endeavour to speake sense.’⁴⁹ Rupert’s reputation for straight talking and loyalty – that November he had loudly vindicated the conduct of his troops – inflect this rather dull speech with a stolid, hearty appeal.⁵⁰ The publication of such a declamation argues an attempt at underlining the practical nature of the Royalist war administration whilst Rupert’s dismissal of pretty words implicitly attacks the speciously persuasive techniques favoured by members of the House of Commons. Shortly after this avowal of straight talking Edward Sackville, Earl of Dorset, published a pair of speeches given at court.⁵¹ In contrast to Rupert’s virtuous and rude style, Dorset puts on something of an oratorical show. The speeches were occasioned by Dorset’s receiving two promotions at court, becoming Lord Privy Seal and President of the Council. They consolidate and emphasise the ritualised hierarchy of the inner court, praising the King for such ‘gracious favours’ and celebrating ceremony and position. Sackville suggests that such councils are important in preserving the independence of the government of the state: councillors in the service of the semi-divine King work for the common good, whilst ‘mere Politicians [...] [work] for their own ends’ (p. 6).

Speech-making became part of an ongoing political dialogue, performed in public. They expressed the opinions of various political factions and, particularly during the early part of the wars, a desire for accommodation with Parliament. One dissident, the Earl of Hertford, addressed the changed nature of the court and highlighted the physical constraints placed upon the King:

⁴⁹ *A Speech Spoken by His Excellence Prince Rupert To his Sacred Majesty, and the Lords of his Privie Councill, at his returne from Redding to Oxford* (Printed at Oxford by L. Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for John Rivers, 1642[3]) [TT: E83 (29)], p. 3.

⁵⁰ *Prince Rupert His Declaration*, Madan #1094.

⁵¹ *Two Speeches Spoken at Oxford, By The Right Honourable, Edward, Earle of Dorset, before His Majesty, and the Lords of His Privy-Councill. The one, At his receiving the Office of Lord Privy-Seale. The other, At*

Loste your Majesty is sure to have of your subjects, loste in your revenue, loste in your magnificence, and the extent of your regality being, as it were, circumscribed to this City of *Oxford*, and deprived of the possession of your Royall Palaces, in and about your City of *London*, which would to God your Majestie had never left'.⁵²

The words 'regality' and 'possession' have a territorial and spatial aspect; Charles' Royal jurisdiction has been compromised and 'circumscribed'. Hartford emphasises the financial, loyal and physical losses consequent upon the continuation of the war.

In December 1642 a London edition of two speeches by the Earl of Bristol and Edward Sackville appeared. The speeches represented the two sides of Royalist political thinking at this juncture. Bristol argues passionately in favour of the war, Sackville pragmatically for accommodation.⁵³ Two days later a different publisher produced the King's answer, creating a three-way dialogue in print.⁵⁴ That these speeches were intended solely for a London market used to such a means of political expression is likely; as there is little or no bibliographical evidence of the Oxford versions (Madan, p. 197). However, equally important to their appeal is the notion that these speeches were first given at the Council in Oxford and are reprints of Lichfield's originals. The King's speech complements the two others; he ends favouring accommodation but is pleased that the debate has taken place, as quoted in Chapter Two:

It is no new thing among so many wise men to have severall and faire different conceptions; yet none unrepugnant to reason, or dissentions from

his being made President of His Majesties Councell (First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for Edward Hartley) [TT: E83 (45)].

⁵² *A Speech delivered by the right honourable William Lord Marquesse Hartford, in the Councell-chamber at Oxford* (London: Printed for Henry Benson, Jan. 20 1642[3]) [TT: E85 (31)], p. 7

⁵³ *Two Speeches Spoken at the Councell-Table at Oxford. The one, by the Right Honourable John Earle of Bristol, in favour of the continuation of the present Warre. The other, by the Right Honourable Edward, Earle of Dorset, for a speedy Accommodation betwixt His Majestie, and his High Court of Parliament* (Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, And now reprinted at London for John Harson) [TT: E83 (19)].

⁵⁴ *His Maiesties Gracious Answer To the Different Opinions of the Earles of Bristol and Dorset concerning Peace and War. Wherein is intimated to all His Loyall Subjects the earnest desire He hath of a faire attonement betwixt Himselfe and his High Court of Parliament* (First Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for John Rivers [1642]) [TT: E83 (21)].

truth; as in the severall parts and dimensions of the body the limbs move severall wayes, but all to one end (p. 3).

Behind this seemingly liberal viewpoint lies a keen sense of audience and the changing political situation. Bristol's speech had asserted the divine nature of monarchy: 'Is it fit for a King to beg peace of his Subjects? For the regall authority, the immediate figure of heaven and the Deity on earth, to descend from its supreme height' (pp. 4–5). Charles steers clear of such bombast and seemingly ratifies the advisory role of a Parliament. The debate the King describes as taking place between 'wise men' reconstitutes a humanist discursive trope, absorbing such debate into institutional court culture. The polis or forum is replaced by the court. In many ways, this had actually happened, as the court physically occupied the spaces formerly dedicated to discussion and declamation (the Academic Schools themselves were used to store grain and cloth). The healthy and necessary discussions of his subjects are firmly placed within the configuration ordained by the King, who re-emphasises his role as the chair and head of the body of debate – whether Parliamentary, courtly, or nation-wide. The speeches also highlight the institutionalisation of the culture of criticism that Kevin Sharpe identified in the court of the 1630s. Debate and panegyric is controlled and mediated within a public, or published, space.⁵⁵ The ambiguity that Sharpe and also Annabel Patterson find inherent in Royalist expression has been replaced by rhetorical discursive tropes and panegyric declamation, by the logical and clean lines of political debate. What is important here is the issue of control; the speeches are inflected by that of the King. In many ways the breakdown of relations with Parliament was due to their perceived refusal to allow Charles this power any longer.

⁵⁵ That said, many masques and poetic commentaries on the court of the 1630s were themselves published, so this practice has simply mutated rather than being anything new.

By introducing an anatomical metaphor, moreover, the King subtly reasserts and reconfigures the hierarchical model of the body, emphasising the servitude of the limbs and organs to the heart and mind. He does so on the authority of William Harvey's dedication to *De Motu Cordis*, in which the King's Physician wrote of how the heart's operation was 'a divine example of his own actions.'⁵⁶ The speeches of the King articulate a version of paternal monarchy that is concerned about but firm with his wayward subjects. He advises Prince Rupert that 'Tyrants shed blood for pleasure, Kings for necessity', continuing:

Were it against a forraigne enemy, We should permit you to use your owne discretion, but being, as it were, against Our selfe, Our children (all subjects ought to be so to their King, as he is *Pater Patriæ*) blame Us not if We be tender of their receiving the least wound; when the head is sensible of any paine in the inferiour members, wee must necessarily feele what ever is inflicted on him.⁵⁷

Once again utilising a refined anatomical metaphor, the King counsels mercy and presents himself as the indulgent head of a unified corporeal state rather than a tyrant out of touch with his people. He conflates two metaphors of state: the nation as body and as family. Both models see the King as the 'head' of a hierarchically controlled space; the family metaphor also emphasises the patriarchal nature of authority. The family space is subject to the patriarchal authority of the father-King. Moreover, the King is sensitive to any wound of the 'inferiour members' of the body of state; this body has a physical and material nature

⁵⁶ Quoted in Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 29–30. The dedication was, of course, to Charles himself. Harvey was Warden of Merton from 1645–6 and engaged in research that, when published in 1650, has been seen to support a republican or commonwealth view of the body, see Christopher Hill, 'William Harvey and the idea of Monarchy' in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Charles Webster (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), pp. 160–82. Hill tends to oversimplify the subtlety of the circulation metaphors and ignores the increasing use of such seemingly corrupted or hybrid models of state in Royalist political discourse of the 1640s. For a Royalist interpretation of *De Motu Cordis* see Roger French, *William Harvey's Natural Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), esp. chs. 6–9.

⁵⁷ *Two Speeches delivered by The Kings most Excellent Maiestie at Oxford* (First Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and reprinted at London for Iohn Turner [1642]) [TT: E130 (32)], p.4.

as well as a metaphorical aspect. The state is both the concept of a nation-space and physically defined in the bodies of the people; both are ruled and constructed by the authority of the King.

The use of anatomical figures was increasingly complicated in the light of Cartesian theory and Harvey's work. Thomas Warmstry articulated the new Harveian model of the state:

But besides this weaknesse that adheres unto the meere division, of which this action wholly consists, There is a fountaine of bloud, even a bloody issue opened hereby in this great body; whereat the very spirits and vitall powers thereof doe as it were continually evaporate and flie out: The very Heart-veyne, yea the Arteries, and very channells of life are hereby in danger to be dissected, and the Orifices still to grow wider and wider, whereby it is like to become meagre & languid, and unable to performe the Actions of life; for as in the body naturall the bloud is *thesaurus naturæ*, so in the body politick the bloud of a nation is such a treasure, that the lavishing away thereof by any prodigall waste, must needs bring it low, and render it faint and feeble. And when it is once lost it is not so easily repaired. Indeed wee confesse, that Phlebotomy may be usefull, in some cases unto both, not onely to the naturall body, but unto that of a Common-wealth. And they may both gather strength by the expence of that blood which is corrupt; but then this is to be done by waight and measure: with the carefull and skilfull hand of a Physician or Surgeon, and that *cum delectu* too, not at all adventure and hazard, and with due regard had unto what the body can beare; this is charily, and warily to be done, not to be committed to the rude hand of the multitude; and great caution be had, that the good bloud may be retained; and this too in case of some urgent necessity, where other milder remedies will not prevaile: but to leave this to a tumultuary performance, as in this case of Civill war, it must needs endanger the very being and consistency of this Common-wealth.⁵⁸

Warmstry's account of the country draws on medical literature of the period, and in particular Harvey's theories. He specifically refers to the 'blood of a Nation', and maps the body onto England. The state has been wounded and must be healed. As Diane Purkiss has argued, the metaphors of dismemberment deployed by Royalist writers throughout the war

⁵⁸ *Ramus Olivæ; or, an Humble Motion for Peace: Presented to His Sacred Majesty, and the Honourable Houses of Parliament* (Oxford, Printed by H. Hall, 1644) [TT: E46 (3)], pp. 20–21.

period have a conceptual and a material resonance.⁵⁹ The passage illustrates this, explicitly conflating the ‘body politick’ with the corporeal body, and showing how the ‘bloud of a nation’ must be let in order to purge political impurities. The civil war has opened unnatural wounds and resulted in invasive and unnecessary surgery. Warmstry sees the space of the nation being invaded and its integrity being destroyed. The ‘very being and consistency of this Common-wealth’ is attacked. England is a corporeal entity which is diseased. Similarly, Martin Lluelyn saw the continuing attacks on the King as poisoning the body of state: ‘By fraile Advantages, still find it good,/ To keepe th’ Infection high ith’ Peoples Bloud’.⁶⁰ Warmstry’s account figures the King’s role as that of the skilful surgeon, bleeding the nation to rid it of disease. This is the action of government, and it is to be used only by highly qualified people, ‘not to be committed to the rude hand of the multitude’; the interaction of the people within this process will lead to further infection and bodily violation. The war itself is the blood-letting necessary to heal the nation, but the worry is that the infection will take hold or the purgation will not be effective enough to retain all the pure blood; the death of many good soldiers will be the price of health. The thesis espoused by Purkiss, that the war problematised notions of masculinity, is hinted at here; whilst the integrity of the body may be restored, there is still an anxiety about the very ‘being’ of the body, the commonwealth, the nation. All three concepts are elided together, and we see the fluidity of Royalist notions of space; easily shifting between material space and a conceptual or metaphorical notion of spatial dynamics. Warmstry’s ultimate worry is

⁵⁹ ‘Dismembering and Remembering: the English Civil War and Male Identity’ in *The English Civil War in the Literary Imagination* ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 220–41.

⁶⁰ *A Satyr, Occasioned by the Author’s Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, the Kings Cabinet Opened* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645) [TT: E296 (1)], ll. 15–16.

that the space of the nation, the absolute space defined and constructed by the King, has somehow been violated, necessitating a violent and destructive reaction.

Some Royalist tract writers still emphasised the traditional model of the body of state:

Lastly, adde hereunto that the King must needs be reputed part of the Parliament, which by supposition was in the beginning waved, but a thing alwayes to be acknowledged for truth; then if the Parliament without the King make the representative body, the King is the reall head to that body of the Kingdom; and it were as absurd as monstrous to exclude the head from acting any thing that should generally concerne the body, since from the head the spirits are derived, which give both sence and motion to the whole body; and that body which will separate it selfe from the head, may please it selfe with the fancy of independency; but the conclusion will leave it a dead, uselesse, and neglected trunk.⁶¹

The slightly grotesque image of a headless nation-body belies an actual fear of the physical sundering of state from monarch. Denial of the King's authority is 'absurd' and 'monstrous', an act against reason and sense. Charles gives the state 'sence and motion', endowing it with a concept of vitality which is a superadded principle imposed by the divinely appointed head.

By emphasising the temporal and in some ways marginalising the divine nature of the body of state, Charles physically reassigned his role at the head. His influence is not superadded but pervasive and invasive. He lives in the bodies of his subjects, and defines their corporeal and physical space. Royalist political theory during the war continued to deploy the hierarchical head-down model of the body politic, but Charles shrewdly allowed his rhetoric to become less exact and seemingly more open, gesturing towards notions of a

⁶¹ *A Letter sent from a Private Gentleman to a Friend in London, In Justification of his owne adhering to His Majestie in these times of Distraction* ([London] Printed for V. N., 1642) [TT: E128 (24)], pp. 4–5.

mixed or self-limiting monarchy.⁶² Certainly, his reconfiguration of this motif wittingly or not undermined the concept of a divinely attributed, centralising power. He was obviously conversant with the central tenets of Harvey's work, and worked hard to map them onto his own model of nationhood. In his speech acknowledging the welcome of the University, he declared that 'The heart of a Prince is kept warm by the blood of his subjects: the blood of the subjects being not to be preserved, were it not loyally entertained into the heart of the Prince.'⁶³ Debate may take place but under the auspices of the King, thus dispelling any tendency toward republican theorising. Oxford had proffered a Laudian version of Copernican thought during the 1630s, which, linked with Harvey's work, created an astronomical and physiological context for the inherently hierarchical systems of monarchical rule.⁶⁴ Furthermore, Charles' rhetoric of inclusion still asserts a model of space which sees the body of state as circumscribed and total; it is 'absolute' and definite, and controlled by the heart. The influence of blood on the body is more pervasive, invasive and inclusive than standard hierarchical structures deployed by political theorists. However, as the *Letter from a Private Gentleman*, quoted above, indicates, Royalism used both models to emphasise the hierarchical and hegemonic spatial structures of the nation.

3. 4 Sermons

⁶² See John Sanderson, *'But the people's creatures': The Philosophical basis of the English Civil War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), pp. 54–55, 64.

⁶³ *The Kings Maiesties Speech, As It was delivered the second of November before the University and City of Oxford* (London, 1642) [TT: E126 (31)], p. 5.

⁶⁴ See Christopher Hill, 'William Harvey and the idea of Monarchy' in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* ed. by Charles Webster (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), pp. 160–182, and Nicholas Tyacke, 'Science and Religion at Oxford before the Civil War' in *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History presented to Christopher Hill*, ed. by Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 73–94.

A similar technique of emphasising the particular moment of delivery is evident in the sermons printed at Oxford during the war. These sermons have a unique status. They are not simply religious pamphlets or ideological tracts; rather, they are texts of performance, firmly situated within a recognisable social framework and public space. As such, they are similar to the published speeches previously discussed. They had a very particular format and style. Printed sermons were a standard genre that had been published throughout the 1600s. The more elite court sermons had a highly important role in the Elizabethan and Jacobean courts which has only recently been established.⁶⁵ Texts articulated Royal policy, in some cases, and criticism or approval of these policies, in others; they were an integral part of the court's culture and ritual life.⁶⁶ They were delivered in elaborately hierarchical spaces, the sovereign observing from a specially elevated closet after having been ceremonially escorted to the chapel.⁶⁷ At Oxford during the 1640s the Chapels Royal were traded for the private courtly space of Christ Church Cathedral and the more public pulpit at St. Mary's. These sites lacked the privacy and ceremony of the specially constructed spaces in the Royal houses, and the sermon is another example of the court having to map standard rituals onto existing locations.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ See Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). McCullough particularly emphasises the importance of the spatial settings of court preaching, pp. 11–51, and the relationships between sermons and court culture generally, pp. 125–41.

⁶⁶ 'Within the boundaries of a broadly defined conformity, the court pulpit was a site of conflict not consensus', McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, p. 5.

⁶⁷ McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, p. 30. He continues his account: 'Chapel symbolism provided a perfect backdrop for the preachers who addressed the monarchical defenders of the faith in England. During chapel sermons, Elizabeth and James reigned from above in the closet, a fact emphasised by the preacher's bows to the closet after he ascended the pulpit steps', p. 31. The whole structure bears a close resemblance to masquing ceremonies.

⁶⁸ 'Sunday ye lower house satt until a 11 a clock to subscribe seale and dispatch their letters to ye E. of Essex, and then came to Snt Maries to a sermon.', 'Diary of the Oxford Parliament, January 1644', Huntington Library, MS HA 8060, p. 2.

Sermons continued to have an important and unique significance in the institutional life of the court.⁶⁹ The sermons of the 1640s, both Royalist and parliamentarian, however, are increasingly inflected by the religiously polarised pamphlet-culture that they interact with. Royalist sermons became public declamations of the religious arguments for and against the positions of the Parliament and King. They followed similar rules, establishing the moment and location of their first delivery and emphasising the immanence of discourse.⁷⁰ This was despite their scholarly format and apparatus, often including marginal glosses and references, and extensive Latin quotation.⁷¹ They are both performances and decrees. The language of patronage deployed by many of the dedications emphasise the role of texts in constructing a sanctioned version of Royalist behaviour and religion: ‘It hath pleas’d your Highnesse to command this Sermon to the Presse, and mee to be your servant: what you have observ’d from either, that might incline you to so much grace and favour, I know not; unlesse it were my plaine dealing with the Times’.⁷² The marginal annotation emphasises the structured and intentional physicality of the text. They are Royalist readings of scripture, exegeses which represent themselves as established fact and precedent.

⁶⁹ They were also very expensive: ‘During the Civil War in addition to the forenoon lectures, for which the Chamberlains paid, and the afternoon lectures, to which all the freemen had to contribute, there were continually lectures for special fast days of special days of thanksgiving, according as the side to which Oxford belonged had a victory or a defeat; for each sermon there was a payment of 10s. or £1’, *Oxford Council Acts 1626–1665*, ed. by M.G. Hobson, H. E. Salter and J. Carter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 408.

⁷⁰ Parliamentarian sermons addressed specific readerships, particularly the House of Commons, and established the physical scene of their first delivery, in similar fashion to their Royalist counterparts.

⁷¹ For this practice see for instance Edward Symmons, *A Loyall Subjects Beliefe, Expressed in a Letter to Master Stephen Marshall, Minister of Finchingfield in Essex, from Edward Symmons a neighbour Minister, occasioned by a conference betwixt them* (Oxford, Printed for W. Webb, 1643) [TT: E.103 (6)].

⁷² William Stampe, *A Sermon Preached before his Maiestie at Christ-Church in Oxford, On the 18 of April 1643* (Oxford, Printed in the yeare 1643) [TT: E101 (1)], Sig. A2r–v.

The sermons printed from Oxford during the war were official celebrations of very particular fast-days and religious celebrations.⁷³ Their original locations and dates of delivery were foregrounded and emphasised in the titles, which focused the religious life of the Royalist calendar on Oxford. As texts they worked to establish a Caroline calendar of praise and loyalty configured through liturgical ritual and Laudian-style worship. This adherence to traditional calendars established a particularly polemic character for church-worship in the face of the liturgical probity of the Puritans and the ecclesiastical destruction of a Parliament which had banned Christmas and outlawed May-poles. The Royalists portrayed themselves as the party of tradition, espousing a pastoral harmonious ideal which emphasised continuity and resistance to destructive change. The sermons published from Oxford established a sub-Laudian character for the Royalist project. The significance of particular modes and methods of worship is illustrated by the Parliamentary tract *The*

Malignants Lamentation:

Alas! Alas! Say they, we tooke up armes, because wee would not suffer the Round-heads to pull downe our crosses, our babies, and our Organs; and to take the surplices from our Priests. Was it not a very fine thing, to go of a Sunday in the afternoone, to heare the Organs, and many other brave instruments of musicke in some Cathedral Church: and to see the Deane, the Canons, the singing-men, and the very Cheristers boyes in fine surplices? It was a fine thing indeed, and much like unto a play. Whilst the eare was ravished with the melody of musicke, the heart did little think of God.⁷⁴

⁷³ William Chillingworth, *A Sermon Preached At the publike Fast Before his Maiesty at Christ-Church in Oxford* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall. 1644) [TT: E52 (16)], 'Published by command since his death', title-page. Compare also the replicating of official Westminster imprimatur printings in Gryffith Williams', *A Sermon Preached at the Publique Fast the eighth of March in St Maries Oxford before the Great Assembly of the Members of the Honourable House of Commons There Assembled And Published by their speciall Command* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall, 1644) [TT: E46 (1)], 'Die Sabbati nono Martii 1643. Ordered that Master Bodwell and Master Watkins give the Bishop of Ossory thankes, and desire him to Print his Sermon. Noah Bridges', Sig. A1v.

⁷⁴ *The Malignants Lamentation in which All sorts of Royalists, bemoan the miseries which have fallen upon them for taking up Armes against the Parliament. Together with an Acknowledgement of their former Errors* (London, Printed by J. M. 1645) [TT: E298 (8)], p. 11.

The external finery of the Caroline church was anathema to the Puritan way of thinking. As the tract emphasises, the theatrical pomp of the ceremonies was extremely important to Laudian concepts of worship, and to those who attacked it. *Mercurius Aulicus* continually attacked the religious intolerance of Parliament by emphasising their avarice and insistence on destroying icons which seemed ludicrously irrelevant: ‘The Rebels at last have discovered the ground of all our miseries, and what should be it but a want of Reformation in permitting Maypoles?’⁷⁵ The satirical manuscript poem the ‘New Letany’ sardonically prays for protection from the devilish props of the Royalist church:

From holy dayes, and all that is holy;
From May poles and Fidlers and all that is Jolly,
From Latin, and Learning, since all that is folly
Good Lord deliuer us.⁷⁶

The Oxford sermons had a polemic function because they reiterated and emphasised the Laudian modes of worship which were under dispute. They emphasised the problematic and intentional misreadings of the Bible undertaken by the Parliamentarian enemy.

The sermons were also lent impetus by the places in which they were preached, a site-specific political value which was an integral part of their purpose and technique. St. Mary’s and the Cathedral of Christ Church were sites of polemic religious significance; they represented the continued Laudian influence over the court, being of vital importance to the ritual and physical life at Oxford. The architectural rebirth of Oxford in the 1630s was central to Laud’s redesigning of the University and the physical structure of the city became a topic of controversy. The building undertaken by Laud in the city was cited as evidence of his popish influence on the university during his trial. The rebuilding of St.

⁷⁵ *Mercurius Aulicus the 68 Weeke* (1644), 14 April, [TT: E45 (10)].

⁷⁶ BL, Egerton MS 2725, fols. 166r–67v, ll. 69–72.

Mary's porch in 1637 which was an integral part of Laud's new university was later used against him. At his trial, a witness recalled:

Master Nixon one of the Aldermen of Oxford deposed viva voce, that there was a Picture of Stone set up in the New-Church porch at Saint Maries Church towards the high Street, of a Woman holding a Babe in her Armes, which they cald the Picture of the Virgin Mary and Christ, (standing almost opposit to his House) which was very scandalous, offensive both to him & others: that himselfe had seene some passengers as they rode along by it, to bow very low to their Horses manes, and put off their Hats unto it [...] He further deposed, that not only in sundry Colledges, but in the Parish Church of Carfolks (the principali Church for the City, whether the Major and Aldermen resorted;) there was a great large Crucifix with the Picture of Christ upon it, set up in the Window by Giles Widdowes who was Parson there and one whom the Archbishop countenanced.⁷⁷

Therefore, by the time the court arrived, Oxford was already an established locus for Royalist writing. Christ Church was a particularly important space for religious difference and had occasioned a Royalist poem 'In defence of ye Decency of ye Cathedrall Church of Christ in Oxford, occasioned by A Banbury Brother, who call'd us Idolaters':

You yt [that] p[ro]fane o[u]r windowes, wth A tongue
Set, like some Clockes, on purpose to goe wronge,
Who, when we were at Seruice, sigh's because
You heard ye Organs Musicke, not ye Lawes;
Pittyng or solemne State, Shakeing ye head,
To see noe ruines from ye Floore to th' lead;
To whose pure nose, or Cedar gae offence,
Crying it smelt of Papist=Frankincence;
Who, walking on or Marble, scoffing sayd
Whose Bodies are under these Tombe stones layd?
Counting or Tapers workes of darkenes; and
Choosing to see Preists in blewe aprons stand,
Rather learn in rich Copes, wth [which] shew ye art
Of Siservas Prey, embroder'd on each part.

(ll. 1–14)⁷⁸

⁷⁷ William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome* (London, Printed by John Macock, for Michael Spark senior, at the sign of the Blue Bible in Green Arbour, 1646) [Wing P3917], p. 72.

⁷⁸ Yale, Beinecke Library, MS b.200, pp. 258–67, signed 'E: West:'. There are two other copies of this verse: one at Bod, MS Tanner 466, a Cambridge miscellany, and a separate copy in the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, which ascribes it in the title to 'J. C. 1640'. It is printed in *Cleveland Reviv'd* in 1659, and *Parnassus Biceps* (London, 1656) [TT: E1679 (1)], but is probably not by Cleveland. I am grateful to Dr. Oliver Pickering of the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, for information relating to this manuscript. For Christ Church as a poetic space, see also the anonymous poem 'Upon the new Quadrangle of St Johns

William Laud and his reforms still loomed large in conceptions and constructions of Oxford. William Prynne devoted 4 pages solely to 'His Popish Innovations' as Chancellor of the University in his 1646 history of Laud's life and trial (*Canterburies Doome*, p. 73). Prynne's narrative included accounts of crucifixes and images raised by Laud and his 'greatest Creatures' in various colleges and churches in the city, and testimony of the appropriation of ecclesiastical and academic life by Laud's Statues: 'That Latine Prayers were enjoined to be used in Lent, and Students to be present at them; That the Table, in most Churches, Colledges were turned into Altars railed in Altarwise and bowed to: That in some Colledges they used Copes' (*Canterburies Doome*, p. 71). The statutes demanded that members of the university who attended St. Mary's bow to the Table or Altar 'under pain of such arbitrary punishments, as the Vice-Chancellour should inflict' (p. 72). The polemic significance of Laud's Oxford inflects the sermons printed from the city during the war; it gives them a polemic aspect which is specifically defined by the space and moment of delivery.

Sermons were texts which had physical life on various different levels. Those printed at Oxford were extremely aware of their multivalent register. Printing was the final part of the transmission process:

Forasmuch as I was at this Sermon among other auditors, who judged it very divine like for the matter and the manner of handling of it, and afterward understood that divers which heard it preached, and more which did onely heare of it by the reports of others, were very desirous to have the view either written, or rather printed: therefore having obtained a copy of it for mine own use, I thought it expedient to

Colledge in Oxford, built by the most Reverend Father in God the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury' which praises the elegant 'symmetry' of the construction and emphasises that 'There's such sweet harmony in every part' *Parnassus Biceps*, ll. 8, 10.

commit it to the presse, for the publick good of all such as will vouchsafe to read it with patience and judge of it by the rule of charity.⁷⁹

This piece shows a keen sense of the increased importance of print. It emphasises the physical moment of the sermon's delivery, and considers how the significance of the piece changes in different formats. The writer acknowledges the piece's multivalent status as oral and aural religious demonstration, private devotional manuscript, and instructive public text. The movement of the sermon into the public space of print is a controlled process, and the passage elucidates the subtle power relations involved in the production of a text. The audience which desires the text were either at the first preaching or have acquaintance with the piece through hearsay. Those that will read it are either these already prepared or 'Christian reader[s]', and their response will be formed by their innate assumed qualities: charity and patience. Whilst purporting to be demand-driven, the printing emphasises textual control by assuming a closed coterie of prepared readers, an interpretative community. The anonymous writer, who was privy to the first scribal publication of the piece and the original sermon as preached, prints the piece for 'the publick good', but attempts as far as is possible to construct and influence the public reception and understanding of the text. Royalist pieces had status and existence on various levels, from manuscript to print, and the passage shows an awareness of the interrelations between these manifestations.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ H[enry?] K[illigrew?], *A Sermon Preached Before the Kings Most Excellent Majesty at Oxford* (Oxford, Printed for W. Web, 1643) [TT: E93 (13)], 'To the Christian Reader', Sig. A2r-v.

⁸⁰ See also George Wilde, *A Sermon Preached upon Sunday the Third of March in St Maries Oxford, Before the Great Assembly of the Members, of the Honourable House of Commons There Assembled* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1643) [TT: E36 (12)]: 'This Sermon, which was first presented to the Eare, comes now abroad to be Preached unto the Eye', Sig. A2r. Wilde dedicates his work to Sir William Boteler and emphasises the active and engaged nature of the printed sermon: 'Sir, This is That which I plead for in the pulpit, though, I confesse, with more Zeale, then Learning; and this is That which you Fight for in the Field, with no lesse Courage then Loyalty', Sig. A2v.

Issues of space, control and privacy are discussed in a later Oxford sermon, Richard Harwood's *The Loyall Subiect's Retiring-Roome, Opened in a Sermon at St Maries*, as discussed briefly in the Introduction.⁸¹ The piece is located at St. Mary's in front of both Oxford houses of Parliament, emphasising place, time and date in an attempt to delineate the exact moment of delivery. The use of a parliament as an audience mimics the sermons printed in London which addressed the Houses at Westminster.⁸² An elaborate title-page shows the text surrounded by a proscenium arch based on Doric columns surmounted by laurel and bay trees. Harwood, who signs the dedication to Edward Littleton, 'Your Lordships most humble Servant, and Chaplaine', praises his patron's learning and generosity: 'your Lordships favour doth animate, To whose benigne influence, as my Studies have hitherto Owed their Vegetation, so doe they now most gratefully present their Primaetiall offering. All that commends it to your Lordships Acceptation, is Opportunity' (Sig. A2v). This scholarly invocation belies the martial circumstances of the text's inception and performance. The suggestion is of a studious coterie maintaining corporate identity within the colleges of Oxford. Harwood immediately begins to address issues of privacy, or rather, inclusion and exclusion. Littleton is identified with the innermost cliques of the court, as 'Lord Keeper of the Great Seale of England and One of his Majesties most Honourable Privie Councill' (Sig. A2v). The text is offered to him as a peaceful space in which he can reflect and find diversion from the war and attendant troubles:

⁸¹ *The Loyall Subiect's Retiring-Roome, Opened in a Sermon at St Maries, on the 13th day of Iuly, (being Act-Sunday) in the After-noone. A.D. 1645, Before the Honourable Members of both Houses of Parliament, Assembled in Oxford* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645) [TT: E300(1)].

⁸² Sermons from Westminster were particularly closely controlled: Thomas Fuller's *A Sermon of Reformation. Preached at the Church of the Savoy, last Fast day* (London: Printed by T. B. for John Williams, at the signe of the Crowne in Pauls Church-yard. 1643) [TT: E36 (8)] has the imprimatur on the title-page: 'I approve this Sermon as Orthodox and usefull, John Downam'.

To a Person, alwayes Employed in the numerous perplexities of a troubled State, [...] a With-drawing Chamber may be as Welcome, as a Haven to the Mariner, after a Rough sea. Please your Honour to step into it, you shall find it ready furnished for your entertainment, not with the vaine trimmings of art, but those more reall ornaments of a noble mind, Prudence, and Patience (Sig. A2v).

Harwood figures his piece as a private space, a closet into which the loyal courtly reader can withdraw to find peace. The piece is aware of itself as both a performance and a private text, read in a more domestic or closed sphere. The conceptual action is a movement from the public printing to a private reading. Harwood reiterates the closed nature of audience, addressing an individual with a uniquely Royalist temperament overlooking his text for a specific purpose. Publications are withdrawn from public debate and occasion private contemplation. Texts are divorced from the pressures and strains of the combative world, succour for the engaged soldier. This aspect of the work has a polemic aspect, as Harwood makes clear when discussing his audience and reception:

I have here opened Chambers to others, and Excluded my selfe: For I cannot be Publique, but I must expect as many Persecuters, as Readers: so easie is it, but to discourse of Martyrdom, and become a Martyr. Yet herein, Authority, that hath called me forth, must be my Apologie: Since She was pleased to Intreat, when She might have Commanded, a Deniall in me were the Highest contempt. Envy it selfe shall give me leave, this once, to be Civill, to be Obedient (Sig. A2v).

Harwood was motivated to write by authority, to protect and justify the discourse of power and subjection established by the King and his court. The duty to write according to and within the physical confines of this 'Authority' is polite or 'Civill'; within a space of social normality and obedience. The legal and courtly inflections of 'Civill' also establish the spatial status of the author; included in the civilised *polis* of discussion, government and property-based institutional power. The public domain, by contrast, is a thoroughly unpleasant place, in which the status of a text is fragile. For every true and fit reader there will be another willing to destroy and attack the text. The use of the phrase 'Persecutors'

establishes the reception of a sermon as being possibly the violent and destructive pursuit of what may be perceived as heresy; the Old Testament echo also infers that the right and true church is being tested (and martyred) through the persecution of unbelievers. Those who read wrongly are likened to legal prosecutors, questioning and attacking a text in order to subvert its purpose as an expression of true authority.

In Harwood's dismissal of entertainments which are 'the vaine trimmings of art' there is a note of equivocation regarding the formation of courtly and Royalist identity. Despite their status as courtly Royalist propaganda, sermons were often critical of extremist positions and encouraged accommodation:

A happy union is that alone, that will give the Palme both to King and Parliament, whilst thereby they shall subdue one of the most violent & most dangerous enemies that can possibly assault a Common-wealth; for such is that intestine division that is amongst us, which strikes at the very essence of a State (p. 20).⁸³

Warmstry conceives of a peaceful conclusion to the war and a reconstitution of the state. He elucidates the importance of the equality of King and Parliament in the construction of this new identity, their mutual relationship being 'the very essence of a State'. Some preachers went further in their public criticism, which suggests that controversy over Laudian reform of the Church was still an issue for the King's supporters:

The beauty of Gods house [...] [consists] not in painting and pargetting of a wall with Mosaick workes, not in anticking the windows with Legends, not in coping the Ministers in sumptuous and gorgeous apparell, but in the humble and fervent devotion of prayer, the sincere and powerful preaching of Gods word; the only image that ought to be in every Church, is the Minister [...] a living image of God

⁸³ See also Edward Symmons' incongruent delicacy in his dedication: 'Courteous Readers, in this following Sermon, you will meet sometime with this Title, The men of Westminster; I desire you would not conceive, that thereby is intended the Parliament of England (as some are pleased to call them) but onely that powerfull Faction there abiding, or thereunto relating, which doth oppose the Lords Anointed, subverting our Religion, peace, and Nation [...] tis their evills that I oppose, not their persons', *A Militarie Sermon* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall in the Yeere 1644) [TT: E53 (19)], Sig. A2v.

by whose exemplary carriage the people should learne to frame and fashion their lives.’⁸⁴

Whilst this may be something of an apologia, emphasising that Royalist priorities lie in worship rather than the decoration that their detractors alleged, it reads rather more like critical advice. Spinkes modulates Royalist cultural encoding; he does not condemn church ritual, but suggests that such activities encourage the worshipper to lose sight of religious priorities.

3. 5 Robert Stapleton: Pliny’s *Panegyricke*

A late coda to the struggle over notions of the ‘public’ and the use of speech is Sir Robert Stapleton’s translation of Pliny’s *Panegyricke*, printed in late 1645. This text also highlights the strain of criticism which was incorporated into Royalist literature. This translation, Stapleton’s first whilst at Oxford, was dedicated to his immediate patron and employer, the Prince of Wales. Thomason’s version of Pliny’s *Panegyricke: A Speech in Senate* is annotated by ‘May 13 1645’ which suggests it was printed before 25 March (the title page gives the year of publication as 1644) and that the version that reached London did not go through the standard propaganda channels, which tended to move a little faster.⁸⁵ Stapleton had evidently followed the King from London, and was knighted at Nottingham

⁸⁴ Richard Spinkes, *A Sermon Preached in Oxford Before the Kings Maiesty, April 19 1643* (London, printed in the yeare, 1643) [TT: E104 (30)], Sig. A3r.

⁸⁵ *Pliny’s Panegyrick: A Speech in Senate translated by Sir Robert Stapylton, Knight, Gent in Ordinary of the Privy Chamber to His Highnesse* (Oxford, Printed in the year 1644) [TT: E283 (5)]. Pliny had been translated once before in the seventeenth-century, a 1601 version of *The Historie of the World* produced by Holland for Adam Islip. This volume was successful, being reprinted in 1611, 1634, and 1635.

on 13 September 1642.⁸⁶ He then repaired with the King to Oxford and became part of the disparate wartime court. He became part of Henry Pierrepont, Viscount Newark's household in St. Aldates; they lodged in John Holloway's Magdalen house which also at times housed Henry Bouchier, Earl of Bath, and various of the Windebank family.⁸⁷

The dedication to Charles is importantly part of the physical nature of the book: it appears as part of the title, and an engraving of the Prince is opposite the title-page. Stapleton and his normal patron Henry Pierrepont both used the Prince to gain a power foothold at Oxford; there is an increasing tendency amongst courtly factions to shelter behind the prince in order to make quite certain criticisms of Royal policy. Stapleton, as is seen below, is ambivalent about various aspects of the war effort. Duppa, as discussed above, used the Prince as a conduit for trenchant advice to the King. Dobson's picture of young Charles at Edgehill, *Charles II when Prince of Wales*, turned the prince into the locus for an ambivalent and distressed meditation on Royalist identity and the ramifications of war.⁸⁸ Such a reading again suggests that speech-making and declamation to an extent replaced masquing as the language of entertainment and political or factional discourse in the court at Oxford.

The *Panegyricus* was at base an official speech of thanks and approbation; however, in Pliny's hands it mutated into a more formal and consciously artistic piece of oratory.⁸⁹ It

⁸⁶ Anthony Wood, *Fasti Oxonienses*, ed. by Philip Bliss, 2 vols (London: Printed for F. C. and J. Rivington, 1815–20), II, 707; Walter Metcalfe, *A Book of Knights Baronet* (London: Mitchell and Hughes, 1885), p. 199. Stapleton was the only man to receive this honour in September.

⁸⁷ Margaret Toynbee and Peter Young, *Strangers in Oxford: A Side Light on the First Civil War 1642–1646* (London: Phillimore Press, 1973), pp. 57–8.

⁸⁸ Malcolm Rogers, *William Dobson 1611–46* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1983), catalogue number 9.

⁸⁹ 'It was his personal achievement to create out of the brief official gratiarum actio something that was to serve as a model for later, less gifted, imitators', *Letters and Panegyricus*, trans. by Betty Radice, 2 vols (London and Cambridge, Mass.: Heinemann Limited and Harvard University Press, 1972), I, xxiii. Another classically-minded oration is Thomas Warmstry's *Ramus Olivae*, discussed in Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, pp. 39–40.

was tied to the concept of a virtuous ruler who has justified his people's faith. It is instructive that Stapleton chose to translate Pliny; certainly Virgil or Horace would be more pliable to the imperial or historic ideal he attempts to portray.⁹⁰ The translation tells us much about the use of speech in factional discourse during the war, and also about the changing conception of public praise or panegyric. The more republican elements of the original are played down by Stapleton in his 'Preface to the Reader' which emphasises that Nerva

Now finding that old-age rendred him contemptible to the souldier, [...] giving Trajan his name and adopting him for his sonne in the Capitol, he immediately transferred his Sovereignty and declared him Emperour in Senate: Nothing now wanted to perfect the reestablishment of the late endangered Empire, but only to provide that an example of rebellion so destructive to government might not with impunity be past over, by his sonnes calmer temper (Sig. B1r).

Trajan's claim to the throne is supported by his conduct in arms and the choice of Nerva; it is made a rightful inheritance, and is underlined by his role in suppressing the rebellion that threatened to destabilise Rome. Trajan is seen as a strong ruler, a man to unite the state; or rather, he is created in Pliny's words as such, and the role he is expected to play is sketched out.⁹¹ The relationship between ruler and panegyricist is subtly nuanced, with the poet constructing an aural ideal that must be lived up to. As Kevin Sharpe has argued in *Criticism and Compliment*, such a relationship has a specifically political aspect. Panegyric is crucial to Sharpe's version of criticism and compliment; it is a mode he chooses to play

⁹⁰ Virgil was in particular used extensively by Royalist poets at this point, see Maclean, *Time's Witness*. For Horace see Howard Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea in English Literature* (London: Edward Arnold, 1983), pp. 174–83.

⁹¹ 'It represents the Senate's ideal of the constitutional ruler, and is a tactful way of telling Trajan what his grateful subjects would have him be', *Letters and Panegyricus*, I, xxiv.

down, but all the works he considers have their roots in classical panegyric practice.⁹²

Combined with the increasingly influential Tacitean method of political analysis, such rhetorical tropes informed classically based literature of the first part of the seventeenth-century.⁹³

Stapleton's dedication to the Prince claims both inspiration and protection. He emphasises that the publication of this '*modest worke*' was prompted by a dutiful desire to refute those '*Licentious Pamphlets*' currently distorting the truth, but claims the Prince's protection against the pamphleteers. Stapleton apologises for his 'rude expressions' but trusts that they will 'have the honour to out-live all those abortives of the Presse, that (like their compeeres the vipers) are curst into fruitfulnessse.' The snake-like pamphleteers will be bruised by the foot of the translator and his prince. His exclamations identify the Parliamentary presses as female, giving birth to progeny that are at once both alive and 'abortive'. These ghoulish texts are short-lived companions of vipers; the biblical allusion also contains an echo of the Gorgon imagery deployed by Royalist writers and artists throughout the war. Later in the text he derides critics of his translation and ends 'Lest foolish forreigne words, should as it were staine the chastity of our Language' (p. 4). Royalist presses and linguistic systems are chaste and obedient maidens; their Parliamentary counterparts are slippery alien creators of death and chaos, the texts produced violating both language and national supremacy. Stapleton shares much of this linguistic thinking with the anonymous author of *Vindex Anglicus*.

⁹² 'panegyric was a literary practice of particular importance, seeking to instruct and to inspire through praise and lift the sights of both ruler and ruled to the image of a better life', Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea*, p. xiv.

⁹³ For their prevalence at court and thence the kingdom, see Malcolm Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, c.1590–1630' in *Culture and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1994), pp. 21–45.

Stapleton addresses the monumental or lasting nature of his verse in ambiguous terms:

For now when *Trajan's Annals* lye in fragments, when those imperiall Statues and Triumphall Arches, that should have immortalized him, have confessed their owne mortality; behold (in this Panegyricke) that best of *Cæsars* from his Ashes reascends his Throne, where he still governes the world, as an example (Sig. A1v).

Whilst celebrating the longevity attained by print and the immortal nature of panegyric poetry, the temporary nature of monuments and locations indicates a profound distress at the unsettling nature of recent years. Stapleton also counsels against choosing the wrong kind of monument: those that 'should have immortalized' Trajan are shown to be merely false idols. The litany of broken images is an implicit criticism of a King who put much faith in visual representation; Stapleton considers that identity springs from word and deed rather than empty ritual or monument.⁹⁴ This ominous version of Royalty chimes with William Dobson's painting *Charles, Prince of Wales*; that which was once solid is now broken, stability and strength replaced by vulnerability and confusion. The Prince becomes a locus for courtly writers and artists to project or inscribe their particular worries about his father's conduct of the war. The engraving of Charles prefacing Stapleton's volume emphasises his vulnerability and youth; he wears court clothes and is very much a child in comparison to the armoured teenager in Dobson's portrait.

Stapleton's Pliny emphasises a new type of monarchical relationship, and one that is echoed in various speeches and poems discussed in the following Chapters. Whilst repeating his role and status as a mere 'subject', Stapleton keeps returning to the nuanced relationship between ruler and ruled. Pliny lived 'in those times when merit onely was

⁹⁴ '[those] Heroicall and Divine Principles we know are written in your heart, because we read them in your actions', Epistle Dedicatory, Sig. A1v.

preferr'd'. A blatant plea for advancement, this description also attempts to subtly rearrange the hierarchical nature of monarchical government. In his 'Preface to the Reader' he deflects criticism of 'my very first words', especially 'when so strong an objection lyes against them, as that those very Senatours whom I call Lords, could not endure the title' (p. 4). He argues that 'The Romans understood the word (Lord) in a twofold notion', firstly as a 'slave for the Correlative, and consequently signified Tyrant; and then as it related to Subject or inferiour, and was the stile of one in Sovereign, or subordinate authority' (p. 4). Linguistics and systems of grammar reflect certain structures of hierarchy and government; by choosing one or other you signify allegiance. Stapleton seems to be mapping an aristocratic model onto the senate, but implicit in this metaphorical shift is an understanding that the senate is partner in government with the monarch. Stapleton advocates a nuanced position whereby the King rules by mutual consent; there is a subtle relationship between monarch and population, and government is something of a partnership. This is not a plea for some kind of new accommodation with Parliament, despite the very recent Uxbridge peace talks that had taken place in February of the same year. Instead it is a reworking of the body of state metaphor which Charles had used throughout the previous years in speeches. It emphasises the mutually beneficial relationship between monarch and subject. Importantly, it is not a proto-republican stance; the monarch is very definitely the head of state. Milton had used a similar public speech model for *Areopagitica*; Stapleton in some ways answers the free civic structure offered by Milton by emphasising the aristocratic and hierarchical organisation of the senate.⁹⁵ For

⁹⁵ See Sandra Sherman, 'Printing the Mind: The Economics of Authorship in *Areopagitica*', *English Literary History*, 60 (1993), 323–49, and Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, pp. 118–139.

Stapleton language is a site where a reader or author redefines his relationship to his ruler; that relationship is binary, and power relations are subtly adjusted.

Similarly, public space in the text is newly defined. The volume itself is a physical forum for praise which invites entry: 'you may be pleased to open the Senate house, and hear him [Pliny] speaking' (p. 4). At this point metaphorical space and material space become combined in an explicitly political relationship. The book creates a forum, literally and figuratively; it is not a locus for debate, however, but a space in which the reader or audience listens to praise of the idealised and apotheosised monarch. Nigel Smith's assertion that 'the enhanced use of print made possible the exchange of views in a public forum' (*Literature and Revolution*, p. 26), depends on the desire for views to be discussed and exchanged. Smith writes about the emergent 'public sphere' as it was experienced by London and those who had an interest in widening debate, in demolishing the traditional hegemonies and heterodoxies, in attacking the 'monopolies of discourse'.⁹⁶ Stapleton reasserts the authority of the text. He establishes an inflexible model of reception; texts are not read, but listened to. Public discourse, especially that which takes place in a public forum or space, is controlled and bounded. This encapsulates the Royalist reaction to the collapse of licensing. The marketplace of print is not a free and open space but one which has particular rules and regulations; it is controlled. The spatial semiotic gestured towards by Royalist speech writers, and, as will be shown, poets and pamphleteers, is particularly concerned with establishing the meaning of words within a particular locus/ location in order to rigidly establish their meaning. They also establish the role of the reader/ audience/ interlocutor, reasserting the hierarchy of the text as something to be respected. The innate

⁹⁶ Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, p. 122.

theatricality and performative nature of Royalist speech-texts and speech-acts roots the volumes in spatialised meaning. What can be clearly demonstrated is that the Royalist party at Oxford attempted to reassert traditional monopolies of discourse in the face of perceived change and challenge to these hegemonies. The model of commonwealth/ kingship they proffered suggested a newly mutual relationship between monarch and populace. However, this partnership was to be implemented and mediated through spaces and discourses that were very much part of the established ideological hegemony.

3.6 Conclusion

After mid-1642 Parliamentary writers used speeches sparingly as writers in London embraced more inclusive, interrogative forms. Speeches were written increasingly only for propaganda purposes, as is evidenced by the anonymous *Barbarous and Inhumane Speech* attributed to Lord Wentworth, which urged Royalist troops to ‘ravish their Virgins; force the timorous maides to clip you in dalliance, and wreake your utmost spleen upon the roundheads.’⁹⁷ This speech not only highlights the shift in Parliamentary political discourse but also suggests that Oxford speeches were so popular and integral to the Royalist propaganda cause to be worth parodying. The pamphlet illustrates in microcosm the conceptual movement in Parliamentary expression, away from the lumbering systems of structured debate toward a generically fluid and dynamic mode of expression.

Public and published speech-making and declaration performed two functions for the early Oxford court. Firstly, they provided a conduit for factional dispute and suggestion in a way that masques and entertainments had in the decade earlier. The most important

⁹⁷ *A Barbarous and Inhumane Speech spoken by the Lord Wentworth (1642)*, quoted in Thomas Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 4.

public aspect of these speeches, however, was in their propaganda use, their ability to create a version or image of Royalist allegiance that was at once persuasive and part of an ongoing dialogue. They defused the nascent republicanism of Parliamentary texts by emphasising that the court at Oxford was a definite part of contemporary political discourse. They emphasised the continuing central importance of the court to the Royalist propaganda effort. Speeches represent an important stage in the procession from the expressive modes of the 1630s those more complex tropes required by the war. Furthermore, they established that Royalist definitions and constructions of space were still viable, and could be imposed upon the reader in order to influence and dictate the rules of engagement with a text. They created a mediated and controlled space for the reception of texts, and participated in the representation and construction of the idealised 'Royalist reader'. The cultural deployment of metaphors describing the controlled spaces of Royalism, and the renegotiation of notions of panegyric poetry, will be the subject of the next Chapter.

Chapter Four

'soil'd with guilty Letters': Oxford panegyric

Writing was continuous with fighting.¹

¹ Christopher Ricks, *Essays in Appreciation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 61.

4.1 Panegyric

In this Chapter I further examine the development of the panegyric mode at the Oxford court, looking in particular at how the University anthology of praise poetry *Musarum Oxoniensum Epibateria Serenissimæ* established a new form of epideictic poetry.² Tracing an overtly engaged panegyric that reconfigured traditional forms, I analyse how Oxford poets responded to the war. In particular I analyse the configuration of an idealised national identity within poetry and consider the role of gender in the cultural creation of a central myth of obedience.³ The poets of the *Serenissimæ* volume trace Royalist notions of space, in particular by deploying astronomical metaphors, and define important spatial tropes: language, masculinity, the family, the country. They are a semi-official poetic response to the institutional rhetoric which attempted to construct Royalist identity. The poets were steeped in verse tradition but also alive to the conflicts and problems of the current situation; they were Royalist readers, and the verses discussed here reflect their assimilation of official discourse and experience of living in the war city-court.⁴ The Chapter therefore begins to trace the development of a Royalist poetics which will be fully explored in Chapter Five (some of the similarities in approach are cited in the footnotes in order to contextualise *Serenissimæ*). The volume demonstrates the pervasive cultural influence of the institutional reforms and official propaganda undertaken by Charles during the early years of the war. It is an important paradigm for Royalist poetic expression. The collection illustrates how Royalist poets reacted to the newly defined polemic Royalist spaces of gender, nation, universe and subjection.

² Warren Chernaik has considered panegyric during this period, but only in relation to the extremely complex case of Edmund Waller, see *The Poetry of Limitation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), esp. pp. 115–71. Ruth Nevo also considers the mode briefly in *The Dial of Virtue: A Study of Poems on Affairs of State in the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 24–30.

³ Discussions of gender during the war period have tended to be restricted to analysis of republican or Parliamentary constructions; for instance, Ann Hughes' *Women, Men and Politics in the English Civil War* (Stoke-on-Trent: Paramount for Keele University, 1997) devotes only one page to a discussion of Royalist notions of marriage, gender and identity. See Diane Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering: the English Civil War and Male Identity' in *The English Civil War in the Literary Imagination*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 220–24, and Susan Wiseman, "'Adam, the Father of all Flesh": Porno-political Rhetoric and Political Theory in and After the English Civil War' in *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* ed. by James Holstun (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 134–58.

⁴ For a wider study of how official discourse affected poets during the war, see Joad Raymond, 'The Daily Muse: Or, Seventeenth-Century Poets Read the News', *The Seventeenth Century*, 10 (1995), 189–218.

In his survey of Royalist panegyric and praise poetry composed after 1646, M. L.

Donnelly defines the genre as

a form highly conventionalised, embedded in social contexts and hierarchies, and full of potential ambivalence between avowal and actual purpose, formal and contextual demands [...] [it] is a mode of praise representing the virtues and achievements of its object, or rather an idealised version of that object's aspirations or self-image.⁵

Donnelly briefly outlines the form as it appeared during the 1630s before turning to panegyrics written in the light of the disruption of 'the Royalist semiotics of hierarchy and power' after the King's flight from Oxford and eventual execution (p. 168). Whilst Donnelly's working definition of panegyric verse is useful, his discussion is not particularly alive to the shifts in Royalist panegyric during the war years; he prefers to trace a generic progression which is profoundly reconfigured only after the fall of Oxford. The following Chapter attempts to give an account of the shifts in panegyric and notions of the public through close analysis of a single volume, which prefigures the wider discussion of Royalist poetry found in Chapter Five.

Panegyric and epideictic poetry had a rich contemporary tradition of commenting and reacting to events in public life. *Serenissimæ* took elements of this tradition but there are some significant departures from generic rules which are fundamental to the composition of the volume. The very publication of the *Serenissimæ* poems by Leonard Lichfield and various indicators such as William Strode's speech or the inclusion of a poem by Sir John Berkenhead politicise the volume. As the discussion of the Parliamentarian construction of Henrietta Maria below shows, she was considered a subversive and destructive influence, and a collection of verse praising her was an inflammatory gesture.

⁵ 'Caroline Royalist Panegyric and the Disintegration of a Symbolic Mode' in *The Muses Common-Weale: Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988), pp. 163–77 (p. 163).

The elision of panegyric poetry and oratory is particularly figured in Strode's speech, which links the verse of *Serenissimæ* with the speeches used by the Oxford court as factional propaganda.

The University poets had long taken their lead from Jonson and established themselves as versifier-orators, rooted in a classical epideictic familiar from their curriculum.⁶ The poems of *Serenissimæ* are characterised by an engagement with the political world and a consciousness that panegyric poetry has a further status as oratory or declamation. This is emphasised by the fact that many of the regular and most well-known contributors to the earlier volumes had exchanged their roles as poets for the status of orators: Mayne, Strode and Cartwright all published speeches and sermons during the early years of the war.⁷ They had little life in poetry other than contributing to *Verses on the Death of Bevill Grenvill*.⁸ A large number of poets forsook their natural medium for print service during the war. Francis Quarles, for example, published several political tracts and pamphlets in 1644 and 1645. Richard Lovelace enlisted in the Royal army, and Edmund Waller took practical engagement even further by attempting to orchestrate a London coup. The minor religious poet Thomas Washbourne wrote to Robert Sanderson, Oxford Professor of Divinity, defending the fact that he had only written and not physically fought for the King:

That you would be pleased, as you shall see it fitt or needfull, to possesse his Maty of a true information of the reasons and grounds of my abiding at home: upon what a tickle poynt I stand; what inmates we have with us here, and how many watchfull

⁶ Raymond A. Anselment, 'The Oxford University Poets and Caroline Panegyric', *John Donne Journal*, 3 (1984), 181–201 (p. 186).

⁷ Strode had a life in manuscript as an orator, see his Latin funeral elegy for John Bainbridge, 'In exequiis Clarissimi Doctoris Bainbrigii, Mathematici ac Medici probatissimi, Astronomiae Praelectoris Publici apud Oxonienses, Oratio Funeris Nouembr 6: 1643. habita.' which appears in collections made for Archbishop Ussher, Bod, Add. MS A. 380, fols. 192r–93r.

⁸ For poets who had an extensive life in manuscript it is notable that neither Mayne nor Strode appear in miscellanies traceable to the city during this period.

eyes about us every way; how glad some men would be to have a faire pretence to violate the faith given for my security; that not my heart, tongue, and pen only, which are already employed in his service, but life and fortunes are and (by Gods grace) ever shall be att his command and pleasure to my power.’

The language of fear and surveillance complements Washbourne’s claim that his service endangers his life. The space of his loyalty stands to be violated; as a subject he can as equally serve the King with his words as his actions. Poetry, and classical modes such as elegy or panegyric, took on a newly charged public nature. This was especially true for the volumes of epideictic poetry which had historically been produced at Oxford, as the anonymous tract *A Declaration of the King Most excellent Majesties proceeding With his Army at Oxford* declared: ‘For the advancement of learning, the Arts enjoying now their best harmony amidst the sound of the Drum and of the Canon, and Armes againe by a rare happinesse finding their best welcome in the habitations of the Muses’.¹⁰ The militant poems of *Serenissimæ* illustrate the conflation of public poetry with active duty undertaken by the Royalist project at Oxford.

4.2 Musarum Oxoniensum Serenissimæ

In late 1642 a letter purporting to be from Rotterdam describing the activities of Henrietta Maria in raising support for her husband’s cause on the continent was published by the command of Parliament.¹¹ The letter warned of the treacherous activities of the Merchants of Newcastle whose ships were sent to Holland ‘for the service of the Queen: And there is

⁹ 14 October 1645, Lincoln College Archives, Cor/ 8/ 1.

¹⁰ *A Declaration of the Kings Most excellent Majesties proceeding* (London, Printed for I. Wright, and are to be sold in the Old Baily, 1642) [TT: E84 (12)], Sig. A3r.

¹¹ *A Great Discovery of the Queen's Preparation in Holland to assist the King in England. Also, how Her Majesty hath sent Her Standard, with the rest of her Regiments over to New castle* (London: Printed for J. Wright in the Old-bayly, 1642) [Wing G1686].

continuall transportation of great store of Men, Money, and Ammunition, over in them.’¹²

The arms and horse imported through Newcastle are specifically for the ‘advancing of Her Majesty’s Army in these parts’, and her own Standard is to follow later.¹³ Newcastle is a conduit enabling the influx of papist foreign mercenaries to fight for the Queen and all that she represents:

It is very credibly reported here, that there is now sending away with all speed to *Newcastle* 160000 pound sterling, which I am very credibly informed by some Dutch-men, is by way of a loane raised by the Papists in these parts (which are not few) for the Queen.¹⁴

The Parliamentarian press figured Henrietta Maria as an independent loose cannon, importing papist influence and Catholic soldiers to fight under her own banner.¹⁵ The money is raised by foreign religious zealots for her own personal use and gain. She is a foreign interloper attempting to fragment England’s religious and social unity.

Henrietta Maria returned to England in the middle of 1643, and her eventual arrival at Oxford after meeting Charles at Edgehill was attended by ceremony and literary rejoicing:

she was entertained with an Oration by Strode, the Orator of the University. That being done, a book of printed Verses in Latin and English, which were made by students of the University to welcome her arrival into England, were, with a rich pair of Gloves, presented to her in the name of the University.¹⁶

¹² *A Great Discovery of the Queen’s Preparation*, p. 1. See also *The Queenes Proceedings in Holland* (London: Printed by T. F. for I. M. 1642) [TT: E83 (33)].

¹³ ‘Upon Thursday last I was at the *Hague*, and there saw Her Majesty’s Standard, which was just then going away, to be sent for *Newcastle*’, *A Great Discovery of the Queen’s Preparation*, pp. 2–3.

¹⁴ *A Great Discovery of the Queen’s Preparation*, p. 4.

¹⁵ In much the same way the Earl of Newcastle’s army was discussed as if separate from that of the King, a loose collection of Catholics wreaking havoc from their safe haven in the North-East. Cavendish’s actions in Northumberland led in 1643 to his being specifically exempted from any pardon of ‘King and Parliament’ by Parliamentary Ordinance; his rebellious nature conflated with a reminder that he ‘has been most active against the King’ as well as the rightful government, *CSPD 1641–1643*, p. 516.

¹⁶ Wood quoted by James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), p. 94, n.86.

It is a strikingly muted return to court; there is little evidence of masquing or official entertainment organised to welcome her. The book of poetry, however, published as *Musarum Oxoniensum Serenissimæ*, stood as a public testament of loyalty and political engagement.¹⁷ It particularly answered the Parliamentarian construction of the Queen by casting her as the ultimate Royalist trope, the loyal and constant wife who had the love of every right born Englishman. The volume was ornately bound and printed at the behest of the University: accounts relate ‘Item given to the Printers of the verses amongst them 5s.: Item to Leichfeild the Printer of 150 Coppies of Verses, £3 10s.: Item to Bookbinder Barnes for bindinge of Books of Verses in Sattin & Vellam for Guilding & Silk Strings, £9. 10s’ (Madan, p. 281). Whilst recalling the halcyon days of the 1630s (and participating in the construction of a myth of peace), the volume bore testament to the cultural and poetic changes the country had undergone since the Queen’s flight abroad in 1642.¹⁸ Her return, and the elevation of Jermyn, Digby, Percy and Wilmot to peerages and positions of power within two months of her arrival, signified the apex of the influence of those advising extreme or ‘ultra’ Royalist policy; *Serenissimæ* is in many ways an expression of this ideologically militant Royalism.¹⁹ The text configured the image of Henrietta Maria in a

¹⁷ *Musarum Oxoniensum Epibateria Serenissimæ* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1643) [TT E62 (14)].

¹⁸ This collection has not been discussed extensively: Loxley mentions it briefly (*Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 81–4), as does Raymond Anselment in *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988), concentrating on William Cartwright, pp. 66–67. Anselment’s ‘Oxford University Poets’ devotes barely a page to contextualising the volume within the University epideictic tradition.

¹⁹ See Ronald Hutton, ‘The Structure of the Royalist Party, 1642–1646’, *Historical Journal*, 24 (1981), 553–69, and James Daly’s critique of the article, ‘The Implications of Royalist Politics, 1642–1646’, *Historical Journal*, 27 (1984), 745–55. Daly shows Hutton’s thesis to be flawed in its attempts to trace a polarisation of feeling at court, arguing instead that the case is more complex than Hutton allows. Political shifts were dependent on local issues, untimely deaths, domestic or courtly feuds, and the pressures of war. These ambiguities are figured in the volume of poetry itself. However, the sudden elevation of Jermyn et al after the arrival of the Queen suggests that her presence was a catalyst in the accumulating movement towards a fully engaged politics and poetics. She suggested the appointment of Digby as secretary of state to replace the more moderate Falkland when he died at Newbury in 1643, and, according to a probably apocryphal story attributed to Prince Rupert, refused to sleep with the King ‘until Jermyn’s elevation was promised’, Hutton,

fashion not attempted by other media during the war. It was produced at a time when the King's army was successful in the field, and confidence was high.

Collections of panegyric and epideictic verse had been produced regularly by the two universities throughout the 1620s and 1630s.²⁰ Nine volumes of poetry were published from Oxford between 1633 and 1641. The poems were in Latin and English, and varied considerably in theme and form. During the period of the personal rule and the early 1640s they helped to 'popularise the sense of halcyon well-being central to the Caroline myth' (Anselment, 'The Oxford University Poets', p. 181).²¹ The collections tended to emphasise platonic harmony and stability, and appeared at times of national importance. Births and marriages emphasised the potency of the Royal household to create a dynasty binding the state together, whilst monarchical progresses emphasised the importance of the body of the ruler to the country and sustained the image of Royalty as it was presented during these ritualised journeys. The influence of Brian Duppa, Laud's chaplain, on the volumes has been analysed by Anselment and Loxley, both of whom see the collections as part of a literary reaction to and public approbation of the political myth-making of the personal rule period: 'both the structure and the cultural practices of Caroline Oxford revealed Royal authority as their strongest determinant [...] the subjection of the University's poetic activities to the authority of the King was itself a consequence of, and element in, the

'The Structure of the Royalist Party', p. 558 n. 47. In private, it seems, the Queen's sexuality was a potent political force.

²⁰ See Anselment, 'The Oxford University Poets', *passim*, for a discussion of University panegyric and epideictic literature during this period.

²¹ Anselment's notion of 'popularisation' is difficult in this context. The volumes were made up of a great deal of Latin verse, and published by University presses. There is little evidence that they enjoyed widespread manuscript transmission, although Loxley finds some examples from the miscellanies of 1633, see *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 54 n. 94.

broader dynamic of the personal rule' (Loxley, pp. 42–43).²² In his apologia sent to the University council from the Tower in December 1642, Laud reflected on the failure of his artistic vision for Oxford: 'I am by my misfortunes made incapable of serving you and that famous Nurse of good Letters, your University [...] with that intire zeale and devotion, which my intentions aimed at [...] had his Almighty Will beene concurrent to my wishes, my indeavours should have rendered Oxford the glory of the Christian world for good literature'.²³ However, accounts of the poetry of 1630s Oxford have sometimes ascribed to it a corporate and uniform aspect which is a little misleading. There were many dissenting voices; for instance, the following poem appears in an Oxford miscellany of the 1630s:

On Bp Laud being chosen Chauncelor of Oxford

Vainglorious men who can your witt applaude
That stretch so farre to get a little Laude
Did nature erre? Or on set paurpose try
To mere her power in such a prodegie
Shee, untill now, nere croun'd (as I could reade)
So vast a body with soe small a head
yet Oxford in thy choise th'art partly blest
For of the thing that's bad a little's best.²⁴

Furthermore, the activities of the Oxford poets were not always looked on as being a positive influence. Loxley comments on the connection between Christ Church and Westminster School in his discussion of the creation of a University poetic during the 1630s. Many of the most influential figures at Christ Church during the period were linked

²² The British Library copy of *Musarum Oxoniensum Charisteria* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1638) is inscribed 'Johnis Mauritij ex dono Br. Duppa Epi Sarum.', suggesting that Duppa had an interest in the circulation as well as the production of the volumes. Duppa was chancellor of Salisbury until May 1638 when he was moved to Chichester, returning as Bishop of Salisbury in 1641; it would appear from the ascription that these volumes were still current several years after their publication. I am grateful to Stephen Clucas for helpful discussion of this MS note.

²³ *A Letter Sent from the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury (Now prisoner in the Tower) to the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, and the rest of the Convocation at Oxford* (Ordered to be printed, First at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for Edward Vere [1642]) [TT: E83 (27)], p. 1.

²⁴ Folger Shakespeare Library, MS Va. 97, p. 5.

by an education at the school, and Loxley argues that this combined with shared patronage to establish a corporate identity for the college and its poets (Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 19–21). However, the relationship between the King and the Westminster coterie at Christ Church was not always as amicable as Loxley suggests. In Christ Church Archives Dean and Chapter MS b.2, known as ‘The Subdean’s Book’, there is a copy of a letter from Charles regarding ‘a very ill Custome to continue in that our Collegiate Church’, namely that

there is a Supper mainteyned yearely, comonly called a Westminster Supper, at wch all (and only) Westminster Schollers doe meete. This Supper Wee hold to be a very ill Custome and noe way fitt to be continued; for first it is a thing not allowable in Gouverment, that any party of Men should have a seuerall Meeting, wch is a direct way to faction and Combination (p. 371).

The letter is signed and dated 19 December ‘in the fowerteenth yeare or or Raigne’, or 1639. Given that the Westminster connection was a mainstay of Christ Church poetic coteries, which were still producing poetry at this time, Charles’ worry seems strangely misplaced. It complicates the picture we have of his relationship to the University, and Christ Church in particular. Charles’ reference to ‘Gouverment’ implies much about the King’s vision of Oxford; his repression of the Westminster society suggests a high level of interest in the character of the University and a worry about faction.

The University collections evolved a form of panegyric which had roots in the demonstrative oratory taught in the Schools but demonstrated a ‘willingness to interpret rhetorical theory quite liberally’ (Anselment, ‘The Oxford University Poets’, p. 187). Poets used various classical forms and epideictic topoi, but rearranged and remoulded the structures in subtle and pointed fashion. In particular the poems emphasise the potent and creative union between Charles and Henrietta Maria, and celebrate a pastoral harmony and cosmic stability which echoes the language and action of court masques. The Queen is

particularly feted for her creative role in giving birth to both children and poetry: ‘her creativity occasions fanciful attempts to exploit a wit now apparent in seeing the Queen as their poetic mother, father, and midwife’ (Anselment, ‘The Oxford University Poets’, p. 189). The volumes configured a notion of family which celebrated Henrietta Maria as mother within a strongly structured network of patriarchal dominance. The poets elide poetic creation with birth, both of Royalty and nation:

Your Queen has often travail’d and we payd
A publick joy for ev’ry Boy and Mayde
So oft; that Wit was troubled to make verse
While she became almost our Anniverse.
Now you have travail’d too, and can we be
Lesse pious for your safe delivery?
When Kings thus travaile, every step’s a throw,
Beyond whole womans labour, and we doe
Valew the fruit of such a painfull birth
Above a Prince: Your trava’ling Queen brings forth
Only your short Epitomy, but you’l
In this bring forth your self unto us whole.²⁵

Their verses are ‘publick’ expressions of joy. Whilst privileging the Queen in panegyrics of birth, this poem highlights the fact that her role was simply to facilitate the creation of a dynasty, whereas the state is focused through the King. This poem in particular contrasts with the construction of the Queen as mother of her country which is found in poems from the 1643 volume.

Henrietta Maria’s departure had occasioned a manuscript poem which prefigures many of the concerns addressed by the poets of *Serenissimæ*:

Must wee depart then, & shall the heauens sole ey
View vs at such a distance, prithy why
Why wilt thou leaue mee, haue I ever bin
untrue to thee, or what soe powerfull sin

²⁵ William Anderson, ‘Your Queen has often travail’d’, *Eucharistica Oxoniensia In Exoptatissimum & Auspicatissimum Caroli* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1641) [TT: E179 (5)], ll. 1–12.

Ecclipseth thee, tell mee & with my prayers
 I'le expiate my Crime & bribe thine Eares
 or hast thou bin disloyall to my Bedd
 that thou must be divorc'd & I not dead
 hast thou displeas'd ye [...] these Tribes
 didst thou receit the Elders suite or Bribes
 Scorning to be a Doilila & betray
 my strength unto their uncircumcised sway.²⁶

The poem introduces the eclipse motif which is of great importance to the later volume. In this version, however, the personal nature of the poem's voice lends the figure a more domestic flavour. In particular the Queen's sexuality is problematised; she is suspected of an adultery which has sapped Charles' power. The opponents of the King are gentile Philistines, ready to betray him. They are physically differentiated from the King who is a member of the Hebrew chosen, included within a grouping of the pious and gentle that will wreak their powerful vengeance if need be. By using Samson as a comparison the poet intimates the symbolic and physical power of outward Cavalier attributes, in particular hair. The piece is simpler and less idealised than those that appear in *Serenissimæ*, and it is illustrative to compare differences in syntax and diction, as well as content and tone, between the two modes of verse.

Musarum Oxoniensum Serenissimæ is characterised by many of the same practices and thematic concerns as those volumes previously published by the University. However, there is a new engagement and sense of location that is missing from the earlier volumes.²⁷

²⁶ 'His Ma^{ty} valediccon to the Queene at the departure', Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 71, pp. 1–3, ll. 1–12.

²⁷ *Eucharistica Oxoniensia In Exoptatissimum* had articulated a position that was consciously inferior to the London court, although defiantly creative in comparison to Whitehall's opulent entertainment:

After the Cities Dres't ioy, and Glad Meat,
 And you your cheerefull Londons Love have Eat,
 We may presume in all this Feasting Time
 No Verse was serv'd, nor came you home in Rhyme.
 And hope that if Ioy Rellish from the Towne;
 Compos'd 'twill Please, and not offend i'th'Gown.

Joseph Howe, 'After the Cities Dres't ioy', ll. 1–6.

The presence of a poem by John Berkenhead, for instance, underlined how different the volume was from those which had preceded it. The contributors are a mixture of old and new voices. Senior poets who had contributed to many other University volumes, like Mayne, Cartwright and Birkhead, all wrote new verse.²⁸ Whilst this emphasised a continuity it also established the differences from that tradition. The older poets had also changed during the war, choosing more to give sermons and write pamphlets (or contribute to *Mercurius Aulicus*) rather than write verse.

In contrast to earlier volumes, the Queen becomes the entire focus of the work, and the renewal of her union with Charles the locus for a renewal of poetic and social normality:

Every Look which You reveale,
Will compose our Commonweale.
And Your bright Eyes will create
Once more a well orderd State.
From Your Returne, Lawes will obtaine
Their Force, and be once Lawes againe.

(Jaspar Mayne, 'Whilist *Orpheus* toucht his Harpe', ll. 47–52)

Mayne's semi-georgic poem opens the collection and establishes the tone of the following verses. The poem compares the Queen to Orpheus, who brought calm and peace to the forest with his song. The absence of her person, and by extension of the songs or verses inspired by her presence, has led to chaos and sociological inversion. In particular is it the glory of her outward appearance that reasserts hierarchical normality. Mayne gives her external virtues the power of verbs; her visage will 'Smile' war away, her looks 'compose' the state and her eyes will 'create' an ordered state. Her influence is expressed in the fundamental building blocks of language. Mayne is careful to insert 'Once more' into this

²⁸ Berkley, Strode, Fell, Hakewill, Bathurst, Rudyerd, Underwood, Barker, Mayne, Goad, Dale, Sandys, Cartwright, Stevenson and Howe contributed to both *Serenissimæ* and the most recent collection,

sentiment, encouraging a notion that this is a return to normality. He introduces an urban dimension to the pastoral:

Ayres, we read too, and soft layes,
Heretofore did Citties raise.
When a gentle close did meet,
Straightway started up a Street;
And like Creatures of the String
From each stroke did Temples spring.
(ll. 13–18)

Orphic creation does not just create and sustain peace but also aids the construction of a national infrastructure and identity. The poetry inspired by the Royal family participates in the creation of trade networks and the physical spaces of the country. Mayne elides a classical and pastoral world with an intentionally vague sense of contemporaneous spaces and situations; poems throughout the volume allow the two to intermingle but it is much subtler and consciously mythological in this introductory poem.²⁹ This practice allows the poet to decry the destruction of an idealised but recognisable world. The absence of the calming influence of the Queen breaks apart this fragile civilisation:

Having lost the Harmonye,
Which combined us in one knot,
Concord, Rule, and Lawes forgot
Every Thing did loose its Name,
A People a wild Rout became
(ll. 31–35)

In this instance the exile of the Queen allows the entirety of the nation to be reduced to chaos, but the loss of language is foregrounded by the poem as the most destructive

Eucharistica Oxoniensia In Exoptatissimum.

²⁹ Mayne's reappraisal of the Georgic is in line with Anthony Low's thesis that the mode was undergoing extensive change during the 1640s and 50s. This change was in part motivated by Samuel Hartlib and the New science, and particularly writings on the reform of agriculture. A new attitude to the very earth of England is apparent throughout the poems of *Serenissimæ*, but it is focused through an ideologically charged model of national identity which is at odds with the reforms suggested by Hartlib et al. Anthony Low, 'New Science and the Georgic Revolution in Seventeenth-Century English Literature' in *Renaissance Historicism*:

consequence, far more important than civic peace or legal clarity. Linguistic confusion follows the loss of national harmony, and this leads to civil unrest and the debasing of the country.³⁰ There is also a terrible confusion involved in the loss of nomenclature; Adam named the world for God in Eden, and this divinely ordered linguistic system has been undone.³¹

The poem's form reflects this corruption as the rhyme scheme inverts normality:

'And those parts which lowest lye/ Striv'd to chance place with the skye' (ll. 41–42).

However, this piece of wit is partially corrected through the stability attained by the full rhyme. Metric and rhyming uniformity is a characteristic of the verse as a whole, contributing a firm exoskeleton to the poem. The piece controls language to illustrate the renewed vigour and harmony brought by the return of the Queen. The rhyme also gestures towards a way that Royalist poetry could contain the subversions and inversions of the Parliamentary enemy. The poem becomes an expression of the absolute space controlled by the King, an area of firm boundaries and structures which invests a society with stability. Royalist rhyme-schemes, and particularly couplets, were increasingly the site of polemic controversy: '[Denham and Waller] linked metrical order with the concord brought by the

Selections from English Literary Renaissance, ed. by Arthur F. Kinney and Dan S. Collins (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), pp. 317–47.

³⁰ Strangely, Donnelly sees this concern as something first evinced by Cleveland after the fall of Oxford: 'Cleveland's treatment of his subject consists of almost hysterical attempts to lay hold of the situation in language whose conventional meanings have been given the lie by the unnatural course of events', 'Caroline Royalist Panegyric', p. 172. His analysis rests on the assumption that texts produced during the period 1642–46 did not express anxiety over the radically altered political and social landscape. This is problematic; the panegyrics considered here are part of a process of destabilised expression which progresses towards Cleveland's later poems.

³¹ 'Naming is an issue of power, since whoever controls the language can order the world as he wants it to be ordered', Sharon Achinstein, 'The Politics of Babel in the English Revolution', in *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution*, ed. by James Holstun (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 14–45 (p. 33). See also Cowley's criticism in *The Civil War* of Parliamentary attitudes to property and ownership: 'Why are th'Estates and good seisd on of all/ Whom Covetu'ous or Malitious men Miscall?', I, 557–58, quoted from Allen Pritchard's edition in *The Collected Works of Abraham Cowley*, 6 vols (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1989), I, 261–91.

ruler to the state'.³² In a note added to the fourth instalment of the first edition of *Paradise Lost* in 1668, Milton claimed that rhyme was 'the invention of a barbarous age, to set off wretched matter and lame metre' and that the blank verse of his poem represented 'ancient liberty recovered to heroic poem from the troublesome and modern bondage of rhyme'.³³ Rhymed verse was the physical expression of the repressive stability of the Royalist project; it reflects the institutional order articulated throughout the war period. Couplets helped to create a structured space for Royalist expression, mediating and controlling the language of the poem. Throughout the *Serenissimæ* volume poets deploy couplets and rhyme as countermeasures to the perceived liberation and chaotic expression of Parliamentary textual practice.

Within this controlled medium, Mayne's poem does trace a political shift which highlights the reconfiguration of panegyric verse:

Every Look which You reveale,
 Will compose our Common weale
 And Your bright Eyes will create
 Once more a well orderd State.
 From Your Returne, Lawes will obtaine
 Their Force, and be once Lawes againe.
 And where You Your Beames display
 'Twill be pleasure to Obey.
 And our Bodyes, which before
 The Style of Subjects only Wore,
 Henceforth will but one halfe be
 Of their Princes Sovereignty.
 You'l enlarge His Realmes, and find
 A greater Empire in each mind.
 And His other Titles fill
 With his Peoples Hearts, and Will.
 When it shall be said in stoye
 You made these his Territory.
 (ll. 47–64)

³² David Norbrook, 'Lucy Hutchinson vs. Edmund Waller: an unpublished reply to Waller's "A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector"', *The Seventeenth Century*, 11 (1996), 61–86 (p. 63).

³³ *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler (Harlow: Longman, 1971), p. 38.

This section posits a dialectic relationship between ruler and populace. The harmony brought by Henrietta Maria is a remoulding or renewal of that which came before, and it essentially rests on a new conception of the body politic and the sovereign's role as head of the nation. Subjection ceases being a passive state and becomes an active involvement in the affairs of the country: 'Twill be pleasure to Obey'. Subjects are bodily part of the 'Princes Sovereignty'; where before livery had clothed them in the colours of obedience, now they are incorporated into the representative commonwealth themselves, becoming 'one halfe [...] Of their Princes Sovereignty'. They choose to obey; their minds are colonised individually as the notion of partnership opens up greater empires for Charles than those he already owns.

The body politic metaphor used by Mayne echoes that of the King in his speeches, which have been discussed in Chapter Three; he is picking up on the newly inclusive discourse being used by Charles at this point.³⁴ This example illustrates that the relationship between ruler and ruled, patron and writer, muse and poet has changed greatly in the time Henrietta Maria has been away; her reappearance heralds not necessarily a return to the idealised 1630s, but a movement towards a new conception of England. For instance, I. Lowen's poem 'Welcome victorious sir' in the 1641 volume *Eucharistica Oxoniensia In Exoptatissimum* had still posited a hierarchical notion of bodily dependence:

Joyes Crowne your Presence which redeemes the state
 From strange Receptours, from the Monstrous Fate
 Of Anarchy; your People without you
 No more then Armes without a Head can doe.
 As soone as you appeare, they cease to be
 A Route, are streight reduc't to Monarchy.

³⁴ Indeed, Charles' invocation of a physiological and scientific model of the body may well have contributed to the undermining of the mystic or divine nature of the monarch, with physically awkward circumstances for the King.

List how all faiths conspire in one accord
 T'observe your Royall Will, to call you Lord.
 May none so much contend for what's his owne
 As to enlarge your Power, t'advance your Throne.
 Since Nothing is so sacred as your Will,
 May that be Law, may that be Statute still.
 (ll. 17–28).

In comparison, Mayne's poem highlights that constitutional positioning in epideictic poetry had evolved greatly in two years. W. Barker figures the newly revived kingdom of

Serenissimæ:

That State, which 'twixt two Hands does Bleeding ly,
 The Hand of Murther and of Chirurgie,
 (While this Cuts off Bad limbs, and that the Sound,
 Till there be scarce a Body to be found)
 Now gathers breath againe, and hopes to Live,
 Not by what strength it hath, but what She'l give.
 ('Go burne some Rebell Towne', ll. 7–12)

Barker's physiological vocabulary is echoed in Henry Birkhead's poem 'Till with Your selfe' which desires that the Queen 'unite us, and distempers cure' (l. 36). John Beesley's poem 'Great Luminary of our Clouded Spheare', discussed below, actively engages with the 'false Opticks' of the Parliamentarians, attacking their science as well as their religious and political values (l. 73). These examples suggest a medical or scientific discourse underlying the poetry in the volume. Barker's verse extends the Queen's creative potency to enabling a resurrection of sorts. England has been butchered, both geographically and institutionally, and it is only Henrietta Maria's intervention that can reanimate the anatomised body politic. The state is revitalised by the Queen's return, highlighting the mutual relationship between commonwealth and monarch that had been established by Charles' speeches. The verse maps a Harveian model of the mutual dependence of the

bodies limbs and organs onto the state, a trope used by Charles throughout his public speeches.³⁵

Barker gestures towards a newly configured populist reaction to the arrival of the Queen: ‘Go burne some Rebell Towne; for such alone/ Are Bonfires suiting to the ioyes we owne’ (ll. 1–2).³⁶ He incites the inscription of a destructive Royalist panegyric onto Parliamentary urban spaces. Birkhead’s poem goes further in describing the ‘numerous Unitie’ which holds together the British state, ‘Fowre bodies being so wrapt up together,/ That every part at once is all, and neither’ (ll. 10, 11–12). This concept of the ethnic plurality of national identity is unusual insofar as it accepts the Scots into the model. Birkhead deplores the strain placed on identity by the strictures of the war: before the combat, ‘Traitor, and Subject undistinguisht stood,/ Since ‘twas all one to seeme, and to be good’ (ll. 5–6).

4.3 Gender and authority

These notions of bodily representation and political identity are gender-charged. The space of the subject within the nation is inflected by constructions of masculinity and femininity, and furthermore by structures of the family. Whilst the poets of *Serenissimæ* celebrate Henrietta Maria as the mother or creator of a new England, she is also part of the empire, colonised and appropriated, meaning inscribed upon her, a locus of idolisation and an ideal to adore. She is ‘By Dangers made more pretious/ As Things put on new price and cost/

³⁵ For a discussion of the gender and power relations bound up in the notion and practice of anatomy, see Valerie Traub, ‘Gendering mortality in early modern anatomies’ in *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects*, ed. by Valerie Traub, M. Lindsay Kaplan and Dymphna Callaghan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 44–92.

³⁶ For the use of populist or carnivalesque tropes in creating a ‘mythic unity of prince, gentry and people’ see Peter Stallybrass, “‘Wee feaste in our Defense’”: Patrician Carnival in Early Modern England and Robert

When most in perill to be lost.’ (‘Whilest Orpheus toucht his Harpe’, ll. 70–73). The poet and people value her as a lost possession. They are ‘as He, who his Jewell threw/ Into the Sea, received it new’ (ll. 74–75), welcoming the return of a precious cargo: ‘We doe receive you back as Treasure [...] Or as the longing Merchant prizes/ By th’Wracks they scape his Merchandizes’ (ll. 82, 84–85). John Fell desires that ‘Neighbour Hollander’, that particularly mercantile nation, give up ‘that Prize,/ So farre about thy richest Merchandize [...] Returne our Lillies, we will ask no more,/ Nor envie thee the Indies in thy store’ (‘When we remember those affronts’, ll. 29–34). She is granted status as commodity, something to be prized for extraneous rather than innate value; indeed, Fell’s verse expresses neatly the underlying gendered imperialist impulse of a male body politic that needs to possess its Queen. She is greatly important in a symbolic or idealised sense, but not a physical. The abstraction of the panegyric mode works to allow this gendered distancing, as the subject of the verse becomes exalted and objectified. However, these poems suggest that the Queen was actively constructed as part of the locus of Royalist national identity mediated through the necessities of a masculine war effort. She is a morale boosting pin-up, idealised and unattainable. The construction of the object as a valuable commodity is not necessarily gender-orientated; Bevil Grenville is lamented as ‘We hazard Gold, They, but the drosse of men’.³⁷ (Dudley Digges, ‘Thou Name of Valour’, *Verses on the Death*, l. 8). However, Grenville is given symbolic value in order to contrast his valour with that of the opposition army; the metaphor works within a discourse of competitive masculinity and commodity exchange rather than idealisation and objectification.

Herrick’s “Hesperides” in *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from English Literary Renaissance*, ed. by Arthur F. Kinney and Dan S. Collins (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), pp. 348–67.

³⁷ Dudley Digges, ‘Thou Name of Valour’, *Verses on the Death of the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenville, Knight* ([Oxford: Leonard Lichfield] Printed, 1643) [Wing O990A], l. 8.

Combat problematises masculinity, as Diane Purkiss has demonstrated in her exploration of the traumatic consequences of the war: 'The fissures in the ideal of masculinity at war are obvious even to those most eager to see war as a space where masculinity reaches its apotheosis' ('Dismembering and Remembering', p. 224). She identifies gendered anxieties inherent in writings about the war, and argues that the 'experience of seeing dismembered bodies torn apart and thrown about by gunfire' led to a fear of the destruction of the masculine order, which would be replaced by 'the dismemberment and chaos that gave birth to niter'.³⁸ Masculine anxiety was mapped onto the body; the desire for an ordered hierarchical society was linked to a gendered need for corporeal completeness. The body of state is explicitly male, although, on the models proposed in *Serenissimæ*, born of an idealised or mythological female. Parliamentary rebels are 'Unmanly' and alien: 'Nature nor Law could check their Villanie' (R. Meade, 'When first to th'Winds and Waves', ll. 33–34). William Towers portrays England as a place where 'Here all things Clash and Stagger, Townes, and Men,/ Just like Her Waves, break, and are broke agen', a country in which soldiers are destroyed in the same way that city walls are broken down ('Neptune no sooner had his Trident shook', ll. 5–6). Sentiments such as this highlight the inherent incongruity between the abstraction of neo-platonic panegyric and the destructive reality of the war being described. Within this newly anxious model of masculinity the subjection of the female to particular roles within a hierarchically structured model of state and national space was particularly important. Royalist notions of gender were in a state of flux during the war due to the unbalanced situation. The poems of

³⁸ Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering', p. 229. She identifies Edgehill as a prominent locus for newsbook accounts of such 'loss of self, loss of image and propriety, and loss of ownership and control over appearance and the body', pp. 222–3.

Serenissimæ illustrate the problematic definitions of gender in the special case of the Queen.

In his history of Balliol college, John Jones points out that the inclusion of women in the bursary accounts made them technically members of the college.³⁹ Such practice allowed aristocratic women a controlled entry into the highly gendered educational spaces of the University.⁴⁰ The increased feminine involvement in the University and city-court was a conceptual extension of the influence of Henrietta Maria during the 1630s.⁴¹ In the late 1620s and early 1630s the Oxford University panegyricists began to produce verse in English that Henrietta Maria might read it; female cultural agency was important in this shift toward vernacular renderings of texts that would ‘normally’ be in Latin.⁴² *Serenissimæ* even contains poems in French, an early staging post in the 1640s *rapprochement* between English verse and continental practice, but also an important indicator that this volume of poetry was specifically designed with the Queen as a reader in mind.⁴³ The wartime

³⁹ *Balliol College: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 102.

⁴⁰ For female education and gendered notions of space see Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550–1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 81–92, 205–212.

⁴¹ For Henrietta Maria’s influence on the cultural activities and tenor of the 1630s court see Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); the political implications of her position at court are outlined by Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 175–79. The Queen’s own physical movement into the Warden of Merton’s lodgings are described in Merton College Archives, 1. 3 (College Register 1567–1731), p. 360–61, see Appendix III.

⁴² It has been argued that the movement toward vernacular poetry in the University collections was due to the Queen’s ignorance of Latin, Anselment, ‘The Oxford University Poets’. Anselment modifies his position somewhat in *Loyalist Resolve*, stressing that much panegyric produced in English was addressed to the King and not the Queen, p. 47. James Loxley has recently identified a desire to ‘identify the English language with the British Stuart dynasty that the Royal couple were so assiduously securing throughout the 1630s’, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 27. Loxley argues that the trend was a conscious part of Brian Duppa’s ‘attempt to formalise and make necessary the involvement of the universities’ vernacular tradition with the cultural procedures of Charles’s monarchy’, thus placing the movement to English within the context of the creation of a Caroline national image, p. 28. During the 1630s female agency had become an increasingly important motivation for translation: for example, Robert Stapleton dedicated his *Dido and Aeneas* (Printed for William Cooke at Furnivalls Inn gate in Holborne, 1634) [STC 24812] to Lady Catherine Twistleton, asserting that he undertook the exercise partly because she could not understand the original Latin, Sig. A2v.

⁴³ English poets engaged with French verse forms and theory, in particular Paul Scarron’s burlesque and the translation practice of Malherbe and d’Ablancourt, at the courts in exile, c.1647–56. For accounts of this cultural encounter see P. H. Hardacre, ‘The Royalists in Exile during the Puritan Revolution 1642–1660’,

acceptance of courtly women into previously male spaces was a controlled version of the equality *Mercurius Aulicus* mocked in the London religious communities.⁴⁴ However, it would be a mistake to see such changes as widespread or profound. The shifts in gender roles were heavily mediated: *Serenissimæ* still contained Latin verse, and those women that were accepted into the colleges were tolerated only under the extreme conditions of the war. The Queen had to satisfy herself with being in a different college from the central focus of the court, and the ceremony accorded Royal visits between colleges suggests that to an extent such movements were rare or unusual.

An interesting sidelight into the atmosphere of the wartime court at Christ Church is given by a letter from Captain Anthony Willoughby to Henry Mulliner from Oxford, 7 January 1642[3].⁴⁵ Willoughby writes, 'I know is as old with you as that my Lady Essex hath brought my Lord a young heir. When his Majesty read the first news of it, In troth, said his Majesty, I think he is no more the father of it than I am, and, Gentlemen here I clear myself of it before you all.'⁴⁶ Charles' joke is informed by the 1613 annulment of Essex's first marriage on the grounds of impotence. However, it also echoes the malicious Royalist propaganda regarding Lady Essex and Lady Waller, and utilises the same discourse as *Mercurius Aulicus* in characterising the Parliamentarian or Puritan enemy as sexually abnormal and voracious.⁴⁷ The nature of the joke and the pseudo-private space in which it

Huntington Library Quarterly, 16 (1952), 353–71 and Thomas R. Steiner, 'Precursors to Dryden: English and French Theories of Translation in the Seventeenth Century', *Comparative Literature Studies* 7 (1970), 50–81.

⁴⁴ For a limited discussion of the representation of women in newsbooks see *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641–1660*, ed. by Joad Raymond (Moreton-on-Marsh: Windrush Press, 1993), pp. 122–27.

⁴⁵ *HMC* (Portland I), pp. 84–6.

⁴⁶ Compare Cowley's *The Puritan and the Papist*: 'They preserve Reliques; you have few or none,/ Unlesse the Clout sent to John Pym be one./ And Hollises rich Widow, Shee who carryed/ A Relique in her wombe before she married', ll. 139–43, quoted from the text of the poem edited by Thomas O. Calhoun and Laurence Heyworth in *Collected Works of Abraham Cowley*, I, 236–60.

⁴⁷ An anonymous 1640s riddle in Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 26 annotates 'One Cuckold^A' as 'A: 1: ye Earle of Essex', fol. 137r. Waller was continually mocked by *Mercurius Aulicus* for his wife's sermonising and the

was related, which is emphasised by the King's site-specific and slightly legal phrasing ('here I clear myself before you'), gives the anecdote a locker-room quality that figures the court or War Council as a privileged male space. The story also challenges the accepted image of Charles as an austere and somewhat pompous figure.

Henrietta Maria was effectively marginalised by ritual and geography from playing an important part in the running of the war.⁴⁸ The Queen was idealised as the perfect companion for the King, a platonic symbol of Caroline harmony that the opposition are attempting to tarnish:

She regards their many forces no more then their more numerous Lyes and forgeries, which have been let loose from Presse and Pulpit in such shamefull, filthy, abhominable plenty against Her Majestie, that as we all know there are Angels which guard the innocent from that end these Libels ayme at; so there are Devils which taught them how to slander, and will see them paid for the great paines they have taken.⁴⁹

Aulicus' construction of the Queen is echoed throughout Royalist verse and prose of the period; she is innocent of all accusations due to her innate virtue, and this is proven by establishing the evil nature of those who arraign her. The poems in *Serenissimæ* idealise her

suggestion that his manhood was compromised by her strength: '[Browne] therefore shook up Sr *William* as his *Lady* used to doe at *Winchester* Church, where if he offered to speake about *Doctrines* or *Uses*, her *Ladyship* would rebuke him, saying *Peace Master Waller, you know your weaknesse in these things*; since which time Sir *William* hath ever gone for the *Weaker Vessel*', *Mercurius Aulicus the 34 Weeke* (1644), 18 August [TT: E9 (5)]. For the relationship between sexual slander and polemic/ political writing during the war period see Susan Wiseman, 'Porno-political Rhetoric and Political Theory', esp. pp. 139–40. Rachel Trubwith, 'Female Preachers and Male Wives: Gender and Authority in Civil War England in *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution*, ed. by James Holstun (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 112–34, offers a discussion of the 'complex connections between the construction of gender and the nature of religious and political authority in the 1640s and 1650s' (p. 113), concentrating on Parliamentary and puritan figures.

⁴⁸ She eventually left Oxford altogether: 'This day the QUEENES Majestie began Her journey into the West, which being the most freed from the Rebels power, Her Majestie made choice of to enjoy the present quiet and peace of those parts, rather then Oxford, where She was in the midst of His Majesties Armies, which afforded security, but too much noyse and businesse', *Mercurius Aulicus the 16 Weeke* (1644), 17 April [TT: E45 (10)].

⁴⁹ *Mercurius Aulicus the 16 Weeke* (1644), 17 April [TT: E45 (10)].

feminine virtues and her martial prowess; the mutually creative union between the King and Queen is still strongly emphasised.

However, national identity is still gender-based and centred upon male hierarchies and the King himself. *Aulicus* portrayed the socially emasculating consequences of the lack of monarchical rule. Sir William Waller's wife is portrayed as a preaching, interfering dominatrix whose aim is to set up a 'Reformed Nunnery; where none must be admitted, but First, Such as are married: Secondly, Such as can preach: Thirdly, Such whose husbands have beene exceeding well beaten.'⁵⁰ She flirts with other soldiers, interprets the bible, preaches, and is generally master of the general.⁵¹ This promotion of women to abnormal roles is part of the egalitarian nature of the Puritan caricature drawn by the Court newsbook.⁵² The 'Shee Committee of Coventry' petition Parliament and take control of the town; Scotswomen stand in line with their menfolk to swell the apparent numbers of an army.⁵³

Conversely, the Queen is supportive to the King but in thrall to him; her sterling work abroad is all done for the love and reputation of her master, and the poets of *Serenissimæ* acknowledge and applaud her for this.⁵⁴ Royalist women in non-traditional roles figure in *Aulicus*' narratives generally as victims or martyrs, separated from their

⁵⁰ *Mercurius Aulicus the 31 Weeke* (1644), 30 July [TT: E7 (10)].

⁵¹ *Mercurius Aulicus the 8 Weeke* (1644), 23 February [TT: E37 (1)]; *the 33 Weeke* (1644), 17 August [TT: E8 (20)].

⁵² *Britanicus* riposted by attacking the power of the Queen: 'we know who can rule her husband at Oxford, and make Keepers, and Secretaries, and privy chamber men; I tell you we doubt here whether this be the year of the Kings raigne or the Queens, and they say some of your better divines, begin to scruple whether they should pray for his Majestie as supreme head and government', *Mercurius Britanicus*, 6 [September 26 – October 3, 1643].

⁵³ *Mercurius Aulicus the 2nd Weeke* (1643[4]), 8 January [TT: E30 (1)]; *the eighth Weeke* (1643[4]), 22 February [TT: E37 (1)].

⁵⁴ 'Good women live the while in a wretched Age, who cannot be assisting to their husbands in their great necessities, as by the Lawes of God and nature they are bound to be, without being Traitors to Master Pym, and some of the good members of both Houses', *Mercurius Aulicus the one and twentieth Weeke* (1643), May 27 [TT: E105 (12)]

menfolk by the strictures of war. The Countess of Derby was a special favourite of *Aulicus*, representing martial femininity and duty to the Royal cause: the long siege of Latham House was reported at length on several occasions, and the stubborn refusal of the Countess to yield her ancestral home became something of a symbol of aristocratic political defiance:

wherein it hath pleased God to grant her such matchlesse courage, that she still holds Lathom House against them (having now beene besieged full Twelve weekes) and this day seavennight (April 10.) this most noble Countesse made a sally out upon the Rebels which was performed so gallantly; that she killed 45, wounded above 60 more, and tooke two Peeeces of Ordinance, with Colonell Moores Colours and Drummes, on who theretofore hath eaten much bread in Lathom House, and therefore this brave Lady caused his Colours to be nayled on the top of the highest Tower of the house, that all the world may see the ingratitude of a Rebell.⁵⁵

The Countess is forced to act in a masculine role by the absence of her husband. In comparison, Parliamentarian women are sexually voracious and active, the 'zealous young Maids' of Norwich now pregnant are an example to 'let all Virgins looke to it, for people hereafter will scarce thinke them honest, who are so bold and shamelesse as to joyne in a Rebellion against their own Sovereigne.'⁵⁶ Rebellion leads to physical violation and social exclusion. The rebels are portrayed through their sexual activities as a group of cowardly, cruel and perverse hypocrites: 'one of their Prisoners was missed by his Keeper, who searching for him, and looking through a cranny into the Stable, he saw a ladder erected, and the holy Rebell (busie at a Conventicle) committing Buggery on the Keepers owne Mare.'⁵⁷ This report illustrates their abnormality both in social/ sexual relations whilst the description of the unholy 'conventicle' figures this kind of covert unnatural meeting as part and parcel of the religious malpractice of the rebellious meetings at Westminster.

⁵⁵ *Mercurius Aulicus the 16 Weeke* (1644), 17 April [TT: E45 (10)]

⁵⁶ *Mercurius Aulicus the 2nd Weeke* (1643[4]), 8 January [TT: E30 (1)].

Henrietta Maria was important to the Royalist project as a symbol of dutiful and normal femininity. Her example illustrated how the Parliamentarian women were unnatural and subversive. The sexuality of the opposition was deviant and transgressive, outside of the traditional space of the family and of structured gender roles. They disrupted the hierarchies of society and ruptured the order of things, violating norms and flaunting sociological rules. Royalist poets at once lauded the Queen and subjected her, emphasising her regal aspect whilst establishing her status as Charles' possession (this is emphasised in Berkenhead's manuscript changes to his poem, see discussion below). Loyalist poetry is seen as the lawful progeny of the King and Queen, fruit of the traditional family unit which seeks to exclude the dirty and the deviant. Gender is a particularly controlled space which emphasises the hegemonies and structural inflexibility of Royalist social models.

4.4 Astronomy and Language

Gender was not the only space of subjection defined by Royalism and deployed in the *Serenissimæ* volume. In the following section I will discuss the use of scientific metaphors in constructing a notion of a divinely appointed Royalist universe. The astronomical model typically deployed by Royalists is based on notions of 'absolute space' taken from Copernicus. I also discuss another mode of monarchist 'absolute' space, that of language. I illustrate how both tropes construct an idealised subject or reader.

Astronomical and heliological images are deployed throughout the volume, generally on a Copernican model of heliocentric Royal authority. Use of the hierarchical interpretation of Copernicus' work was common in University verse from the late 1630s

⁵⁷ *Mercurius Aulicus the 51 Weeke* (1644), December 17 [TT: E80 (8)].

onwards.⁵⁸ Oxford had proffered a Laudian version of Copernican thought during the 1630s, which, linked with William Harvey's work, created an astronomical and physiological context for the inherently hierarchical systems of monarchical rule. In 1638 *Encyclopaedia sen Orbis Literarum*, a diagram of the Copernican astronomical system, was bound with the abridged version of the University Statutes intended for student use, so 'we can say, with pardonable exaggeration, that from the late 1630's every Oxford Undergraduate carried a Copernican system in his pocket'.⁵⁹ The Savilian Professor of Astronomy throughout the war was John Greaves, a prominent academic Royalist. Greaves' remaining papers, mainly academic notes, survive at Bod, Savile MS 47 and Bod, Savile MS 37 & 41 (bound together). Written in Latin and Greek, they indicate that he was still researching, and maybe teaching, throughout the war period.⁶⁰ He was mainly concentrating on astronomy: Bod, Savile MS 47 includes notes on Copernicus, Scaliger and Hales, and an astronomical table ascribed on verso as 'Observacoes S. nouaru stellaru circa 4 mouentiu P Ant: de Rhito 5 Jan: 1643' (fol. 68v). Much Royalist propaganda deployed a heliocentric and hierarchical interpretation of the Copernican view of the universe, and Greaves' notes suggest an intellectual atmosphere in which such Copernican ideas were discussed and theories dispersed. Savile MS 37 & 41 is a collection of separates which includes Greaves' astronomical notes; there is a possibility that they were circulated (there is more than one

⁵⁸ An earlier Mayne poem addresses the King 'you, yet appeare/ To us as glorious, unspent, full of ray,/ As when you first began to rule our Day', 'To the KING', *Eucharistica Oxoniensia In Exoptatissimum*, ll. 68–70. Elsewhere in that volume James Tichborne welcomes the King back 'unto your Proper Spheare;', ('Y'Are welcome back', l. 1).

⁵⁹ Nicholas Tyacke, 'Science and Religion at Oxford before the Civil War' in *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History presented to Christopher Hill*, ed. by Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 73–94 (pp. 89–90).

⁶⁰ BL, Sloane MS 542 is a miscellany once owned by Nathaniell Highmore, a distinguished physician at Trinity College during the war, which includes medical entries and evidence that he was still researching also. Academic work continued to be undertaken; some was even published, such as James Ussher's revised *A Geographicall and Historicall Disquisition, Touching the Asia properly so called, the Lydian Asia* (Oxford,

hand), and his membership of Merton, a distinctly scientific college and also the residence of the Queen, would provide his research with an influential and informed audience.

Henrietta Maria was interested in scientific and practical theories, particularly those which pertained to her image (from theatrical machinery to enamelling processes).

It was natural that this scientific discourse of praise should be apprehended into the poetic sphere. For instance, the eclipse motif is used throughout verse of the early 1640s to suggest the unnatural position of the Parliament: ‘our feares tell us, that unlesse our Sun/ Lend us his beames agayne, our World will run/ Into another Chaos’.⁶¹ The poets of *Serenissimæ* reflect the Royalist fascination with the political interpretation of astronomy. Mayne introduces the first of the collection’s many political eclipse metaphors, as during the Queen’s absence the sun ‘would teach us to count Dayes,/ By its Shade, not by His Rayes’ (ll. 45–46). Elsewhere Henrietta Maria is ‘Your Royall brightnesse’ whose rays disperse the ‘Cloudy Rebels’ which have ‘so long obscurd your light’ (John Finch, ‘When that some gloomy cloud obscures the day’, ll. 4, 9–10). Sometimes she is figured as the sun, although often as the moon:

Our Moone hath been Eclips’d. The muddy throng
Of Earth-borne Traitors hath combin’d so long
To interpose it selfe, ’twixt our bright Queene
And Englands Sun, her rayes were hardly seene
[...]
Yet she has past them both, and now is come
In triumph, to her Vote-condemned home.
And after her Eclipse, with fresher light
Expells those Melancholy clouds of Night
Which had ore-spread our soules.

(Francis Finch, ‘Our Moone hath been Elips’d’, ll. 1–4, 9–13)

Printed by Henry Hall, 1643) [Wing U177], ‘enlarged and much amended (the former Edition being but suddenly thought upon)’, Sig. A2v.

⁶¹ Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 26, fol. 143r, ll. 16–18.

Finch is unusual in the volume in his optimism that ‘fresher light’ attends the Queen. The Royal planets light the world in tandem, but both are necessary for the astronomical structure to function properly.⁶² Copernican concepts are mapped onto pastoral and neo-platonic topoi of unity and binary harmony familiar from the 1630s. Henrietta Maria, ‘Queen of Light’ (John Beesley, ‘Great Luminary of our Clouded Spheare’, l. 53) is constantly bringing illumination to the darkened country:

Great Luminary of our Clouded Spheare,
 In long Night of Your Absence did appeare
 Prodigious works of Darknesse, men grew blind
 Not only in their Eyes but in their mind:
 (‘Great Luminary of our Clouded Spheare’, ll. 1–4)

The sundering of the astronomical system has led to the present spiritual and social darkness. Beesley tells of the awful chaos caused by the breaking apart of the divinely appointed universe. Men ‘Walk’t raving in their Dreames’ (l. 5) during this ‘Eclipse of Sense and Reason’ (l. 20). E. Gayton describes the treasonous rebels as ‘Spawne of Night’, inhuman progeny of darkness (‘Fall back you sonnes of Treason’, l. 1).

The metaphorical darkness creates linguistic confusion: ‘In this State-Babell, or Theomachie,/ We nick-name all things. Truth it selfe’s a Lie; (Great Luminary of our clouded Spheare’, l. 13–4). The imposition of an institutional definition of a new and treasonous state wittingly creates a new Babel which inverts meaning and attacks the concrete truth of tradition. The familiar becomes strange, and the family unit is disrupted: ‘Spies, Scouts, and Traitors now adayes to in / The shape of dearest Friends, and nearest Kin./ Each man is least of that he seemes, or tells’ (ll. 30–32). This is the daily reality of

⁶² Peter Wyche’s poem ‘If Persians used fondly to adore’ combines the eclipse metaphor with the language of the hemispheres familiar from more polemic poetry: ‘What shall we doe, when light doth reappeare,/ Within the limits of our Hemispheare’ (ll. 5–6).

life in a garrison town, as well as applying to the country as a whole.⁶³ Beesley's poem, and many of those within the volume, give brief glimpses or insights into the paranoid and dangerous state of Oxford at this time.⁶⁴ What had been previously safe and known has attained an extra dimension, an unpleasant inflection. The collection as a whole is conscious of this nuanced shift in meaning, as awareness of past textual tradition and practice is nervously mapped onto the present situation. Semiotic systems are shifted and changed, and the physical action and practice of writing becomes politically charged:

Arrested Packets are ript up and read
All backwards. A. perhaps must now be Z.
Or in their Analyticks C. is D.
And this must meane dreadfull State Mystery.
Dove houses must be searcht, least they bring home
Some other winges, and pennes besides their owne.
The innocent white Paper they suspect
As soil'd with guilty Letters, as infect
With Onyons, Lemmons, or salt Ammonick
Milke, Egges, or Allum, some such Magick trick
To charme the eyes of Saints.

(‘Great Luminary of our Clouded Spheare’, ll. 39–49)

To the Parliamentary reader, even the medium of inscription is suspect. The written word and even the deploying of certain characters becomes a subversive action.⁶⁵ Letters, and by conflation all writings in support of the King, can be personified as traitorous. They attain a physical status as representatives of the King; so much so that they can be incarcerated and

⁶³ Henry Birkhead expresses similarly domestic concerns: ‘Welcome to dangers, to Alarms,/ (Best Musick to your Epicæne sense)/ And to Your Consort lockt in Armes,/ Imprison'd in His owne defence:’, ‘Till with Your selfe’, ll. 25–28.

⁶⁴ Compare also Hausted's *Ad Populum: Or, a Lecture to the People* ([Oxford] Printed in the Yeare 1644) [TT: E49 (2)]:

How much the better are ye now, I pray,
That yee with much expence have learn'd to say
Quarter for Lodging, and can wisely well
What Carbine signifies, and Granado, tell?

(ll. 70–73).

⁶⁵ Cipher was used extensively by the Royalists: there are six different keys in BL, Add. MS 33596, and most of the Council of war used it for their correspondence, some more assiduously than others. For secrecy,

'Arrested', legally held and defined. Spies and self-appointed censors rupture the private boundaries of letters and writings, violating their space to be read in a particularly Parliamentary fashion, 'All backwards'. Individual characters and whole works are deliberately misinterpreted by the invasive Parliamentary reader. The war has permitted this misreading and disrupting of meaning, this 'State-Babel'. The passage highlights the invasive and divisive methods of Parliamentary readings. They presume that dissident writings 'soil' and 'infect' the chaste page; this discourse of disgust constructs Royalist writing as antisocial, marginalised and physically other. The 'Lemmons, or salt Ammonick' which 'infect' the page also refers to invisible ink, and the notion of the page having another level of meaning is seen as a 'Magick trick'; self-evidently (to Beesley), the text is innocent and not loaded with alternative meaning. Royalist readers did not publicly acknowledge the possibility of multivalent readings and interpretations; these are religious illusions, misleading and false. The text and the page have one straightforward meaning and their status is inviolate. Self-reflexively the University collection becomes an exercise in righting linguistic confusion, in reasserting the values of hierarchically ascribed and divinely appointed semiotics and grammatical rules.

4.5 Panegyric and engagement

Throughout the volume the very form and status of the poems as University verse are upgraded and the tone and content of the pastoral becomes more overtly engaged and challenging than had previously been the case.⁶⁶ Most self-consciously innovative is T.

conspiracy and Royalist writing see Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

⁶⁶ I. Goad's pastoral dialogue 'Pan Blesse us' bemoans the 'banefull day [...] when Fleece on fleece shall prey!' (ll. 43–4).

Pierce's 'So Titan from his Easterne bed' which privileges subordinate prepositions and conjunctions whilst deferring the main verb of individual lines, creating an instability and fragility which is resolved by an assured, balanced final couplet and the appearance of the Queen. The volume celebrates a new dawn with a sense of the progressive rather than cyclical nature of that event. Beesley's poem also gestures toward an audience other than that addressed (the Queen), and illustrates the engagement which pervades the collection. However, this engagement is not often dialectic, but rather concerned with a self-reflexive shifting and changing that is concerned with the nature of writing Royalist verse rather than answering or attacking Puritan topoi or constructions:

Wee are not taken yet, nor (as we see)
Are like to be, Great Queen, unlesse by Thee.
Yet you will find (the World hath been so tost)
The Musick of our Academy lost.
For since the State in Civill Warres hath burn'd
Our silken Hoods have all to Scarfes been turn'd.
'Mongst us there's scarce a verse, nay line, without
Charge to the Front, to th'Reere, and Face about.
This Metamorphosis is strange, but we
Embrace it, as we would our Liberty
Extorted from us by those hands, that steale
(If you'l beleeve 'em) for the Common weale.
So Epidemicall are their ills, that Art
It selfe hath suffer'd more then th'Twentieth Part:

(William Harding, 'Wee are not taken yet', ll. 1–14)

Harding establishes the physical nature of being at war, but also questions the 'strange Metamorphosis' which has led to the increasing political engagement of University and Royalist verse: "'Mongst us there's scarce a verse, nay line, without/ Charge to the Front, to th'Reere, and Face about' (ll. 7–8). The ambivalence of Harding's poem sits awkwardly if compared with the most ardently engaged of the collection, Henry Harrington's 'For Convoy were I Poet'. Harrington signs himself 'Fellow of All Soules, and Captaine of a Company of Foot-Souldiers', and describes his poem as a 'flagd-barefooted-cripled

Company' (l.10). The verse has a physical manifestation, fighting on behalf of the King.

His poem is the most conscious expression of the scholar-poet as soldier, and makes jokes about the very structure of verse: 'Verses are Files of Foot' (l. 7) quibbles on metrics but also enlists poetry wholesale into the battle.

However, Harding's verse is still committed to an engaged poetics. He sites his verse firmly within the University and previous University verse practice: poets of the 'Academy' change the 'silken Hoods', which delineate them scholars, for the rough colours of the army.⁶⁷ Their external appearances signify a more lasting internal change. In the opening couplet 'yet' refers to a state not reached so far but potentially obtainable through the grace of the Queen. 'Wee' encompasses both the Royalist side and the Oxford poets who have contributed to the volume. Harding seems to be ratifying the hopes of several other poets that Henrietta Maria's return heralds a cultural rekindling. 'We're Schollers once again' rejoices W. Creed, happy that the time when they 'no other language spoke/ Then Warre's rough accents' has seemingly passed ('So in an instant sprung', ll. 6, 10–11). However, Harding's second couplet immediately reverses the ambivalent 'yet' to curtail the possibility of a return to the prelapsarian innocence of the 1630s: 'Yet you will find (the World hath been so tost)/ The Musick of our Academy lost'. The clean logic of the full couplet rhyme closes the sentiment off from ambiguity. Creed's poem acknowledges that all joy at the Queen's return is still tempered by a latent consciousness of the language, both linguistic and visual, of war. That said, he still feels that praise is necessary and looks

⁶⁷ The Royalist preparations of the University are related in a letter from John Whistler and John Smith, members for Oxford exiled to Abingdon, to William Lenthall, 'after this many days together the Scholars and privileged persons with such weapons as they had, trained up and down the streets, in Christ Church College quadrangle, and other College quadrangles, and kept no good rule either by night or day', 3 September 1642, *HMC* (Portland I), p. 57. The letter stresses that the members of these groups are the elite of the city, troublesome and undisciplined. The Scholars finally formed their own company, and drilled on Christ Church meadow.

towards a new beginning.⁶⁸ Both Creed and Harding situate their poems firmly within the University, in terms of poetic genealogy and physical reality. Their approaches and conclusions are different, and this problematises a response to the volume as a whole. However, what they both share is a sense of themselves as scholar-poets, a concept of the newly engaged poetics of the early 1640s, and, most importantly, a conviction that Oxford is a relevant locus for political and public verse.

Other poets marry the new martial voice of poetry with the idealised neo-platonic character of 1630s modes in more awkward style. John Dale's poem 'The Muses heretofore' sets the new collection in its tradition and highlights the shift in emphasis and content of the war poems:

The Muses heretofore were wont to wait
 Vpon you at your Childbed, to relate
 The dangers there o're pass'd, no thought was then
 We should have had such matter for the Penne
 Your Travailes then were shorter, in the space
 Of a small month we saw your Princely face,
 (ll. 1–6)

Dale refers to the earlier University volumes celebrating the birth of Henrietta Maria's children, establishing his poem within that panegyric tradition. The verse is conscious of the changes imposed upon loyalist poetics and traces this shift. By emphasising what had previously (or 'heretofore') been the model for praise poetry the poet highlights the gradual movement toward a different style and stance. Other poets choose to celebrate rather the return of the hitherto 'silent' Muses'.⁶⁹ The notion of Henrietta Maria's maternal agency,

⁶⁸ This sense of a renewed poetic hope is expressed neatly in Goad's 'Pan Blesse us' which celebrates in pastoral dialogue the return of the Queen: 'See where a traine/ (Will make me take up Pipe again,)/ Encompassing with goodlyest dresse/ The most glorious Shephardesse' (ll. 49–52). Henrietta Maria returns in masqueing costume to inspire and lead the poets back to a creative Arcadia.

⁶⁹ 'Our Muses are return'd (Great Queen) with You,/ Your Travails give them Breath and Motion too;/ Since Your departure they were silent all,/ Or weeping Dirges for their funerall', Thomas Lamplugh, 'Our Muses are return'd', ll. 1–4.

which had been so important in earlier volumes, is here reflected upon as something potentially harmful. Dale extends the childbirth metaphor, comparing her 'Enemies' then, which were 'Pangs and Groanes/ Which breeding caus'd within Your Royall Bones' (ll. 9–10), with the malicious 'Rout' which threaten her now.⁷⁰ Parliamentary opposition is likened to the illnesses attending pregnancy. It is part of the body politic that must be purged or endured; the Queen's innate virtue and divinity will protect her from these labour pains until her arrival gives birth to a new state and she becomes, as Strode later describes her, 'Mother of [the] Country' (Sig. D3r).⁷¹ Dale's verse reworks the ritualised praise normally associated with the birth of a new member of the Royal family to fit this new conception.

Throughout the poem, Dale establishes the ritualisation of conflict. Henrietta Maria's courtly entourage becomes indistinguishable from her conquests. Her return turns war into a ceremonial or ritual, a stately progress across the country toward Oxford:

Your sweet celestiall Voice doth farre more cheare
 Then any Trumpet, and forbids all feare.
 Your Maids of honour with their glorious fight
 Millions of Preaching Citty dames will fright.
 Each beauty takes a Pris'ner, and what hand
 Can hurt those Starrs which doe the hearts command?
 Newes of your Victories, like Pages, came
 Before your Person, to proclaime your fame.
 To take a Towne by th'way it was your sport,
 Nor was your prosp'rous Iourney hindred for't.
 (ll. 25–34)

⁷⁰ For literary treatments and attitudes to childbirth and miscarriage in the period see Raymond A. Anselment, *The Realms of Apollo: Literature and Healing in Seventeenth Century England* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1995), especially pp. 49–91.

⁷¹ Her return is elsewhere compared to that of Astræa, the last God to leave the earth: 'So when Astræa shall come back to Earth,/ The ruin'd World expects another Birth./ And this disord'red Frame, lookes to inherit/ Forme from her Beauty, Vigor from her Spirit' (Barker, 'Go Burne some Rebell Towne', ll. 13–16). The verse figures the Queen as mother and healer of her country, but also foresees a return to the glory of Elizabeth's reign. Elizabeth is important both in her panegyric manifestation, as Astræa, and by extension in her role as institutional female ancestor of the present Queen.

War is a 'glorious' undertaking, and the battle itself becomes an idealised 'sport' or pastime; almost a masque to divert the court.⁷² Comparable is the closing progress of I. Goad's pastoral dialogue 'Pan Blesse us', in which the Queen appears as if dressed for the *Shepherd's Paradise*:

You may descry a Crowne and Crooke,
That Gold, this Silver: then I see
Our wood and Flockes shall settled be.
Welcome from Low-country Land
To once-fairer Englands Strand.
(ll. 52–56)

Goad's attendant shepherds emphasise that the Queen's return will not transform the country or provoke a return to the golden age when England was 'fairer'; the transcendent power of the court entertainment has been diminished. The outdated pastoral allegory can only comment upon what has once been and will not return.

In Dale's poem pages and Maids of honour attend the triumphant and 'prosp'rous' apotheosis toward the King and court. Despite the power attributed them, women can only fight with traditional weapons: grace and beauty. The generic expressions of the wounded lover are redeployed in a different, although still figurative, setting ('Each Beauty takes a Pris'ner'). Puritan women are 'Dames', ugly old wenches ignorant of all but preaching. Whilst this line satirises all female discourse emanating from Parliamentarian sources, it specifically picks up on the extensive public criticism of Lady Waller. By contrast, members of the Queen's entourage are young and pretty (if ambivalently 'maids').⁷³

⁷² See also Creed's 'So in an instant sprung': "'tis to you/ We owe the sad Scenes change [...] Conquest attends your Presence', ll. 27–32.

⁷³ An anonymous London pamphlet claimed that court women were 'errant Ladies, the Trophees of your Oxford victories' where the Amazonian Lady Waller was 'a Conqueresse [...] is it not an honour to conquer?', *The Oxford Character of the London Diurnall Examined and Answered* ([London, 1645]) [TT: E274 (32)], p. 6.

Continuing to establish his role as a scholar-poet, Dale appropriates military metaphors for his poem which mix pastoral fantasy and panegyric with a new sense of engagement:

The Birth of Princes the chiefe Theme hath beene
 For Scholars, now, the safety of the Queene.
 We now doe runne to meet You in the Field
 Wherein we see your Fanne turn'd to a Shield
 Vpon Your Cheekes the Royall Colours lye,
 The Rose and Lilly in full Majesty,
 Your lovely Look Commander is in Chiefe
 Of all the Hearts; your Hands powre out releefe
 To needy Souldiers; 'mongst your Femall train
 The Lady Money followes, to sustaine
 Your Army with full store, which was not got
 By th'publike Faith, that handsome sugred plot.

(ll. 13–24)

The rhetorical model of poetry has shifted from celebrating birth to idealising military engagement. The scholar-poets, rushing to meet the Queen with praise, discover that as a Muse she has become distinctly militarised.⁷⁴ The work she now inspires is martial and situated on the battlefield. The Queen's complexion exhibits her innate nobility, with the rose and lilies demonstrating her connection of the Anglo-French monarchies. She becomes a physical site of allegiance, as symbolically important as the Royal colours themselves. The trappings of monarchy and femininity are turned to martial use, protecting her subjects.⁷⁵ A line in the following poem, Richard Steevenson's 'What? Scholars digge' uses

⁷⁴ Her warrior garb does owe something to William Davenant's 1640 masque *Salmacida Spolia* in which the Queen and her ladies descend to reward the King for 'reducing the threatening storm into the following calm' dressed 'in Amazonian habits of carnation, embroidered with silver, with plumed helms, baldrics with antique swords hanging by their sides, all as rich as might be', *Court Masques: Jacobean and Caroline Entertainments*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), ll. 18, 352–55.

⁷⁵ Interestingly, the two external examples of Henrietta Maria's new power, make-up and fans, are those traditionally associated with disguise, covert asides and subterfuge. See for instance Cowley's description in *The Civil War of Rebellion*, 'full of painted Grace', ll, 404. These ambiguous and problematised motifs are reclaimed and represented as indexes of symbolic strength. However, the acceptance of Henrietta Maria's femininity is still mediated by her construction by male poets who have shaped her to their own purpose. Unlike Weaver's lover/gorgon discussed in Chapter Five, her identity and power seems to be something the male poet can control or claim. For her feminised external power, compare Jasper Mayne's poem 'Could I report' in *Verses on the death of Bevill Grenvill*: 'O what a Terrour issued from thy Looke/ Which fought as

a similar model: 'Each Maid of Honour's Fanne's become a Shield/ Indeed no honour like to that o'th field' (ll. 17–18). This is a striking instance of poets in the volume utilising similar tropes and motifs to different effect. Dale fetishises the Queen's idealised role as protector and inspiration, her courtly protection or exterior now changed to armour.

Steevenson instead highlights how all servants of the Queen, from courtly maidservants to poets, must engage with the enemy and use their natural tools in that fight. What outwardly seems empty of purpose and simply beautiful must be turned to practical use in the Queen's defence.

Both poets engage with the Parliamentary criticisms of Henrietta Maria's sojourn on the continent. This is a motif of the majority of the volume. Steevenson celebrates the 'Queene's Army' (l. 16), highlighting Henrietta Maria's agency in the physical running of the conflict and her inspirational role. Rather than try to excuse her fund-raising, Dale paints it as a charitable act, giving the Queen a faintly religious aura as the dispenser of peace, grace and 'releefe' (l. 20). Indeed, many of the poems in the volume seem to bring an underlying Catholic discourse to their work. Henrietta Maria attains the status and power of her divine namesake, bringing 'the chast Birth of a Victory' (J. Read, 'Welcome, from Tempests to a Calme', l. 18). They rework platonic Catholic virtues that had been commonly attributed to Henrietta Maria during the 1630s: her role as a mother, as an inspiration, as an intercessor or facilitator of reconciliation, as a leader to truth.⁷⁶ Various puritan critics had picked up on this representative association in their attacks on the

well as Thou [...] Thy unarm'd face shew'd dreadfull as our Lances,/ The foe felt new Artilleries from thy Glances', ll. 67–72.

⁷⁶ Erica Veevers examines the association of Henrietta Maria with the Virgin Mary in *Images of Love*, especially pp. 103–09. In particular she notes the relationship between platonic representations of the Queen and her Catholicism: 'The common element of Platonism in the Queen's love fashions and in her religion thus made it easy for contemporaries to pass from one to the other, and could lend a double significance to works based on its language and imagery', p. 109.

Queen, and their responses range from attacking the creeping papacy of Charles' court to the perceived impotence of the King within such a model. Prynne complained about the popish cult of the Virgin which claimed 'That all things are subject to the command of Mary, even God himselfe'.⁷⁷ The *Serenissimæ* poets take these criticisms and make them virtues, creating a martial Virgin crusading for the cause of justice and divine right, turning her religion into a trope of polemic significance.

4.6 Sir John Berkenhead

The connection between the public and panegyric modes of the volume is nowhere better illustrated than by the presence of Sir John Berkenhead's poem 'Now let them Vote, Declare, Contrive'.⁷⁸ Whilst a culturally engaged Fellow of All Souls and in Oxford regularly, Berkenhead had not contributed to any of the three volumes of epideictic panegyric verse produced by the University between 1640 and 1642, despite their increasing content of vernacular verse.⁷⁹ That his first publicly acknowledged work should be in a volume of Civil War praise poetry signifies the movement of broadside satire into a previously academic sphere. It also highlights the anachronistic nature of both the volume, and, to an extent, the monarchical harmony that has been seen as celebrated in other poems.⁸⁰ These panegyrics are politicised by the presence of Berkenhead's verse, which emphasises that the volume is not a simple poetic exercise in praise but a piece of

⁷⁷ *The Popish Royall Favourite*, quoted in Veevers, *Images of Love*, p. 108.

⁷⁸ The poem is signed 'Io. Berkenhead. Coll. Om. An. Socius.'

⁷⁹ He was a member of the Duppa circle of poets and wits that included William Cartwright, and in 1640 presented 'Thomas Stanley, translator of Anacreon and editor of Aeschylus, for incorporation in the University', P. W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead 1617–1679* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 24.

⁸⁰ 'The harmony lost during her [Henrietta Maria's] absence and the concord she returns recall the values celebrated in the court masques and inform some of the best poems', Anselment, 'The Oxford University Poets', p. 196; 'Her arrival seemed to some to mark the return of pre-war glories, as the manner of her welcome by the University recalled the Royal visit of 1636', Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 82.

propaganda. The text has status in terms of constructing a national identity and as part of the courtly war effort.

Berkenhead's poem celebrates the return of the Queen, but stands out in the volume by its difference in prosody, form, and method. Henrietta Maria is not addressed, rather her return is seen as striking fear into the Commons. Her idealised state is continually brought into a tension with a brutal reality, as 'Angells look'd downe and like'd it well,/ All but the Lower House and Hell' whose 'Feares exceed their Iealousies' (ll. 23–24; 11). Events of the war are regurgitated in an intentionally coarse ballad-verse, and the glory of the King and Queen only just shines through.⁸¹ Berkenhead's poem in microcosm illustrates the shift from the idealised neo-platonic of Court and University poetry of the late 1630s to the kind of unbalanced, polemic works produced in Oxford during the war: 'When Waller could but bleed and fret, / Then, then the Sacred Couple met' (ll. 41–42).⁸² The physicality of the war is compounded with an image of the transcendent union between King and Queen. The return of Henrietta Maria brings balance and harmony, and the royal couple are celebrated as 'this Great Best Paire' (l. 13). This is emphasised by the couplet rhyme, as seemingly unrelated concepts are bound together and seen to have an organic and mutually important relationship. The first three stanzas continually use techniques of doubling or inversion to make a point, and the couplet format emphasises a binary relationship. Where in other poems the couplet is used to bind the Royal pair, in this instance it merely serves to highlight the relationship between then and now, us and them, the intermingling of 1630s

⁸¹ 'The most notable thing about it is an adaptation of *Aulicus*' jeer at Farifax's flight from Leeds. This readiness to work satirical reflection into complimentary verses alone distinguishes the piece from the more conventional adulation of most of its companions', Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead*, p. 106. However, poets were influenced by newsbooks, and increasingly utilised their style as well as their information when composing verse, see Raymond, 'The Daily Muse'.

platonic panegyric with contemporary violence, the connection between the twin hemispheres of King and Parliament.

Edgehill was the locus of the greatest Royalist victory to date and had been culturally appropriated as a potent symbol of martial prowess.⁸³ Few of the poems in the volume consider the physicality of the meeting between the King and Queen. Of the arrival of Henrietta Maria at the battlefield, Berkenhead writes

Thou Honourd Mount, She grac'd thee more
Then all thy Blood and Spoyle before!
'Twas Conquest then, 'tis Triumph now,
(For which the Beast must bleed and bow)
(ll. 19–20).⁸⁴

Rather than presenting the ascending Henrietta Maria in an apotheosised or idealised state, Berkenhead draws out the destructive reality of the location.⁸⁵ In propaganda terms this emphasises the scale of the Royalist victory, but the blunt images attain a baroque and gory quality that quite subverts all poetic expectation and changes the verse model entirely.

Rather than a celebration of the 'restoration of cultural forms' or 'revivification' of earlier Caroline modes that have been seen to characterise the rest of the volume (Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 82), Berkenhead's poem emphasises the reconfiguration or

⁸² See, for instance, M. L. Donnelly on Cleveland: 'Cleveland's treatment of his subject consists of almost hysterical attempts to lay hold of the situation in language whose conventional meanings have been given the lie by the unnatural course of events', 'Caroline Royalist Panegyric', p. 172.

⁸³ In *The Civil War* Cowley portrays the meeting between Charles and his Queen as a renewal of the victory: 'In Keinton field they meete, at once they view,/ Their former victory and enjoy a New', I, 493–94. Both Cowley and Berkenhead emphasise the importance of the location in this meeting; the symbolic language of the Royal union is inflected by their presence on the victorious field.

⁸⁴ In the manuscript version (see below) the poem is given a title that confirms the site of the meeting as Edgehill, but in the printed text this information is interpolated by use of a marginal note to l. 17. The annotation recalls the overly interpretative format of *Mercurius Aulicus*.

⁸⁵ Compare, for instance, Cowley's description of the same scene: 'Looke, happy Mount, looke well for this is shee/ That toyld and travaild for thy victory./ Thy flourishing head to her with rev'ence bow,/ To her thow ow'st that Fame that crownes thee now', *The Civil War*, I, 501–04. The account also owes much and differs greatly to Denham's praise of Windsor in *Coopers Hill*: 'Than which no hill a nobler burthen beares [...] Nature this mount so fitly did advance,/ We might conclude, that nothing is by chance', quoted from the

remodelling of older tropes and formats. Importantly, he is not unusual in this; whilst his style and form stand out in the volume, his approach and engaged poetics do not.

The poet decries the new governmental institutions: '[Let them] Make a New Seale, New-England too,' (l. 4). Berkenhead identifies the antipodes of other Royalist verse as the experimental puritan colonies in America.⁸⁶ Parliament's attempts to forge a newly configured state are mocked and figured as a 'wild career' that will be stopped by the arrival of the Queen. Their institutional procedures are explicitly aligned with those of religious ceremony, as the pattern of the first line is mimicked in the third: 'Let them give Thankes, Lye, Fast, and Vow'. The religious, gender and social experiments of the Puritans are mocked: Fairfax's defeat is established by the fact that 'none but's Lady staid to fight' (l. 35).⁸⁷ The poem attains an urgency and narrative impetus during stanzas five to seven. Nine of eighteen lines begin 'When', and the whole section delineates the symbolic importance of the Queen to the war effort. The final lines of each block map the movement from the Queen's being 'nigh at hand' to 'come in sight' until her eventual meeting with Charles where she becomes part of 'the Sacred Couple'. Her movement toward Charles is the foundation (and the final line) of each stanza's martial endeavour: 'Eternall Grenville stood/ And stopt the gap up with his blood', Fairfax flies from the battlefield, Newcastle 'purg'd all the North' and Carnarvon fights with his keen blade 'and keener wit' (ll. 27–28,

'A' (Oxford, 1643) text in Brendan O Hehir, *Expans'd Hieroglyphicks: A Critical Edition of Sir John Denham's Coopers Hill* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), ll. 67–70.

⁸⁶ See in comparison Cowley's criticism of priests in *The Civil War*: 'Their sordid soules with dull rewards enflame,/ Large feasts, and larger Gifts and popular fame./ But sometimes shake the halter and the chaine,/ Shew them their Ilands, and new World againe', II, 590–3. The puritan colonies were mocked for their religious extremism, see *A New Wind-Mill, A New* (At Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1643) [TT: E249 (21)]: 'Our Wind-mills, you know, are framed in so perfect a crosse, as if they were erected in defiance of Reformation. To what purpose do wee banish the Crosse out of our Churches and Markets, if we allow it upon our City-wals, or in our fields: It is no marvell if our corne that is ground with so Idolatrous an engine, turne to no better nourishment, and serve only to feed wicked humors; I warrant you our Brethren in New-England admit of no such abomination', p. 1.

33–34, 32, 37–38). The war is fought by symbolic aristocratic figures, the Parliamentary pathetic and failing, the Royalist idealised and strong.⁸⁸

Despite the differences, however, Berkenhead's poem is very much part of the volume's overall discourse. He creates a progression for the Queen and casts the warring factions as physical actors in the drama she controls. By naming the players he reflects on their dual nature as symbols of good/evil but also as real figures who dance the masque of war. The arrival of the Queen brings harmony where there was discord, and heals the ruptured state. The 'Hell' to which the 'Lower House' is consigned echoes the state of *Coelum Britannicum* but also emphasises the role of dualities in Royalist discourse: their hell may only be constructed in relationship to the Royal heaven.

Evidence of a link between official Royalist cultural expression and what manuscript circulation or composition there was at Oxford can be found in a variant separate version of the poem, entitled 'Upon the meeting of the King & Queene upon Edge hill', in Bod, Ashmole MS 36–37 (bound together, fol. 1r). Berkenhead's biographer P.W. Thomas does not discuss the manuscript and it is not identified in Margaret Crum's *First-Line Index of English Poetry*. The text is neatly set out; close attention is paid to careful spacing, the margins are regular, the lineation conscious. The ballad format is emphasised through an indented final couplet in each stanza. The hand is clear and formal, suggesting a copy-text, although the emendation might indicate a script for coterie transmission. The text is at great odds with that printed.⁸⁹ Most of the variants indicate the presence of a copy-

⁸⁷ Compare Cowley's *The Puritan and the Papist*: 'Your Women preach too, and are like to bee/ The Whores of Babylon, as much as Shee [Joan of Arc]', ll. 197–98.

⁸⁸ Berkenhead uses Grenville as a bridge to the engaged and politicised volume of elegies on his death. The intertextual reference is another example of Berkenhead reaching beyond the physical boundaries of a printed text to inflect his verse and, by extension, the volume.

⁸⁹ The substantive syntactical variants are as follows: l. 9 *MOX* 'where now All are' / MS 'wherein are all are'; l. 13 *MOX* 'But though' / MS 'What, though'; l. 22 MS has no brackets and reads 'Beasts' rather than

text which suggests circulation of a limited form. In lines 9 and 33 the text is consciously emended. The variants might suggest that this is a draft copy of the poem. However, the volume was printed in haste and the verse commemorates something that had happened very recently, so it is more probable that this is a later version, either rewritten or corrupted by miscopying. It is tempting to hypothesise that the manuscript was an early draft submitted to be ratified by the Oxford Council or one of Berkenhead's collaborators on *Mercurius Aulicus*, but this is unlikely given the state of the document and the circumstances of the poem's composition. It is more likely that this text is a later version which had been circulated around Berkenhead's coterie and the Oxford poetic community. Few of the variants are greatly substantive, with the exception of line 44 where the change of possessive pronouns from 'Hee is her husband, she his wife' (MS) to 'Hee's the Husband, She the Wife' (*Serenissimæ*) marks a movement away from presenting an intermingled partnership of mutual ownership and harmony to a more static and emblematic relationship. Berkenhead's poem signifies that the volume and the poetic practices it deploys have a very important public function within the war effort. As the variant readings in the manuscript version show, poets were constructing a very particular notion of Royalty and identity. This was the textual creation of a Royalist identity, a particular readership. The following section will address the shifts in concepts of panegyric and the public implicit in the two texts which close the volume.

4.7 Strode's Speech and Lichfield's Poem: Panegyric Space and Engagement

'Beast'; l. 29 *MOX* 'durst not stand' / MS 'could not stand'; l. 32 *MOX* 'As in Nine dayes purg'd all the North,' / MS 'That in Nine daies he purg'd the North;'; l. 33 *MOX* 'When Fairfax vast perfidious force' / MS 'When Fairefax ^{vast} false pfideous force,'; l. 37–8 MS no brackets; l. 40 *MOX* 'Strook yesterday's Great Glorious blow,' / MS 'Stroke yesterday's soe glorious blowe?'; l. 42 *MOX* 'the sacred couple' / MS 'that'; l.

Serenissimæ ends with two different forms of the panegyric mode which both address the newly engaged space of such work as it has been established throughout the volume.

William Strode's speech of welcome to the Queen is printed after the main body of the poems, and the book is concluded by Leonard Lichfield's verse address to Henrietta Maria. These pieces are more overt than the previous works, particularly in their explicitly official function. Strode's oration links the loci and topoi of the University verse with the speeches being produced at court; it emphasises that both modes of praise are part of the same Royalist continuum. Previous volumes of epideictic verse had not included orations. It also emphasises the moment of the Queen's arrival which was the inspiration for the volume as a whole. Lichfield's poem articulates the obedience of the press to the monarchy and portrays panegyric homogeneity as part of a wider discourse of loyalty. Whilst such verses had commonly closed University volumes, this is differentiated by its polemic charge. For instance, the 'Printers Close' ending *Musarum Oxoniensum Charisteria* takes a more secondary position than that outlined in *Serenissimæ*: 'Your Priests their vowes have on this Altar payd;/ I doe but Echoe out what they have said' (ll. 5–6). Lichfield's verse establishes the primary importance of the Oxford court and press in the cultural mediation and construction of a Royalist identity. It illustrates clearly the purpose of the court in constructing a cultural and social identity for the loyalist subject. Both these texts reveal much about the questions of identity and loyalty which have been discussed throughout this Chapter.

Strode is identified as the 'Orator of the University', the public mouthpiece of the institution. His 'Speech made to the Queenes most Excellent Majesty' (Sig. D2v) is cast as

44 *MOX* 'That Hee's the Husband, She the Wife' / MS 'Hee is her husband, She his wife'; 1. 45 *MOX* 'That She seduc'd Him t'o save His Life' / MS 'That she seduc'd him sav'd his lyfe:'.

an official declamation welcoming the Queen. The specific moment of her arrival is celebrated and the volume given a context and significance. Strode's piece encapsulates and extends the poems which have come before. It polemically creates a role for panegyric verse and generic reworking. Strode's identity as a poet is important; his dual nature as official spokesperson and University versifier allows his speech to establish a role for poetry in the war effort. The text is a major public contribution to the discourse of speechifying identified in Chapter Three. As such it exemplifies many aspects of that phenomenon, but provides its own reading of the newly minted genre. It complements Strode's earlier speech of welcome to the King, which had been printed in 1642.⁹⁰

The speech is fluid and expansive, with lengthy sub-clauses building on each other. The punctuation is strong and divides phrases sharply, but the first full stop is 20 lines in. This reminds the reader that the speech is intended to be heard; it is punctuated for delivery aloud rather than effect on the page. The status of the reader is demoted to that of an audience rather than an interlocutor. This technique also creates a sense of gradual movement towards an eventual stability. Rhetorically the piece relies on a layered repetition which progresses towards the Queen's eventual apotheosis as the beloved of 'every thing that hath Breath or sound' (Sig. D3v). Henrietta Maria's absence from 'that Company [...] which you most Lov'd' was 'so barbarously forc'd with danger, persued by Calumnies, so patiently born' (Sig. D2v). The repetition of 'so' allows her grace to replace or triumph over the barbarity of her enemies, as the phrase is reworked. Her patience is an early indication of her divinely appointed status and another echo of the Virgin in

⁹⁰ *The Kings Maiesties Speech, As It was delivered the second of November before the University and City of Oxford. Together With a gratulatory Replication expressed by that learned Man Doctor William Strode* (First printed at Oxford, and now re-printed at London, 1642) [Wing C2778].

constructions of the Queen.⁹¹ Later in the speech this resolute virtue becomes a political stance, the dialectic opposite of the savage Parliamentary troops: ‘for how much greater Your vertue, ‘tis with so much the fiercer malignity aimed at, and with so much more prevalent Grace defended’ (Sig. D3v).⁹² The actuality of Henrietta Maria’s physical movement from exile is given a religious inflection, as the orator describes her ‘second coming’ (Sig. D3v). Strode utilises a charged Parliamentarian diction to justify Henrietta Maria’s sojourn in Europe; he describes the Queen ‘sequestering your selfe from the Armes of Your Royall Husband’ (Sig. D2v). Unlike several of the poems in the volume which engage directly with Parliamentarian criticism of her fundraising, Strode idealises the Queen’s mission: she leaves Charles in order to ‘furnish His Hands with strength, to send him the sinewes of *Mars* for the *Venus*-like Brests which you carried hence’ (Sigs. D2v–D3r). Henrietta Maria’s role was to exchange the feminine and maternal for the masculine and warlike. The Royal couple are apotheosised and attain the characteristics of classical gods. They achieve a transcendence apart from the physical reality of the war which sits awkwardly with the engagement of the preceding poems.

The speech conceives of a national Royalism constructed through representation and a fidelity to the Queen. Strode emphasises the importance of the image in Royalist identity: ‘to greet your most desired Presence; which, in beholding your Picture, we longd

⁹¹ The speech echoes several of the poems in *Serenissimæ*. Strode opens the text by claiming that ‘our Lips [are] overflowing to God in Thankes’, deploying the water and river metaphors used extensively throughout the volume. As James Loxley notes, he also uses the rhetorical method of ‘redescription’ which is deployed by other poets, particularly Mayne, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 113.

⁹² Strode throughout uses the techniques of dialectical inversion to establish the justness of his cause. He foresees an end to the conflict now that there are ‘More of every kind for us, then against us; more Angells then Divells, more true Hearts then perjur’d Consciences, more Prayers then Blasphemers, more Joy then Envy, more Prayers then Curses, at length more Victories then Combats’, Sig. D3v.

for, and in beholding Your Person, we are ready to dye for' (Sig. D3r).⁹³ Strode acknowledges that the Royal person is most important in terms of loyalty, but argues that artistic representation of the Queen can encourage obedience and boost morale. The conceptual movement from idealised representation to physical reality is a piece of machinery which introduces the body of the Queen to her court, blurring the distinction between stage and audience or public and private in a fashion reminiscent of the masque.⁹⁴ Her progress toward Oxford is celebrated as the return of stability and harmony: 'You have left behind you Victory in the North; You find it spreading in the South; and Victory from the West hath been seasonably stayed till this poynt, as ordain'd to salute your approach, and celebrate Your entertainment' (Sig D3r).⁹⁵ Tactfully leaving out the Parliamentary strongholds in the East, Strode conceives of victory attending the Queen's movement south. Decisive conflicts have been specially staged for Henrietta Maria's benefit, and the war itself is reconfigured as an entertainment. The arrival of the Queen heralds the movement from antimasque to peace and revelry, the renewal of harmony and stability defeating the lords of misrule and confusion.⁹⁶

⁹³ The connection between Royal image and obedience was established early in the war. There is an engraving of Charles opposite the title-page of *Military Orders, and Articles, Established by His Maiestie, For the better Ordering and Government of his Maiesties Armie* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University [1642]) [Wing C2495]. The work contains 'the Oath which every souldier is to take' (title-page). The engraving is a standard Augustan heroic pose of the armoured King on horseback. London and in particular Westminster Abbey appear in the background.

⁹⁴ For the dissolution of the barrier between monarch/ masquer and court/ audience see Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1975) and Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987), pp. 179–80.

⁹⁵ This movement is replicated in Gayton's poem 'Fall back you sonnes of Treason': 'Here Eagle-wayes thy Victories doe Fly/ The West, and North is talk'd in every Mouth,/ We must salute Thee now the Queene o'th South', ll. 18–20. National identity is mapped onto compass-points which signify particular areas of the country.

⁹⁶ This is reflected throughout the volume, for instance Gayton's verse commands 'Fall back you sonnes of Treason, Spawne of Night,/ (Who bold, but vainly have advanc'd a Might/ 'Gainst heavenly Pow'rs) be chas'd like mists away,/ Dispers'd before Her MAJESTIES Array/ Shee's come. How could the Land but soone obey?', 'Fall back you sonnes of Treason', ll. 1–5.

At a later point this vision of the returning Queen becomes a description of a masque-like entrance: 'We behold a strong Hoast of Men in Your attendance below, and with other eyes a stronger Hoast of Angells hovering above, under Gods ordering' (Sig. D3v). The Royal marriage is 'renew'd' and 'all the Spectators are as joyfull Now, as Then' (Sig. D3v). The Queen's body is again the nexus of obedience and national identity, as 'a union of the Rose & Lillies springs a fresh on Your cheeks' (Sig. D3v). This echoing of Dale's earlier poem highlights a profound difference in approach, even though both pieces celebrate the joining of the pastoral and the martial. Dale's image of the Queen is revelatory, a new ideal for the new situation. Strode situates himself firmly along a continuum, assured that Henrietta Maria's exile has been a temporary hiccup. He is careful to emphasise the similarity between 'now, as Then', and highlights the glow returning 'a fresh' to the Queen's cheek.

Throughout the volume poems had emphasised the residual importance of court poems and the masque to a construction of Royalist identity, and in particular the physical staging of such entertainments. The poets take from the masque a consciousness that the court is the central focus of the nation. They also create an illusion of power; within the space or boundaries created by the poems the reader becomes a spectator, observing the drama that unfolds with the precision and ritual of a scripted performance. Allegiance and loyalty becomes site-specific, and texts take on a particular meaning depending on where they originated or the places they are associated with. Whilst Strode's speech has nothing materially to site it in a time or place, apart from its presumed occasion, its positioning at the end of a volume of panegyric verse gives it a conceptual location. It is a product of the University, that idealised microcosm of the ordered state. The speech marks the overlap between the court poets and the court orators. The panegyric modes, in speech and poem,

are integrated into a single volume. Both orator and poet share a similar discourse. Strode's speech emphasises the performative and public roots of the panegyric mode that is reflected in Stapleton's translation of Pliny. This in turn inflects the poetics of the volume, suggesting that they have a very public function and nature. Poetry is assimilated into the ranks of Royalist expression.

Leonard Lichfield's poem 'THE PRINTERS CONCLUSION To Her MAJESTIE' that ends the volume indicates that the King had become interested in the public and propaganda value of print during the first months of skirmishing:

That Traytrous and Vnletterd Crew
Who fight 'gainst Heaven, Their Sovereigne, and You,
Have not yet stain'd my Hallowed FOUNTS, The spring
Must needs be Cleare that issues from the King.
Presses of Old, as Pens, did but incite
Others to Valour, this It Selfe did fight:
In Ranks and Files these Letters Marshall'd stood
On Dismall Edg-Hill-day, yet 'twas not blood
They boaded by their Black, for Peace they sought,
And Teem'd with Pardons while the Rebels fought,
(ll. 1–10)

The Pardons referred to are probably *His Majesties Offer of Pardon to the Rebels now in Armes against Him*, and *His Majesties gracious Proclamation to the Cittyes of London and Westminster*, both published by Lichfield on the march from Edgehill to Oxford. The mere presence of an official press with the King indicates an understanding for the need to publicise Proclamations to the wide audience attained by print. The press is seen as an integral part of the war, and is a conduit for the King's words to spread throughout the nation. Ideological transmission depends on control of a press, and this in turn is crucial to the maintenance of monarchical power. The thesis presented in Chapter Two, that all works emanating from Lichfield's press are in part ideologically in thrall or service to the King, is

clearly demonstrated here: 'The Spring/ Must needs be Cleare that issues from the King'.⁹⁷

The press has a 'Hallowed' function in voicing the opinions and commands of the monarch.

The ignorant enemy will be corrected through material published by the printer to an ancient and eminent, as well as pious, University. Lichfield identifies himself as the King's 'spring' or fountain, facilitating the issue of loyal and hallowed texts, but importantly suggesting that Charles is their source.⁹⁸ Texts published by Lichfield would be official Commissioners for the King, mediating and representing his thoughts and decisions. This then would inflect all work published by Lichfield; the fact that this poem ends a volume of poetry suggests that all Royalist expression mediated through Lichfield's official press bore to a greater or lesser extent the imprint of the King and his establishment. In extension it could be argued, that, as Proclamations and Warrants published from court were representatives of the King, being his words and commands, so in some ways all Royalist texts were representing Charles. The printing press replaced the Heralds in voicing Charles.

Lichfield's poem draws attention to the function of the volume as a piece of courtly propaganda; as much as a 'Pardon' or 'Commission of Array' (l. 12), the poems in this text are in service to the King. They use his language, his type, and are expressions of loyalty and praise. Letters, the physical signs of language, which had been problematised in Beesley's earlier poem, become resoundingly loyal, arranging themselves to fight for the King at Edgehill. Language itself is conscripted and becomes political and combative. In

⁹⁷ The same image is used by an anonymous letter-pamphlet: 'I am confident, I am so well inform'd, that what I shall say is come to mee by very good Conduit pipes, though I had it not from the Spring head', *A Letter from a Scholler in Oxfordshire to his Unkle a Merchant in Broadstreet* (Printed in the Yeare 1642) [Wing L1436], p. 3.

⁹⁸ An anonymous poem written just after the King's execution figures him in a similar fashion: 'As an obstructed fountains head/ Cuts of ye entayle from ye streams/ Soe brooks are diminished:/ Honr, & beauty are but dreams/ Since Charles & Mary lost their beames;', Harvard, Eng. MS 1356, fol. 51v. The poem utilises the sun-King imagery deployed by Oxford poets and propagandists throughout the 1640s, although to

line with the Oxford propaganda disseminated by *Mercurius Aulicus* and John Taylor's pamphlets, the proof of Parliament's 'Traytrous' nature is their lack of education.⁹⁹ They are an 'Unlettered Crew', an ill-educated mass who presume to rebel against divine law and hierarchical structure.¹⁰⁰ They also lack a language, since the only true linguistic system is that of loyalty and obedience to the monarch. Parliamentarian attempts to reconfigure the state are expressed linguistically: for instance, the 'monstrous Creature' that is clerk to the Parliamentarian Committee which imprisons the anonymous author of *The Cambridge Royallist Imprisoned* is described as a 'Mooneling' who inhabits a 'Mad Wildernesse of Non-sence'.¹⁰¹ He is a lunatic secretary, and his role as Parliamentarian licenser inflects all documents printed in London with his madness. In Lichfield's poem, such destruction is expressed in line 19, 'More confused Nonsense', which has no rhyme and creates an odd number of lines. This is securely fastened within the firmly rhymed poem which opens and closes with the same couplet rhyme ('Crew/ You'). The lack of a chime for 'Nonsense' emphasises that London's print culture is at odds with normality, an anomaly that has

less optimistic effect; later in the cycle of poems post-regicide England is described as 'this sad solstice of ye Kings' and undergoing 'a generall eclipse', fol. 51v.

⁹⁹ See James Hunt's *Spirituell Verses and Prose* (London: Printed for J. H., 1643) [TT: E85 (22)], which was dedicated to 'the most Honourable and High Court of Parliament', for an instance of a London writer refuting accusations of ignorance with a counter charge of elitism: 'For now God of his great power (all people shall see)/ That he doth not tie himself to the art of schollership which the Clergie have been taught in the University/ For there is no man can be a true and sound Interpreter of Gods Word,/ But God must give him a powerfull two-edged sword', p. 3. Hunt uses a binary model in which the godly are 'Angels of Light' and the Royalist opposition 'Angels of Darkness', p. 1. However, in contrast to the Royalist poets discussed, this opposition does not imply an awkward relationship but a process of negation in which Christ will 'conquer the beast and all his darke angels', p. 1.

¹⁰⁰ Satire of the perceived ignorance of the Parliamentary supporters became mapped onto University institutions and academic practices. University College, MS MA30/3/MS/69 is a 1647 Latin parody of a Visitation document entitled 'Per Visitatores'. The notice decreed that all disputation in the Schools be in English so that members of the (by now largely Puritan) New Inn Hall and Magdalen Hall can understand them. The text terms the Visitors 'Vitiosus-Cancellarius, Insipidisimi Procuratores, Indoctissimi Doctores', punningly mistranslating their title to suggest that they are 'full of vice'. My thanks to Robin Darwall-Smith, Archivist of University College, for discussion of this document.

¹⁰¹ *The Cambridge Royallist Imprisoned* ([1643]) [TT: E62 (15)], ll. 111, 115.

challenged by the smooth lines of obedience. Secondly, such works that are published from London can find no natural reflection or echo.

Lichfield notes a shift in the purpose of printed material; where presses 'of Old' merely encouraged noble acts, this engages with and battles the King's enemies for him. The public domain becomes an important nexus for conflict and engagement. The poet emphasises the physicality of print, dwelling on the black border reserved for elegies or sermons, and the physical arrangement of the type 'In Ranks and Files' which makes up the hierarchical and structured Royalist language. Print inhabits both metaphorical and material space. On the page it is 'Black' type, arranged into loyal sentences. Yet it also has a metaphorical presence and value in combat or on the battlefield. Both these spaces are mediated by the press, and so ultimately, the King. Pamphlets, proclamations and poems are the new infantry, confounding the 'Nonsense' issued by 'That Babel London' (ll. 18–19). As has been argued above, the productions of the press consciously strove to create a structured public space for obedience.

Lichfield ends on a decidedly theatrical note describing the press as 'now an Ida to discover You' (l. 23). Ida was the mountain from which Zeus watched the Trojan Wars, and the birthplace of Paris. Both associations indicate that the press has presented the vision and the reality of Henrietta Maria to the King for his pleasure. Their union transcends the physicality of print. There is even a faint hint that London may fall as Troy before it. The ambiguity of 'discover' is emphasised by the punning prosody: Ida was also home to the Idaean Dactyls, magical smiths. The discovery or unveiling of the Queen ruptures the iambic line with a dactylic stress as the press magically presents her to the King. She has been safely brought to Royalist and idealised space; the movement has something of theatrical machinery to it, one of Inigo Jones' set-pieces created in print. The press takes

over from Jones, however, as the foremost creator of theatrical space, the orchestrator of the court.

Lichfield's verse articulates the active role of the printing presses in constructing and expressing a Royalist identity. The close relationship between the censor and the author, and the official control of the material means of publication, meant that texts produced from the Oxford court were expressions of an officially sanctioned Royalism which was predicated upon hierarchical structures of identity and loyalty. These hierarchies were in turn based upon hegemonic notions of authority and the absolute space of monarchy which had been established by Charles and his court through political writings and institutional documents. The poems analysed here illustrate in microcosm the cultural reaction to and poetic reception of this polemically constructed identity. They participated in the construction of a Royalist reader, a subject governed by particular concepts of identity and action.

4.8 Conclusion

The poems in this volume show the outlining of an engaged discourse but highlight that this was often an ambivalent position during the early years of the war. They configure identity around notions of masculinity, especially by contrast with female identity or sexuality. They establish a language of Royalism and obedience which is opposite to that of Parliamentary and London texts. The poets utilise the language of institutional Royalism, in particular deploying the conceptual notions of particular controlled spaces to highlight the monstrous violations and invasions of the enemy. R. Meade defines the Parliamentary crimes as beyond the legislative imagination: 'Shame o'their Country, who e're have thought/ That beyond Treason they could start a fault' ('When first to th'Winds and

Waves', ll. 29–30). The monstrous behaviour of the enemy is beyond the legal definitions of normality. They cannot be part of society as there is no judicial language with which to arraign them. Meade establishes the Parliamentary actions as alien and outside of the institutionally defined space of the nation. Similarly, the poets of *Serenissimæ* work hard to re-establish the Royal language of the golden 1630s. In particular they see the need for a national identity focused through linguistic systems. These systems are as inviolable and important to the structure of the world as the scientific laws which define existence; just as scientists defined and characterised the concept of 'absolute space' through inflexible rules regarding the universe, so Royalist writers conceived that language created a space of dominion within which the user was subject to the innate authority of the King.

The volume shows poems working within a closed or controlled discourse. They have an individual dynamic but work collectively to establish and construct a Royalist identity based in hierarchical systems which control language, the universe, gender relations and loyalty. The relocation to Oxford led to a need to define identity in a controlled and recognisable fashion. These poems reconfigure Royalist identity and create a concept of loyalty mapped onto the person of the King and his court. The volume was a closely controlled and configured official expression of Royalism. Royalist poets were readers, and the verses reflect their understanding and experience of contemporary discourse. The concerns and issues discussed in these poems, and the polemic construction of identity, will be discussed further in the concluding Chapter that analyses a wider Royalist poetics.

Chapter Five
**'Great Honr. bids mee vse my might': The Royalist poet in the
English Revolution**

Who is not Active, Modestly Rebels.¹

¹ William Cartwright, 'Not to be wrought by Malice', *Verses on the Death of the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenville, Knight* ([Oxford: Leonard Lichfield] Printed, 1643) [Wing O990A], l. 20.

5.1 Introduction

The Chapter provides a survey of Royalist poetic practice during the war period, offering a reading of Oxford poetry in the light of the findings of earlier Chapters. I consider the terms of engagement for Oxford poets during the war period, and the articulation of purpose and political stance in their work. In particular I demonstrate how the poetry of Cowley and Lluellyn is embedded in the Oxford print discourse, deploying tropes and descriptions taken from the pamphlets and prose works published within the city during the early 1640s. As I argued in the Introduction, Royalist poets of the 1640s responded to the discourse of Royalism as formulated and constructed by the institutional reforms of the court and the newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus*. This Chapter discusses their varying poetic articulations of support for the King's cause. Through it I analyse how poets took specific genres and reconfigured them in support of the King. The poets discussed used their verse to construct a Royalist identity. They created a loyalist poetics which by constructing a partisan identity and the deploying of spatial metaphors defined a Royalist polemic discourse. In particular, they reconfigured genre in order to reassert the status and authority of the King.

The Chapter opens with a consideration of an unpublished collection of manuscript verse by a member of Christ Church, Thomas Weaver. The miscellany provides insight into the poetic culture of Civil War Oxford. I then discuss Abraham Cowley's poems *The Puritan and the Papist* and *The Civil War*.² Particular attention is given to contextualising *The Civil War* within the institutional and literary discourse of Civil War Oxford that has been discussed thus far. *The Civil War* is an exemplary text for the demonstration of the

² For this discussion of *The Civil War* I am indebted to the in-depth textual work and commentary of Allan Pritchard's edition of the poem in *The Collected Works of Abraham Cowley*, 6 volumes (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1989), 1, 261–91. The notes to this text will hereafter be referred to

central importance of Oxford to Royalist Civil War poetics. The poem closes with an elegy for the fallen Falkland; this section is followed by a discussion of elegiac poetry at Oxford. Elegiac verse melded with panegyric to publicly celebrate certain heroic figures as martyrs to the cause and the apotheosis of loyalty. They were exemplary loyalist figures, and the verses provide us with a description of what the ideal Royalist subject would be. The Chapter ends by discussing a collection of poems written in the closing months of the siege of Oxford and printed in the aftermath of the fall of the city, Martin Lluellyn's *Miracles*. The collection represents a finely nuanced expression of cultural defiance and identity. The poems discussed in this Chapter share a homogeneity of purpose if not form and arrangement; they construct and form an image of the Royalist subject and a concept of loyal identity which is mapped onto the intended reader.

5.2 Thomas Weaver

An unique record of poetic life in Oxford during the war is found in Thomas Weaver's autograph manuscript book of poetry which is now Bodleian, Rawlinson Poet. MS 211.³ Weaver was an undergraduate at Christ Church who became a chaplain or petty canon at the Cathedral upon graduating in 1641. He was ejected by the Parliamentary visitation in 1647, and although there is no concrete evidence to place him in the city during the war, it is probable that he stayed in Oxford throughout this period.⁴ Weaver's volume is interesting as a product of the court surrounding Christ Church. He was an associate of the Cathedral, a

as 'Pritchard'. References to the notes for *The Puritan and the Papist*, edited by Thomas O. Calhoun and Laurence Heyworth in the same volume, pp. 236–60 will be referred to as 'Calhoun and Heyworth'.

³ Signature fol. 1r 'TWeaver his booke'. The verse in the MS can be dated as beginning c. 1640 and ending in about 1650; after this date the volume is used for brief household accounts and to record family history.

⁴ A verse letter, 'From Hangiby Castle in Monmouthshire to Sir Evan Lloyd in London' (fols. 71v–69v, reversed), is likely to have been written after his eviction from Oxford. The poem is late in the volume,

space that had a heightened significance that St. Mary's lacked; Christ Church was more the private chapel of the King, privy to members of the inner court rather than the general public which attended ceremonies at the University Church.⁵ As a member of Christ Church in the late 1630s, Weaver was heir to a vibrant and important poetic tradition.

His verse is unusual in many ways, not least in its physical form: preserved in manuscript where poets of the generation above him were either publishing or turning from poetry to more polemic roles.⁶ University poets tended to forsake their natural medium for polemics or public engagement. Furthermore, manuscript circulation during the war period was ambiguously inflected; whilst some collections illustrate a particular Royalist reader creating a particular body of polemic and loyalist poetry (Bod, Rawlinson Poet. 26 or BL, Add. MS 37719, Commonplace book of Sir John Gibson, of Welburn, Yorkshire for instance), other miscellanies testify to a retirement from battle.⁷ Folger, MS V. a. 282, a collection of elegies celebrating 'the life of that rarely accomplished gentleman, Mr William Poley, who died in ye flower of his age' (fol. 1r), is an almost wilfully undogmatic volume which ignores the recent events of the war. It provides evidence to suggest that Cambridge poetry was being written and circulated in a freer and less polemic fashion than that at Oxford.⁸ Contrarily, Weaver's case testifies to a continuing tradition of manuscript

following some time after 'A Carol for Christmase day 1646' (fols. 20v–21r), dating it to that year or (more probably) later.

⁵ 'This day the Fast was kept at *Oxford*, according to His Majesties Proclamation, the Bishop of *Kol-Alla*, (but better known by the name of the Bishop of *Rosse*,) preaching at *Christ-Church* before the Duke of *Yorke*, and the Lords of His Majesties privie Counsell', *Mercurius Aulicus The 24 Weeke* (1644), 14 June [TT: E53 (5)].

⁶ Whilst in no way Oxford poets, those who are most akin to Weaver are Herrick and Fane; they kept working in manuscript, and were only moved to publish at a much later date when their engagement had a very different purpose, see T. G. S. Cain, "'A Sad Intestine Warr": Mildmay Fane and the Poetry of Civil Strife', in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 27–52.

⁷ For discussions of manuscript and retirement see Cain, "'A Sad Intestine Warr'".

⁸ Compare, for instance, Cambridge poet Thomas Philipott's poem 'To the Reader' prefacing his *Poems* (London, Printed by R. A. for John Wilcox, and are to be sold at the Crown in Pauls Church-yard, 1645[6]) [TT: E1144 (8)], 'Reader, thou mayst without affrightment look/ Within the pages of this guiltlesse Book/

circulation and engagement. His anti-Puritan poem 'Zeal overheated', which nearly led to his imprisonment when it was republished in 1654, has an extensive life in manuscript during the civil war.⁹

Weaver's collection includes drinking songs, glees, lyrics, ballads and verses. The pastoral lyrics of Weaver's volume are interspersed with poems on diverse subjects, ranging from directly satirical, to generic treatments of contemporary events ('To his deare friend Cap: Sekgar, sick of a fever at Baghilt', fols. 6v–7v; 'To certaine gentleman Prisoners in Manchester who in a Poem describ'd theyr resolutions to be drunk', fol. 8r).¹⁰ Weaver's poems are inflected or affected by the sense that he is writing from within a Royalist garrison. This has biographical significance for 'His song being a Prisoner' (fol. 14v) which is obviously written after the fall of Oxford or during the Parliamentary Visitation.¹¹ Moreover, Weaver is aware that the 'Oxford' lyric models on which his verse is based have been reconfigured due to the imposition of a dogmatically 'Royalist' poetic identity.

Following the verse practice of Carew, Strode and Herrick, Weaver creates a fictional muse and maps onto the central figure of 'Sylvia' a variety of poetic

For here no Satyr, masquing in disguise,/ Amongst these leaves in Ambuscado lies', ll. 1–4. Philipott assures his audience that his lyrics are free from aggression or political sentiment: 'No foot or gall I'll mingle, to possesse/ My words with an invective bitterness', ll. 13–14.

⁹ The poem appears in this MS and there are other versions in Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 26, Ashmolean MS 36/7, Ballard MS 50.

¹⁰ This last, along with poems on the Archbishop of York's 'Revolt to the Rebels' (fols. 15r–16r) and 'On ye Shrewsbury Committee being Canvas'd by Mytton in the Election of Knight of ye Shire' (fols. 16v–17v) illustrate a dialectic engagement with contemporary texts and discourses, a conscious intervention in polemic debate.

¹¹ Weaver's *DNB* article is not particularly forthcoming about whether he was imprisoned or not during the period 1646–47, and Judith Curthoys' Database of Christ Church Members does not have any specific information on this matter. The poem specifies that 'no foule offence,/ But Loyaltie vnto my King/ Caus'd my Restraint', ll. 14–16. There was a considerable manuscript response to the Parliamentary Visitation, see for instance University College, MS MA30/3/MS/13–17, four brief sets of instructions of ways and techniques to obstruct the commissioners, beginning 'To appear Coram non Judice, is not a submission to, or

considerations and topoi. Lyrics include 'to his Friends who sought to comfort him after the fayre Sylvia's departure' (fol. 2r), 'Sylvia singing' (fol. 3r), 'Sylvia frowning' (fol. 3v), 'An Elegie On ye death of ye fayre Sylvia's Spaniell' (fols. 8r-9v), 'To Sylvia, on a bracelett of her hayre wch she sent him' (fols. 9v-10r), as well as two versions of a 'Pastorall Dialogue' between 'Thirsis and Sylvia' (fols. 9r-v, 11r-v). However, what seems innocuous generic poetry is thrown into sharp relief by the poem 'To Sylvia going to an Enemies Garrison' (fol. 13v-14r). Mixing the vocabulary of love poetry with that of combat and military loyalty, the poem updates the contemporary society of the pastoral and inflects the language of the lyric with contemporary resonance:

But stay not long (sweete Nymph) for so
May thy returne procure our Woe
Whilst we, like men, wch for long space
haue beene confin'd to some dark place,
Shall, beeing restored to that light,
By wch we see now; loose our Sight
(ll. 17-22)

A deeply ambivalent tone of moral and spiritual inversion disrupts the seemingly platonic ideal of the poem. The poet had desired Sylvia to use her beauty's power to destroy his enemies, that 'those sunnes, [...] / Consume, not warme them wth theyr fire' (ll. 13-14).¹²

Now, however, the light of Sylvia's eyes which in the opening couplet protects 'From gloomy night' has attained a randomly destructive quality which is only made obvious after

an acknowledgement of Jurisdiction without an Emparlance. Neither is it an Emparlance, to require a sight, or Coppie of his Comission & to desire time to consider it'.

¹² Continuing the military metaphor, the poet demands

But if they ar decree'd to goe
From our Horizon to the Foe,
Cloud 'em wth frownes, yt through ye world
A generall darknesse may be hurl'd
So we ye better shall sustaine
A losse, wch is to them no gaine (ll. 5-10).

a period of confinement or imprisonment.¹³ Her reason for visiting the enemy is unclear, and the diction implies violation or a financial relationship: the poem is full of charged words such as 'procure', 'Idolators', 'Consume', 'confin'd', and 'convey'.¹⁴ The movement from the controlled and loyal space of the Royalist town to the ambiguous and unmediated location of the enemy garrison will precipitate social and personal upheaval. Puritanism is defined in the poem as the direct topographical inverse of the Royalist garrison: 'our Antipodes' (l. 4).¹⁵ Sylvia's sun-like eyes 'are decree'd to go/ From our Horizon to the Foe', as the world is literally turned upside down. Her venturing beyond the safe environs of the city and voluntarily excluding herself from the space of Royalism leads to an uneasy ambiguity of status. The poet wishes to idealise 'Sylvia', but her proposed actions reveal her to be undutiful and politically suspect; she is external and other, a problem. Her gender particularly becomes a site of conflict; her formerly idealised qualities become destructive, and her entire being and status as a woman is problematised. In particular, her free movement between the sides of the war gives her a polemically elusive quality which can destroy the loyal troop; as with the Cavalier and the Lady, discussed below, the temptations of the flesh distract the soldier from his loyal duty. The poem deploys standard lyric tropes

Weaver uses similar figures and vocabulary in his construction of his imaginary mistress as the poets of *Musarum Oxoniensum Serenissimæ* did to describe and praise Henrietta Maria. In particular his astronomical language is reminiscent of their verse, see Chapter Four, above.

¹³ The idea of imprisonment is important in a construction of a wartime Cavalier poetics, from Bertie Montague's heroic capture saving his father at Edgehill to James Howell's pamphlets and Richard Lovelace's lyrics. See Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 134–37.

¹⁴ The connection between mercantile capitalism and disloyalty is made clear in 'The Price of Anarchie To ye Tune of Madde Tom' which begins 'All you yt would no longer/ To a Monarch be subjected/ Come away to Guild Hall', fol. 75r (reversed).

¹⁵ The distinction is made politically clear in 'A new Ode. To the Tune of the Black-smith' which appears in Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 26, fol. 142v: 'I meane to tell you of England's sad fate:/ Meane tyme, God blesse the good King & his mate,/ Who now art crost by an Antipodian State', ll. 1–3.

but inflects them with new ambivalence, warps the generic rules by investing the subject of the poem with a central ambiguity.

This sense of a newly positioned identity for University verse is most explicit in 'A dialogue betwixt a Cavalier & a Lady upon occasion of an Alarme in ye night' (fols. 10r–v). A witty and bawdy dialogue, the poem ambivalently appropriates the blunt language of war to its own particular purpose. In doing so, it restructures a model of bawdy verse and inflects it with ambiguous and at times savage darkness. As with 'To Sylvia going to an Enemies Garrison' a gloomy awareness of death pervades the poem:

La: Deare prethee stay, why doest thou haste
As if this Trumpet were ye last,
And call'd Thee from thy Graue, I doubt,
Ay mee, it rather call's thee to't
(ll. 1–4)

This doomsday metaphor is contrasted with the Cavalier's loud exclamations that he will 'giue that fate unto the Foe,/ And teach his Insolence, what 'tis/ thus to disturb a lover's bliss' (ll. 7–9). Throughout the poem his valorous and defiant heroism is counterpointed by the Lady's desire that he not risk death for honour:

Cau: No, I'l reserue that sweete defeate
To crowne & make ye rest compleate
When I haue spent much bloud before
Here't will refresh to spend yet more
Lad: yet ere you goe, dispatch my paine,
Leaue not a Mayde=head halfe slaine,
Deare make another Pass Cau: No more
The God, wch Souldiers most adore,
Great Honr. bids mee vse my might
For Reputation first, & then Delight
(ll. 15–24)

The Cavalier describes orgasm as 'sweete defeate' and speaks in terms of honour, although the residual financial inflection of 'spend' is picked out by the Lady's 'dispatch'. She sees

their relationship in far more profound terms, her militarised language eschewing his idealised image of honourable wounds for a blunter realism and harsh rhyme ('paine'/ 'slaine'). She is not allowed to continue in this vein, and her voice is subsumed within his. He finishes her line (l. 21), and encloses her words by rhyming with his own earlier 'before'/ 'more' (ll. 17–18, 21–22). The repetition of l. 18 in 'No more' gives the line an imperative quality which asserts his authority over the situation. Their Chorus expresses and ratifies his version of events, and the poem ends with an affirmation of a concept of martial honour:

Chorus

Tyranne Honr makes the braue
And noblest minde, the greatest slaue
Whereever he commands, we goe
And leaue our dearest freinds, to meet a Foe
(ll. 25–28)

Using a language of obedience to a higher, idealised power, the poem strains to construct a Cavalier or Royalist identity. Masculine martial honour is preferred to base feminine desire. Sexual pleasure is conceived as secondary to loyalty to the King; the supporters of the King sacrifice their own desire to his cause, rejecting the 'sweet defeate' in search of a more lasting duty.¹⁶

The weak but passionate female character is an example of the unmanning and limiting power of sexuality; her feminised discourse can be compared to the rapacious Parliamentarians conjured up in *Mercurius Aulicus*, content to wallow in their own filth and deviance rather than attain higher glory. Yet she also expresses sentiments that tarnish the

¹⁶ Compare Lovelace's 'Song. To Lucasta, Going to the Warres': 'I could not love thee (Deare) so much,/ Lov'd I not Honour more', *Lucasta: Epodes, Odes, Sonnets, Songs* (London: Printed by Tho. Harper, and are to be sold by Tho. Evvster, 1649) [TT: E1373 (1)], ll. 11–12. Lovelace's mixture of pastoral lyric and politics, particularly in the songs from prison, is very similar to Weaver's.

masculine ideal which is finally seen to be the victor in their dialogue.¹⁷ Her role is that of the poet in 'To Sylvia going to an Enemies Garrison', pleading with her partner not to engage in a dialogue with the enemy and therefore violate or injure themselves.¹⁸ Elsewhere in the collection wounds are idealised, but they are problematised by being received by women; the conflation of womanly discourse and martial language evident in the Lady's part of the dialogue is taken further, as the debilitating and damaging effects of the war are inscribed upon the feminine body. Arcadian models of verse are violated by the grim spectre of war, or of enemy other.¹⁹ As Diane Purkiss has established, the creation of a masculine ideal or identity during the war years was an increasingly problematic and complex pursuit. Platonic and classical modes were violated and invalidated by the physical consequences of the combat. Weaver's poems are characterised by a deep ambivalence about the war, their generically frivolous forms belying an engagement with a more profound and destructive reality. They reflect the creeping influence of the material consequences of the war upon poetic practice, but also illustrate particular concepts which were important to institutional and official definitions of Royalist identity. The

¹⁷ The fracturing consequences of the physical fact of war upon masculine identity are discussed in depth by Diane Purkiss, who argues that 'the fissures in the ideal of masculinity at war are obvious even to those most eager to see war as a space where masculinity reaches its apotheosis', 'Dismembering and Remembering: The English Civil War and Male Identity' in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 220–42 (p. 224).

¹⁸ For deeply ironic elision of lyric trope with masculine anxiety and satirical point see Lovelace's 'Sonnet. To Generall Goring, after the pacification at Berwicke': 'To his lovely Bride in love with scars,/ Whose eyes wound deepe in Peace, as doth his sword in wars', *Lucasta*, ll. 13–14.

¹⁹ The poems are 'On Mrs Maurice of Lanbeder's wound wch she receau'd by a Round=head' (fols. 18r–19v) and 'Maruticia: to a lock of yt hayre, wch was Cut when she was wounded, sent to a fayre Lady who requested it' (fols. 19v–20v). The latter expresses the movement into a public domain of the language and reality of wounds received during the war; the hair attains a new status and significance:

Know, little Lock, first from my head,
Now from my Cab'nett banished,
That Thou enjoys't a glorious Fate
And that a greater fame doth waite
On thee, then all my hayres beside (ll. 1–5)

Parliamentary other is spatially defined and seen as disgusting and deviant. Particular social hierarchies and structures are foregrounded, and the verse works hard to construct an idealised loyalist subject grounded in the traditions of the 1630s but alert to the challenges of war. As will be argued throughout this Chapter, these issues were reactions to the official discourse of loyalism defined in Chapter One.

5.3 Cowley: *A Satyre. The Puritan and the Papist* and *The Civil War*

These two poems by Abraham Cowley reflect the influence of official discourse and a generally engaged poetic practice. They illustrate Cowley's understanding of insitutional doctrine and his reading of Royalist texts. In this section I will assess the poems as distillations of the discourse of the Civil War court and address how Cowley constructs and defines the loyalist subject. Cowley had left Cambridge about six months after the outbreak of war; the town was in too Puritan a region for someone with such a high Royalist profile.²⁰ Calhoun and Heyworth, the most recent editors of *The Puritan and the Papist*, argue that the poem was written in Cambridge between 7 December 1642 and 2 March 1643; Cowley left for Oxford after 23 March 1643, and an authorised edition of the text was published soon after his arrival at court.²¹ Cowley 'almost certainly provided the printer

²⁰ His preface and epilogue to *The Guardian*, 'a Show or Comedy acted before Prince Charles at Cambridge March 1641[2]', were extensively circulated together in manuscript; he obviously had a literary reputation as a defender of the monarchy and critic of the London 'rout': 'For now no Ornaments ye head must weare,/ No Bayes, no Mitre, not so much as hayre./ How can a Play pass safely, when yee know,/ Cheap-side Crosse falls, for making but a Show', Folger, MS V.a. 322, ll. 7–10. The poem appears in just about every loyalist manuscript collection of the 1640s and 50s.

²¹ According to Wood, Cowley settled at St. John's College (quoted by Calhoun and Heyworth, p. 343), whilst apocryphal stories attest that he went to Christ Church. There is no evidence that he was at either College, however. An unauthorised counterfeit London version of 'The Puritan and the Papist' was printed as *Sampsons Foxes Agreed to fire a Kingdom: Or, the Jesuit, and the Puritan, met in a Round, to put a Kingdom out of a Square* ([Oxford, 1644]) [TT: E52 (6)].

with the copy', and obviously controlled his text as those few manuscript copies there are seem to derive from the printed version (Calhoun and Heyworth, p. 242).²²

Despite the uncertain and nomadic circumstances of its composition, the poem is firmly located within the city-court. The title-page proclaims the text 'By a Scholler in Oxford'. Eschewing the hectoring persona of the earlier *Puritans Lecture*, Cowley utilises the form to create a controlled one-sided drama which lists the faults of the puritans and satirises their principles:

They blind obedience and blind duty teach;
You blind Rebellion and blind faction preach.
Nor can I blame you much, that yee advance
That which can onely save yee, Ignorance.

(ll. 107–10)

The piece is direct and confrontational, establishing a dialectic with a silent puritan interlocutor. It is something of a performance in this respect, almost a dramatic monologue. Susan Wiseman observes that dialogic texts during the war 'reactivate and reshape old genres to occupy the cultural ground between political theory and conversation, imitating public speech in an attempt to create and influence opinion', (*Theatre and Politics*, p. 32). *The Puritan and the Papist* is a Royalist version of this reconfiguration in that it utilises various rhetoric strategies of the political oration. Furthermore, it establishes a dialectic relationship with a puritan interlocutor and/ or a reading audience in order to give weight to its polemic expressions.²³ Calhoun and Heyworth consider that the distance between the 'spectator-poet and his subject' established in the opening lines of the poem 'weakens the

²² There are contemporary copies in the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Bell/ White MS 45, Bod, Rawlinson.. Poet. MS 172, Huntington HM MS 16522 and formerly in the possession of John Sparrow, see Calhoun and Heyworth p. 239, for extensive description of each text. The Bell/ White MS has marginal glosses identifying topical allusions which indicate a reader interested in decoding the contemporary resonances of the poem.

satirist's attack insofar as it prohibits a zealously polemic, one-sided argument' (p. 339).

This misrepresents the dialectic purposes of satire during this period. The poem works by comparison and answering contrast, in similar fashion to *Mercurius Aulicus*. Listing the destructive qualities of either religious and social extreme highlights the validity and normality of Royalism.

The poem particularly attacks the textual or print constructions of parliamentary institutional and cultural identity:

Not all the Legends of the Saints of old,
Not vast Baronius, nor sly Surius hold
Such plenty of apparent Lies, as are
In your one Author, Jo. Browne Cleric. Par.
Besides what your small Poets have said, or writ,
Brookes, Strode, and the Baron of the Saw-pit:
(ll. 29–34)

Official Parliamentary textual expression is mocked and controlled as Cowley mimicks the contraction of the licenser's name and title, forcing them into a hierarchical rhyme-structure. Rather than use John Browne's full name Cowley physically appropriates the abbreviated version given on the title-page of licensed and officially commanded volumes. This is a verse equivalent to the Oxford printings of Parliamentary texts: published within a firmly Royalist system of expression and structure of ideological transmission.

Parliamentary discourse is controlled and belittled at the same time. Their official expressions and licensed print work are dismissed as 'apparent Lies', obvious falsehoods.

The distance between the poet and his 'subject' is negligible, once the opening conceit has given way to the satirical listing monologue. This in itself gives way to a prolonged accusatory passage (ll. 224–92) of great energy and polemic thrust. The

²³ For the polemic strategies deployed by Cowley see Thomas O. Calhoun, 'Cowley's Verse Satire, 1642–43, and the Beginnings of Party Politics', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991), 197–207.

interlocutor becomes Parliament, and Cowley arraigns them for their attempts to mirror or parody the court:

By what vast hopes is your Ambition fed?
'Tis writ in bloud, and may be plainly read.
You must have Places, and the Kingdom sway;
The King must be a Ward to your Lord Say
Your innocent Speaker to the Rolles must rise,
Six thousand pound hath made him proud and wise.
[...]
One Groome for the close stoole again would bee,
Rather than still Groome of the close Committee.
Another for his Staffe againe doth itch,
Faith let him have it, for another switch.
For the Five Members, they so richly thrive,
They'le but continue alwayes Members Five.
Onely Pym doth his naturall right enforce,
By the Mothers side he's Master of the Horse.
Most shall have Places by these popular tricks,
The rest must be content with Bishopricks.
(ll. 225–45)

He shows how the Parliament merely apes the structures and institutions of the court; cuckoo-like, they attempt to displace the King in order to take his power and position. They are in a dialectical relationship with the court, simply reflecting what has already been established. Their purpose can be easily read and has been made public: the military body becomes a text onto which the enemy inscribes meaning, 'writ in bloud'. They are destructive mercenaries, only interested in position. The poem's silent interlocutor may be Parliament, but the intended recipient of the poem is a Royalist reader defined in contrast to the behaviour of the Commons. Parliamentary procedures are attacked because they are pale imitations of the right and normal way of doing things; worse, they portray themselves as new and radical but they are simply attempting to colonise courtly ritual and hierarchy for their own interest.

The Puritan and the Papist shows how Cowley deploys official rhetoric and a language of Royalism heavily influenced by the discourse of the city-court. This is even more apparent in the pseudo-epic *The Civil War*, composed at Oxford during the second half of 1643. He claims in the poem to be writing in the service of the King ('unapt themselves to fight,/ They promised noble pens the Acts to write', II, 231–32) and his biographer Sprat concurs: 'Affection to the Kings Cause drew him to Oxford, as soon as it began to be the chief seat of the Royal Party' (quoted by Pritchard, p. 357). *The Civil War* was never published in Cowley's lifetime, and the only manuscript copies of the poem date from after the Restoration.²⁴ Whilst it is evident that the text had a limited transmission during the war period, it is unlikely to have been widely circulated (Pritchard, p. 270). The reason for this, and Cowley's motives for not publishing (and professing to destroy) his poem, are unclear. Pritchard offers the view that '*The Civil War* is a poem that was overtaken by history before it was completed' (p. 266). Whilst 1643, the high-water mark of Royalist confidence and morale, ended in the somewhat inconclusive battle of Newbury, this seems scant reason to leave off the work. Cowley suggests this motive himself, however, in the preface to his 1656 *Poems*: 'the succeeding misfortunes of the party stopt the work' (quoted in Pritchard, p. 266). It is worth bearing in mind, however, that this preface is something of a conciliatory apologia for his past Royalist affection which attracted criticism from some of his former friends.²⁵ Certainly the poem was overtaken by

²⁴ In the preface to his 1656 *Poems* Cowley professed to have destroyed or 'cast away' the poem, arguing that 'it is so uncustomary, as to become almost ridiculous, to make Lawrels for the Conquered', quoted in Pritchard, p. 267. There are MS copies at Bod, MS Douce 357, BL, Add. MS 36913 and Hertfordshire County Record Office, Panshanger MS D/EP/F.48 and F.36. The unauthorised 1679 version of the poem evidently used yet another manuscript source.

²⁵ He continues 'And I would have it accounted no less unlawful to rip up old wounds, then to give new ones; which has made me not onely abstain from printing things of this kinde, but to burn the very copies, and inflict a severer punishment on them my self, then perhaps the most rigid Officer of State would have thought that they deserved', quoted in Pritchard, p. 266. What is pointed about this passage is Cowley's fear of the

events, but Oxford was still a centre for propaganda and Royalist verse, and the King had not been defeated. It would seem to be even more pressing to write a lengthy poem in his defence after the various setbacks of the winter of 1643. There seems to be a definite retirement in Cowley's withdrawal from the fray, a loss of engagement which led him to publish no poetry until the edition of 1656, and which contrasts sharply with the activities of nearly all other Royalist writers.²⁶

However, considering why the poem was not published is simply speculation. It still stands as an overtly engaged work deeply embedded in the discourse of Civil War Royalism, and the text is an important case-study for understanding the cultural contexts and inflections of the Royalist project. In particular it defines modes of reading and behavioural spaces according to the official constructions of identity discussed in the preceding Chapters. *The Civil War* is inextricably located within the print discourse of Oxford. As Pritchard's rigorous commentary shows, the poem extensively utilises the vocabulary and polemic strategies of political tracts, Royal proclamations, war reports and newsbooks published in the city.²⁷ Cowley consciously uses loyalist figures and tropes during the poem; furthermore, he uses phrases and constructions taken almost verbatim from Royalist propaganda.²⁸ He uses published narratives of the battles he describes,

government and the chance that his work might be used against him; he was, after all, preparing the edition of 1656 during a period of imprisonment at the hands of the Commonwealth government. It is intriguing that he feels the need to burn copies; suggesting variant texts of the same poem, but furthermore eliciting a concern with the physical status of a text, published or not. As Arthur Marotti suggests, manuscript took over from print as the principal medium of the exiled and defeated Royalists, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 125–26.

²⁶ Cowley was very careful of his text and concerned with its appearance; the editors of *The Puritan and the Papist* discuss the authorial transmission of the text from manuscript to print and note the poet's 'emphatic italicisation', Calhoun and Heyworth, p. 237.

²⁷ For an analysis of this pattern for other poets, see Joad Raymond, 'The Daily Muse: Or, Seventeenth-Century Poets Read the News', *The Seventeenth Century*, 10 (1995), 189–218.

²⁸ '*The Civil War* contains very little information that Cowley could not have found in the Royalist newspapers, newsbooks, and pamphlets printed in 1642 and 1643, and the poem frequently seems to be specifically indebted to these publications', Pritchard, p. 363.

augmenting these dry accounts with the polemic inferences of *Mercurius Aulicus* (Pritchard, p. 364). He draws on the political tracts of Dudley Digges, in particular *The Unlawfulness of Subjects Taking Up Armes Against their Sovereigne*, the main arguments of which he rehearses throughout the poem.²⁹ *The Civil War*'s description of Oxford emphasises Parliament's fear of the engaged text. The Roundheads who held the town at the beginning of the war defaced Bodley's library: 'All Bookes (they know) the chiefe Malignants are./ In vaine they silence every Age before;/ For Pens of times to come will wound them more' (I, 352–54). Poetically, his work looks to a variety of traditions from Lucan to Spenser; he combines these influences with the work of his contemporaries by echoing the collections published from Oxford during the summer of 1643.³⁰ Cowley's hybrid genre reflects the reconfiguration of expression and formal technique which had been forced on poets during the opening years of the war, conflating epic and lyric, polemic and panegyric, newsbook scurrility and pamphlet tub-thumping.³¹

The poem opens in controlled epic style, but the elegance and austerity of the verse is undermined by the destructive reality it describes:

What rage does England from it selfe divide
 More than Seas doe from all the world beside?
 From every part the roaring Canon play;
 From every part blood roares as loud as they.
 What English Ground but still some moysture beares
 Of young mens blood, and more of Mothers teares?
 What aires unthickned with some sighs of Wives!

²⁹ He also uses the theoretical political work of Henry Ferne and Thomas Morton, Pritchard, p. 369.

³⁰ 'the existence of close affinities between passages in *The Civil War* and various contemporary occasional poems suggests the degree to which Cowley amalgamates with epic tradition a series of the prevailing literary types of his period, including Renaissance courtly verse and panegyric, elegy, and satire. Even a form so remote from epic as the court masque exerts a persistent influence on *The Civil War*', Pritchard, p. 383. For a discussion of Cowley's use of masquing techniques, in particular the transformation and the vanquishing of the forces of disorder by virtue and authority, see Pritchard p. 383.

³¹ 'The epic structure of *The Civil War* is a conflict between masque and elegy (Royalism) and satire/scatology (parliamentarianism, puritanism) with epic narrative as the negotiating middle ground between the two', Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, p. 208.

And more of Mayds for their deare Lovers lives!
Alas, what Triumph can this vict'ory shew
That dyes us red in blood and blushes too!
How can we wish that Conquest, which bestowes
Cypresse, not Bayes uppon the conqu'ering browes!
(ll. 1–10)

Cowley emphasises England's island status and conceives of the state as a corporate being, each part suffering from the war. There is a tension between the destructive horror of war and the visual and aural portrayal of this suffering. The canon 'play' whilst blood 'roares'; the populace are punningly dyed red. The artifice of the verse and such representative language is contrasted with the actuality of death and combat. The role of the poet is implicitly questioned; the only panegyrics and elegies worthy of such destruction are the cries and tears of mothers, wives and lovers. The crisis in masculinity as analysed by Diane Purkiss is evident here; male voices are resoundingly absent, and war is seen to be a sickening waste that defies false glory and deified virtue.

Whilst reflecting many of the concerns expressed by Royalist artists during this period, particularly the difficulty of idealising combat, this opening is uncharacteristic of the poem as a whole. Apart from this section and the elegy on Falkland that closes the piece, the tone is triumphalist and gory, revelling in the heat and clamour of battle. Cowley draws on various accounts of the battles he describes to give his text veracity and immediacy. His tone is that of the pamphlet and newsletter, rather than that of the concerned artist.³² The historical narrative that follows this opening passage owes much to the political arguments of contemporary pamphlets which reclaimed English historical

³² The opening sequence may be a later addition, although it does not appear to be interpolated in any of the manuscript versions of the poem. This argument would support the position that Cowley abandoned the poem in distress at the recent events of the war. The closing lines of the poem declare a collective guilt: 'gracious God, stop here thine hand,/ And let this losse [Falkland] excuse our perishing Land [...] Wee have offended much, but there has been/ Whole Hecatombs oft slaughtered for our Sinne', III, 639–47.

examples to justify the position of the King.³³ He concentrates in particular detail on the deaths of Parliamentary troops and leaders: Rupert's men storm Bristol, 'and all around/ The groanes of men, and shriekes of woemen sound' (II, 257–8); the base Colonel Stane attempts to escape death 'In vaine; the Poleaxe came, and cleft it wide;/ The parted head hung down on ether side' (III, 403–4); Simon Blore is shot, 'Through his false mouth the vengefull bullet fled;/ It sing'd the Braine and peirc'ed his seely head' (III, 449–50).³⁴

Cowley's concerns are primarily within the context of praise and panegyric for the virtue and valour of the Royalist troops and commanders.³⁵ He disdains the opposition, counting them a simple rout of the mercenary proletariat: 'What should I here their Great ones Names rehearse?/ Low, wretched Names, unfit for noble Verse? [...] But with them let their Names forever dy;/ Too vile, and base for well-writ Infamy' (III, 383–84, 453–54). As in much Royalist propaganda, their status as tradesmen and workers invalidates them from the idealisation afforded the aristocratic soldiers fighting for the King.³⁶ Their actions are those of the uncivilised antimasque: 'They dance about their Pris'oner, and around,/ Their shouts, and laughters, and wild Musicks sound,/ Such is their wanton furie tragick play' (III,

³³ For instance see John Spelman, *The Case of our Affaires, in Law, Religion, And other Circumstances briefly Examined, and Presented to the Conscience* ([Oxford] Printed in the Year, 1643) [Wing S4935], or Laurence Womock, *Sober Sadnes: Or Historicall Observations Upon The Proceedings, Pretences, & Designes of a prevailing party in both Houses of Parliament* (Printed for W. Webb Book-seller, near Queens Colledge, 1643) [TT: E94 (28)].

³⁴ Compare the death of Henry Spencer, Earl of Sunderland, at the same battle: 'Excellent Spencer! In thy bloome of day/ From all the joyes of Life thow'rt snatcht away;/ Noe more must thow behold the Sunns deare light', III, 465.

³⁵ Colin Burrow notes how the elegies of Cavendish and Falkland are modelled on those of the *Aeneid*, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), p. 238.

³⁶ Even their leaders have no noble qualities; before Newbury the King addresses his troops at length (III, 277–327) whereas 'th'Essexian Rebell' speaks in vain 'with powresse words to move;/ His Speech was dull and tædious' (III, 329–31). The King's oratory uses diction and vocabulary from various of his published speeches, see Pritchard, p. 433 and 434. Speeches are cast as highly motivational and austere as well as importantly Royalist in structure; part of Essex's problem is that his was 'for him made/ By some great Deacon of the Preaching Trade' thus doomed to be a 'liveless sentence' (III, 331–32, 337). For Cowley's satirical version of puritan preaching see *The Puritans Lecture* (1642) in *Works*, I, 94–101.

241–43).³⁷ They are butchers and weavers, tanners and ‘a drunken, banisht Dutchman’ (III, 385); Simon Blore was ‘A woemans Taylour once, and high in prize,/ For cheateing with good words and turnd-up eyes,/ Shrill was his vocye at Psalmes’ (III, 435–37). He is drawn to the war by his ‘zeale to Plunder’ and dresses ‘none more richly bright,/ In silver lace, or better horst for flight’ (II, 443, 445–46). His cowardice is linked to his dandyism, and his shrillness and cunning mark him as being far from the Royalist masculine ideal. There is a suggestion of feminised homosexuality which chimes with the polemic strategies of *Mercurius Aulicus* in using the perceived abnormality of puritan sexuality to attack their cause. It also challenges the Parliamentarian criticism of cavalier foppishness that has been given as another of the rebel’s motives (‘In hate to Bishops and long Haire’, III, 407).

The poem highlights how deviant Puritans step outside of the divinely sanctioned space of normal family hierarchies and patriarchal structures. Cowley weighs into the controversy surrounding the divorce tracts by alleging Parliamentary support for such a sociological aberration: ‘The number of their Wives their Lusts decree;/ The Turkish Lawe’s their Christian Libertie!’ (III, 95–96). Milton argued for divorce in terms of Christian liberty in *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (see Pritchard, p. 428). Cowley elides this with an account of the polygamy practised by John of Leiden and then castigates this non-European custom. As well as being savage, uncivilised and exotic, it also breaks

³⁷ Their antisocial manifestation is emphasised by being compared to cannibals, I, 239. The masque-like action of various set-piece moments in the poem is striking. For instance, the Queen’s arrival at Edgehill replaces the ‘sent of powder’ with ‘Easterne Smells’ as the mount becomes ‘the noblest Scene of War and Love’ (I, 499, 500, 496). Her arrival transforms a scene of discord and anarchy into a classicised emblem of harmony and stability. Smith notes the ideological echoes in the diction: the passage is ‘written in the language of the court masque, used by Charles as a vehicle to suggest his pre-eminent power’, *Literature and Revolution*, p. 209.

divine laws. Royalist propaganda made much of the 'normality' of marriage in comparison with the perceived sexual and social deviance of Puritans and Parliamentary figures.³⁸

This aberration is motivated and encouraged by the Furies of Hell, who 'licence that wild Multitude to raigne' (III, 18). Cowley punningly uses the vocabulary of the censor to illustrate how licensing influences behaviour and constructs codes of identity and action. London's public domain is not truly free and unlicensed but merely seems so, being truly controlled by forces of evil and destruction. The Hell they originate from is an unlimited, unfettered location: 'Noe bound controules th'unwearied space; but Hell,/ Endlesse as those dire paines which in it dwell' (II, 377–78).³⁹ This boundlessness is what *defines* it as Hell; the ungodly are banished forever to a place of no structure and endless pain. Therefore uncontrolled space is the locus for rebellion and revolt, the dwelling place of Rebellion whose false words are 'Bullets' which enrage 'the beastly rout' (II, 416, 417). Language and text are part of the arsenal of the conflict. Cowley conceptualises the unbound and free print sphere in London as the breeding ground for texts that actively fight to destroy the peace of 'well-grounded States' (II, 420), explicitly linking an unlicensed press with devilish incitement. The Furies, beaten by Grenville at Roundway Down, return to London and 'mustered up new Troopes of fruitlesse lies' to mask their loss (I, 487). Words are conceived as soldiers, their arrangement on the page described with military diction.

³⁸ See Ann Hughes, *Women, Men and Politics in the English Civil War* (Stoke-on-Trent: Paramount for Keele University, 1997), p. 13.

³⁹ Cowley's description of hell owes much to the revised version of *Cooper's Hill*, published under Denham's supervision from Oxford in 1643, in particular the lines which describe Londoners 'Blinded with light, and sicke of being well,/ In tumults seeke their peace, their heaven in hell', quoted from the 'A' (Oxford, 1643) text in Brendan O Hehir, *Expans'd Hieroglyphicks: A Critical Edition of Sir John Denham's Coopers Hill* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), ll. 45–46. These lines were additions to the poem for the 1643 edition. Denham's demonisation of the city, 'in a thicker cloud/ Of businesse, then of smoake; where men like Ants/ Toyle to prevent imaginarie wants' (ll. 28–30), and the vocabulary of mistake in the sequence describing London (ll. 28–48) — 'Blinded', 'imaginarie', 'vaine', 'secret', 'False', 'lost' —

Cowley's poem emphasises the need to mobilise in order to defend traditional monopolies and hierarchies: he has Charles rouse his troops before Newbury by asserting that 'Yow by just power are hether calld, [...] Yow fight things well establish't to defend;/ All ages past your pious armes commend' (III, 287, 291–92). His army defends their birthright, 'My Crowne and all your Liberties' (III, 322).⁴⁰

The centre of the poem as it stands, Book II, portrays the gathering of Hell's 'dreadfull Parliament', an institution given to discussing 'Mischiefes of greatest consequence' (II, 506, 514).⁴¹ The congregation has a specific location ('Bel-zebubs Hall') and legislative function: 'none but might ill's these Sessions move' (II, 507, 512). The Parliament is a parody of Westminster; meeting 'at their grimme Soveraignes call', they allow his tyranny free rein and support his destructive actions. The sovereignty they are acknowledging is that of the pretender, the false and dissembling claimant to the seat of power. He is King Pym, empowered by his own will and the assent of a weak parliament.⁴²

The account maps standard Parliamentary function and ritual onto Hell. The speaker or

created a representation of the urban marketplace as a diseased wordly hell which influenced Cowley and many others, as well as reflecting standard Royalist rhetoric.

⁴⁰ This expression tends to emphasise the newly configured model of state in which power and representation were part of a mutual relationship between King and populace. See also an earlier criticism of Parliament: 'All things (they hold) to all must Common bee;/ Are these they who defend our Propertie?', III, 90–91. Such proto-collectivist thought was anathema to the Royalist defence of monopolised discourses and traditional ownership rights. Compare Denham's formulation in *Coopers Hill*: 'Kings give liberty, and Subjects love', l. 318.

⁴¹ Cowley picks up the vocabulary of contemporary religio-political pamphlets in describing his hellish parliament: 'that monstrous Rebellion, which hath beene the deformed and unnaturall issue that the hellish copulation of Satan, with this wicked and adulterous generation; the very lees and dreggs of almost exhausted time hath brought forth. It is a monster indeed, made up of many monsters, every limbe or part of it as it were a severall portent, presaging without the great mercy of God, a generall ruine to this poore nation, in all that it can stifle good; lawes, lives, religion, soules, government, order, plenty, safety, honour', *A Briefe Discourse, Declaring The impiety and unlawfulness of the new Covenant with the Scots* ([Oxford] Printed Anno Dom. 1643) [TT: E73 (1)], pp. 5–6.

⁴² For Royalist treatments of Pym as tyrannical and presumptive leader of a weak Parliament see 'Pym's Juncto', BL, Egerton MS 2725 fols. 164r–65v, 'The Roundhead's psalme of money', Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 71, pp. 159–61 (O Lord preserue the parliament/ and serue pim longe to raigne', ll. 1–2), or the extensively circulated 'Pym's Ghost' by Martin Lluellyn, copies at Bod, Jones MS 56, Rawlinson Poet. MSS 62, 84, 152, Rawlinson MS D. 1092.

leader of the House, rising from his 'direfull' false throne and described as 'Tyrant', chafes at the binding power of virtue and right religion (II, 517, 518):

Shall wee behold long sleepy peace againe,
The illls of Charles his dull and godly raigne?
Shall wee againe the Bishops pride behold,
Which sixteene hundred yeares hath us controul'd?
(II, 530–33)

Satan complains of the peaceful and harmonious reign described at length elsewhere (I, 79–95). He participates in cavalier constructions of a myth of peace.⁴³ He bids his cohorts haste to London to encourage rebellion in order to subvert and undermine the controlling influence of the Church and Monarchy. This control has led to the peace he hates; the mainspring of the puritan revolt is seen to be a desire to break and challenge traditional monopolies of discourse and control. It will lead to 'publick ruine' and the disintegration of the state (II, 567). Satan's speech emphasises the theatrical nature of public oratory in Parliament, but also the destructive consequences of such speeches if freed from their bounds; the Furies are released.

The account of the Parliament in Hell clearly lays the blame for the wars at the feet of such unbending institutions. In particular, the poem defines the Grand Remonstrance as the beginning of the disintegration of the body of state:

How could a warre so sad and barbarous please
But first by slandering those blest Dayes of peace?
Through all the excrements of state they pry,
Like Empricke to find out a Malady.
And then with desperate Boldnesse they endeavour,
Th'Ague to cure by bringing in a Feaver:
This way is sure to'expell some illls; noe doubt;

⁴³ Compare, for instance, Peter Hausted's *Ad Populum: Or, a Lecture to the People* ([Oxford] Printed in the Yeare 1644) [TT: E49 (2)] which creates at length an elaborate image of the peace of the 1630s: 'O those were Golden dayes! All things were quiet/ While Pym did whisper Treason for his Dyet', ll. 60–61; 'When no grimme Saucy Trooper did ye harme', l. 52; 'Ye then/ Were not enslav'd, but free-borne Englishmen', ll. 101–02.

The Plague will drive all lesse Diseases out:
What strang[e] wild Feares did every morning breed?
Till a strang[e] fancy made us sicke indeed;
(I, 109–18)

Parliament is a quack doctor attempting to cure ills by introducing more; the body of state is envisioned with Swiftian literalness. A little later the Commons is a group of ‘Surgeons’ inflicting ‘wounds’ onto the body of England (I, 162). The physiological model concurs with other Oxford poems of the time. Cowley addresses the newly balanced politics of the feverish state: all other or lesser squabbles have subsided in the face of Parliament’s poisonous invasion of the body as the plague drives other illness away. The concern with bodily health and corporeality reflects concerns about masculinity in the poem; as Purkiss argues, the destructive nature of the war leads to the sundering and dismemberment of the gendered order.⁴⁴

Throughout the poem Cowley uses a Spenserian tone to address notions of the physical manifestation of England and discuss topographical features which have ingrained meaning. The Thames, the Trent, London, Oxford and the mound at Edgehill figure most prominently as indexes of national identity but *The Civil War* is a poem firmly bedded in a geographical sense and definition of nation.⁴⁵ The opening sequence recounts an imperialist history of England. Cowley lists events of contemporary polemical significance from Henry

⁴⁴ See, for example, the description of the sacking of Brentford: ‘Witnesse, those men blowne high into the Aire,/ All Elements their ruin Joy’d to share./ In the wide Aire quick flames their bodies tore’, I, 325–27. Elsewhere the Earl of Sunderland’s burial on the battlefield (probably due to the state of the body) means ‘Thy very Tombe is robd of part of Thee’ (III, 470). Other Royalist elegies shared a concern with burial:

Bedew what hearse ye please, here is no room
For such light mourners at this Solemne Tombe.
But (ah) where I’st? *Northampton* must not have
(Such is their inhumanity) a Grave;
To him who in his death deserved Heaven,
Five foot of Common earth would not be given.

An Elegy on the Death of the Right Honourable Spencer, Earle of Northampton, who died a Conquerour at the Battaile of Hopton-heath ([Oxford, 1643]) [TT: E103 (11)], ll. 17–22.

II's victories over Roderick of Connaught, Richard I's crusading feats in Palestine and Henry V's victory over the French at Agincourt.⁴⁶ He then chronicles more recent events in detail, celebrating the golden age of naval success under Elizabeth and the peace of James' reign.⁴⁷ English national identity is defined by martial exploits in foreign countries. There is a construction of a prelapsarian Georgic England:

The'astonisht Plowmen the sad noyse did heare,
Look'ed up in vaine, and left their worke for feare.
Pale woemen heard it from afarr, and prest
The crying Babes close to their panting brest.
(II, 15–18)

It is notable that a great many of the Royalist victories Cowley describes are sited within urban spaces: Exeter, Bristol, Birmingham and Gloucester all fall.⁴⁸ Parliamentary strongholds are the uncivilised and licentious cities.⁴⁹ The country's earth is female, but 'Great Brittaines aged Genius' is male (II, 13); creation, especially poetic creation, is a gendered concept.⁵⁰ Cowley maps a gendered nation and configures national identity through this landscape. His Royalism reasserts a neo-platonic pastoral model of national identity focused on the land.

⁴⁵ A measure of the halcyon peace of the 1630s is that the river Tweed 'had with long rest forgot/ On which side dwelt the English, which the Scot' (I, 97–98).

⁴⁶ Richard's religious victory displaces unholy Islam and colonises the space vacated: 'Hee th'English Crosse displaid,/ Eclypst one Horne and th'other paler made', I, 23–24.

⁴⁷ Through the proud world a Virgin Terror strooke,
The Austrian Crownes and Romes seaven Hills she shooke.
To her great Neptune homag'd all his Streames,
And all the wide Ocean was her Thames.
Thus our forefathers fought, thus bravely bled,
Thus still they live, whilst we alive are dead.
(I, 61–67)

⁴⁸ 'Cowley [...] [has] the Royalist armies rescue the glorious, loyal pasts of these cities (especially Exeter) from their present disloyal and indeed infernal inhabitants, thereby restoring their true identities', Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, p. 211.

⁴⁹ For the politics of Royalist pastoral control see Leah S. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

⁵⁰ The maternal earth joyfully gives up the Furies, 'this old monstrous burden of her wombe' (III, 4).

The mercenary and mercantile zeal of their troops is partly due to their home city, 'Luds seditious Towne' (II, 538).⁵¹ London is the centre and focus for 'rebell Passions' and religious intolerance (III, 17). Inspired by the Furies, 'Up rose the base Mechanicks, and the Rout' (III, 41):

Their onely Sonns the frantick Woemen send,
Earnest, as if in Labour for their End.
The Wives (what's that, alas), the Maydens too,
The Maides themselves bid their owne dear ones goe.
The greedy Tradesmen scorne their Idol Gaine,
And send forth their glad Servants to bee slaine.
The bald and gray-hair'ed Gownemen quite forsooke
Their sleepy Furrs, black Shoes, and City looke,
All ore in Iron and Leather clad they come;
(III, 47–55)⁵²

This is an inhuman reversal of the opening lines of the poem; rather than bemoan the departure of their sons the hysterical women encourage them to leave. Maternal normality is inverted as mothers seem to labour for the death of their sons. This inversion highlights the destructive power of uncontrolled femininity.⁵³ Cowley addresses this issue in conventional Royalist style by deploying the motif of the Gorgon throughout the poem.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Cowley takes his view of London from contemporary Oxford propaganda, in particular Peter Heylin's *Lord Have Mercie Upon Us* and *A Letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus*, attributed to John Berkenhead, both published in 1643, Pritchard p. 423.

⁵² This description owes much to Heylin's *Lord Have Mercie Upon Us*: 'How did the Widows presse to cast in their Mites, the married Wives their wedding-rings, the zealous Virgins their whole stocke, to their Silver bodkins', quoted in Pritchard, p. 426. This intertextual echo counterpoints the mercantile undertone of Cowley's passage.

⁵³ The poem is notably male in orientation and execution: Henrietta Maria has merely 10 lines and mentions of Royalist wives and Ladies are in relation to their mourning. Femininity is confined to being allegorically destructive or Puritanically inverted and problematised. There is no resolution offered by the Queen such as is recorded in *Musarum Oxoniensum Serenissimæ*, for instance.

⁵⁴ Comparison to a Gorgon was deployed regularly through the 1630s by writers in description of an ugly or shrewish woman: Strode's Song ('Keep on your maske, and hide your eye') and Shirley's 'Curse' are lyric examples. Gorgons or snake-haired women also regularly figured in court masques; the antimasque to *Salmacida Spolia*, for instance, is introduced and instigated by a Fury 'her hair upright, mixed with snakes, her body lean, wrinkled, and of a swarthy colour, her breasts hung bagging down to her waist, to which with a knot of serpents was girt red bases, and under it tawny skirts down to her feet. In her hand she brandished a sable torch, and looking askance with hollow envious eyes came down into the room', ll. 100–04, text from *Court Masques*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995). The image takes on a more

This image of uncontrolled and destructive femininity is used several times, with far more confidence than is allowed in other uses of it that have been discussed. Serpents are throughout associated with dissembling and rebellion; Schisme, 'old Hag', seems young 'As snakes by casting skin renew their yeares' (I, 215, 216).⁵⁵ The first Gorgon is the figure of Sediton: 'Her knotty haire were with dire Serpents twist,/ And all her Serpents at each other hist' (I, 223–24). Her hideous exterior is contrasted with the naked Truth (I, 225). Bevil Grenville's victory over the serpent-like monster of the Parliamentarian army at Lansdown causes the Furies to howl 'aloud through trembling Aire,/ Th'astonisht snakes fell sadly from their Haire' as they make their way back to their haven in London (I, 483–84). Thus far the Gorgon is an instrument of evil or symbol of dissent from acceptable social structures. There is a biblical echo which chimes with Satan's edict that rebellious vice should possess the souls of the puritans 'As subtly, as the close Originall Sinne' (II, 546).

However, Cowley begins to explore the ambiguity of the image in his description of the skirmish at Aldbourne Chase:

Digby on whom free Pallas did bestow,
All that her Armes can dare, and Wit can know;
In both has gain'd her Gorgons pow'er ore men,
By's Sword struck dead, astonisht by his Pen.
They force their passage through an Host, and strow
The way with groaning Rebels as they goe;
(III, 229–32)

Pallas Athena's favour gives Digby epic heroic status. Cowley makes much of her dual role as war goddess and personification of wisdom through being patroness of the urban arts.

charged significance during the war, in particular as it appears in the background of William Dobson's *Charles II as Prince of Wales* (1643).

Digby is equally strong and destructive with pen and sword, a reference to his role in the production of *Mercurius Aulicus*. The passage equates the roles of text and iron as weapons furthering the King's cause; both help Digby to force his 'passage through an Host' and confound the rebels. The Gorgon of Pallas Athena's shield is a controlled double-edged weapon; the detail of the 'groaning' rebels gives the motion a poignancy that echoes other problematised uses of the motif. Pallas Athena's agency in the use of the Gorgon is important also; as a virgin ('maiden' is one interpretation of her name) she can control such destructive femininity.

The text's conceptual engagement with the political and martial sphere attains a physical dimension and manifestation as it is overtaken by events:

A Muse stood by mee, and just then I writ
My Kings great acts in Verses not unfit.
The trowbled Muse fell shapelesse into aire,
Instead of Inck dropt from my Pen a Teare
O 'tis a deadly Truth! Falkland is slaine;
His noble blood all dyes th'accursed plaine.
(III, 545–49)⁵⁶

This extraordinary self-consciousness ruptures the balance of the verse. In Loxley's view it destroys Cowley's project: 'The revelation of his poetry's own involvement in the conflict it represents disables its epic frame' (p. 87). This is to an extent true, and it may be part of the reason the poem was never published. However, it ignores the polemic value of the poem. Loxley argues that the poem attempts to 'raise the self-consciously ephemeral and contingent textual volleys of civil war into the substance of an historical epic' (p. 86). The

⁵⁵ The origins of the inter-cine war is hinted at: 'Some Cadmus sure sow'd Serpents Teeth for us', I, 72. Compare Lluellyn's 'Pym's Ghost': 'Envy here [in Hell] for Ever wakes/ Midst her curld family of snakes', ll. 13–14.

⁵⁶ Cp. The death of the stag in *Coopers Hill*: 'Dying he dies, and purples with his bloud', l. 300. Also compare Peter Heylin's elegy on Laud, 'Dignum Laude virum Musa vetat mori', which closes Peter Heylin's *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate the L. Archbishop*

case is more complicated than he allows, however; the poem merely borrows phrasing and formal models from historical epic, as much as the above lines borrow 'my penne's the spout/ Where the rain-water of my eyes run out' from Cleveland's 1638 elegy on Edward King.

By suggesting that the poem is elevated above polemics and the pamphlet wars, Loxley misrepresents Cowley's purpose. It is important to see it as part of a continuum: the epic invocations of the poem can be found in *Bevil Grenville*; the nation-making and celebrating are similar to pieces as diverse as *Vindex Anglicus* and Denham's *Coopers Hill*. The self-reflexivity of the poem acknowledges its status as part of this continuum; the poet is involved in the physical moment of the combat. Furthermore, Cowley is not an observer but an actor: 'just then I writ/ My Kings great acts in Verses not unfit'. He is physically involved in the combat. Rather than historicising the present by recourse to epic style, Cowley emphasises the immediacy of his work, the polemic and political expediency that he writes for.⁵⁷ It is not the case that 'the poem's form and reach establish a distance between itself and its subject which is far removed from the mustered verses of the Oxford polemicists' (Loxley, p. 87); as has been argued, the poem is steeped in Oxford polemic practice.

The revelation near the end of the poem is, as Loxley points out, extremely theatrical (p. 87). There are affinities with the centralism of the masque. More than this, however, it is meta-theatrical; the author reveals himself as a character in the poem and comments upon the creative process itself. He ruptures the verse in order to explain its

of Canterbury (Oxford, Printed in the Yeare 1644) [TT: E269 (20)]: 'I needs must droppe a verse/ Write it with Teeres, and fit it for thy herse', ll. 9–10.

⁵⁷ He underlines the importance of his location in Oxford: 'I saw, meethoughts, the Conquering Angell fly/ From Newb'ury Feilds towards Oxford through the Sky;', III, 529–30.

polemic significance as a performance; he portrays Charles's 'great acts' (a phrase with a secondary performative inflection). This *deus ex machina* gives the verse purpose and resonance. The poet's appearance in the text establishes a control; meaning is immanent in the text, not contingent upon interpretation or inflection. The author validates his work and mediates reception. Cowley corrupts and disrupts the generic rules of his chosen model throughout the poem, moving from chronicle to epic to survey to elegy to panegyric to Royal speech.⁵⁸ He marries styles and conventions to produce a text that is firmly bedded in the here and now of a disjointed culture and an unbalanced textual discourse. Utilising contemporary loyalist modes and tropes, he deploys a polemic poetic vocabulary to construct a Royalist identity. He defines the absolutely inflected loyalist spaces of gender and nation in order to illustrate the authority of the monarch and the innate subjection of the reader to the text and the King.

5.4 Elegy: Loyalty through example

The overwhelming tenor of the poetry written and published at Oxford during the war years is elegiac. *The Civil War* concludes with the elegy to Falkland which conceives of the dead intellectual aristocrat as the noble paradigm all subjects should attempt to emulate.⁵⁹ The elegiac mode often had a panegyric inflection, and sometimes used a polemic tone and model. James Loxley notes the 'polemical deployment of elegy within Royalist poetics' during the war, analysing how 'many civil war poems manage to fuse the affective and self-

⁵⁸ Smith attempts to smooth out Cowley's purpose: '[the poem] is an example of genre dynamic as a refraction of real power relations and differences', *Literature and Revolution*, p. 208.

reflexive characteristics of the former [funeral elegy] with the less personal, public praise of the latter [epicede]' (*Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 192–93). Royalist elegy insisted upon the elevated virtue of its subject and stood as a lasting physical monument to the cause's martyrs, a public expression of grief tempered with pride and defiance. Elegy as a genre was fluid and effective in loyalist hands: 'Royalists were practised in producing elegies which, given the circumstances, could not sustain their traditional generic boundaries' (Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, p. 288). Writers skilfully cast their subjects as lasting representatives of the innate virtues of the English nation:

To him who in his death deserved Heaven,
Five foot of Common earth would not be given.
Foolish and Cruell! In denying one
Each noble English breast is now become
Recorder of his vertues, and his tombe,
Who shall his name in lasting letters keep
When short liv'd Marble shall be laid to sleep,
When *Brook*, and *Gell*, and *Pym*, & *Strode & Gray*,
(That poor one-syllabled race) shall melt away
And dwindle into nothing, He shall fill
Times Brasen Leaves, that who come after will
Forbeare great Acts, for fear there should not be
For them and him too, room in history.

An Elegy on the Death of the Right Honourable Spencer, Earle of Northampton, ll. 22–34

The memory of the fallen will live within every right-thinking Englishman; the space of the grave is mapped onto the body and bodies of the country, as the martyr becomes an expression or a function of national identity. The unchanging 'lasting letters' which are Spencer's eternal representatives suggest a notion of reception particular to elegy in which the words have a physical manifestation within the imagination and minds of the entire

⁵⁹ Falkland had a posthumous monument in print when Lichfield printed *A Draught of a Speech Concerning Episcopacy, by the Lord Viscount Falkland. Found since his Death amongst his papers Written with his own hand* in 1644, Madan #1747.

nation. All of England will remember Spencer; the whole country is a Royalist reader that remembers and mourns his passing.

Edward Walsingham published elegiac biographies of two military leaders that fell during the war, Sir John Smith and Sir Henry Gage.⁶⁰ During the war Royalist elegiac biographies assumed a certain audience and looked to instruct that readership by example. This blending of advice literature, instructive biography and elegiac poetic entirely reconfigured the mode. These volumes offered their subjects as exemplary figures, valorous and honourable. The texts mix biographical account with elegiac poetry and annals of achievement. The humanist emphasis placed on pious virtue and loyalty belies the complex political encoding and cultural purpose underlying the two pseudo-Plutarchan accounts.

Smith and Gage were minor leaders in the Royalist army, and their loyalty figures as a microcosm for the stolid and obedient nature of those in service to the King.⁶¹ Gage was Governor of Oxford, a career soldier who quickly returned to England from Europe to serve Charles. Walsingham recounts the congruence between his physical and moral virtues, and their manifestation in his loyal military actions:

Those that were pleas'd to take notice of what he said and did, continually discovered new proportions of Vertue in him, and the stricter their observations was, so much the more did they admire his Vertues and Abilities, of some whereof at least, I have engag'd my selfe to give a short account. What was most singular in him was his perpetuall industry, and that even when he was not in actuall Service in the field, by exercising his Souldiers in the use of their Armes, cutting out Townes and Forts in Turfe, and teaching his men even by way of recreation how to become expert; how to Approach, to Scale, Retreat, how to gaine a Towne by Assault, or by

⁶⁰ *Britannicæ Virtutis Imago. Or, The Effigies of True Fortitude, Expressed to the life, in the famous actions of that incomparable Knight, Major Generall Smith* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall, in the Yeare 1644) [TT: E53 (10)] and *Alter Britannicæ Heros: Or the Life of the Most Honourable Knight, Sir Henry Gage, Late Governour of Oxford, Epitomiz'd* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1645) [TT: E303 (6)].

⁶¹ Smith was leader of a cavalry brigade, see Stuart Reid, *All the King's Armies: A Military History of the English Civil War 1642–1651* (Kent: Spellmount, 1998), pp. 26, 176.

a famishing Siedge, how to make their Trenches, and secure themselves, with a Thousand such Souldier-like imployments (*Alter Britannicæ Heros*, p. 25).

Gage assiduously instructs his soldiers; Oxford has become a military academy. His abilities and virtues are closely linked to his service in the field for the King; his character is interpreted by his allegiance and active engagement. His status as governor of the Royal garrison is also important in constructing a concept of the cavalier military ideal; actively engaged in protecting the King's interests and his representative court.

Smith was also celebrated for his role in symbolically shielding the King's reputation and person. His particular feat was the recapturing of the Banner Royal Standard at Edgehill when Sir Edward Verney was killed, a courageous and highly publicised act which earned him an instant knighthood.⁶² The poem 'Anagram' creates a physical monument to his bravery, equating his virtue with his loyalty to the King's representative symbol:

TO
THAT
NOBLE
WORTHY
T H E
MIRROR
OF TRUE
V A L O U R
S R J O H N
S M I T H E
P R E S E R V E R
O F T H E
R O Y A L L
S T A N D A R D⁶³

⁶² He was also used by Charles, Henrietta Maria and Sir Edward Nicholas to carry important letters and commands, see *The Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn to which is subjoined the Private Correspondence between Charles I and Sir Edward Nicholas* (London: Routledge [1912]), pp. 780, 788.

⁶³ For the iconic and political significance of the Banner Royal, see Michael Jaffé, 'The Standard Bearer: Van Dyck's Portrayal of Sir Edmund Verney', in *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts: Essays in honour of Sir Oliver Millar*, ed. by David Howarth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 90–106.

The poem is linked to an acrostic spelling Smith's name.⁶⁴ His life and achievements are recounted in order to instruct by example, and Walsingham includes elegiac poems intended as a physical monument 'to immortalise the memory of so brave a Spirit'

(*Britannicæ Virtutis Imago*, p. 26):

Suspend your teares, whilst I declare
Whose ashes here enshrined are.
This Tombe adornes the precious dust,
Of one whose fame can never rust
(‘His Epigaph’, ll. 1–4).

The poem is printed as though reproduced on a gravestone, framed with columns. Smith is celebrated as the epitome of English loyalty and obedience, a paradigm of identity and action. The text is a lasting representation of his valour, consecrated ‘To the Immortall memory of that ever famous Gentleman, The Glory of our English Nation’ (Sig. A2r). The representation of poetry as literal monument gives the verse a physical and solid aspect. It is unchanging, straightforward, stable; this suggests that all elegiac verse, which was a conceptual monument to the fallen, shares this constancy of physical manifestation and, crucially, of meaning.

The most polemically significant works of elegy published from Oxford were two apologias for the life of Laud following his execution in January 1645, Peter Heylin's, *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate the L. Archbishop of Canterbury* and the brief anonymous poem *An Elegie on the Most*

⁶⁴ Acrostic poems were common in both manuscript and print, compare for instance the elegy ‘upon the Earle of Strafforde’ beginning ‘That man that mounts soe high if once he fall/ His fate is most precipitate of all’, BL, Add. MS 37719, fol. 208r. The twinning of acrostic and visually constructive poetry in Walsingham's work recalls the epigrams of Francis Quarles but, as this example shows, was fairly standard practice.

Reverend Father in God William Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.⁶⁵ Heylin was involved in the production of *Mercurius Aulicus* and was a close associate of Laud; his is the more official version of the Archbishop's life.⁶⁶ It defends both Laud and his policies by attacking those whose malicious characters and abuse of power led to his death. Laud is cast as a Christian martyr, struggling against affliction.⁶⁷ The volume combines elegy with panegyric poetry and borrows from contemporary speech-genre in establishing a specific spatiotemporal location for the piece:

The Speech and Prayers being ended, he gave the Paper which he read unto Doctor Sterne, desiring him to shew it to his other Chaplaines, that they might know how he departed out of this world, and so prayed God to shew his mercies and blessings on them. and noting how one Hinds had employed himselfe in taking a Copy of his Speech as it came from his mouth; he desired him not to doe him wrong in publishing a false or imperfect Copy (p. 23).

The speech is inflected by its location and timing. This passage dramatises the delivery of the final speech, and establishes the difference in status between public declamation and publication. Laud shows a keen and somewhat pompous awareness of his posthumous life

⁶⁵ *An Elegie on the Most Reverend Father in God William Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* ([Oxford], 1644[5]) [TT: E271 (8)]. The anonymous elegy to Laud relies more on a visceral account of the harassment, trial and execution of the prelate than hagiographic detailing of his life and ideas:

Was He Apostate, who your Champion stood,
Bath'd in His Inke before, as now in Blood.
He that unwindes the subtile Iesuit,
That Feels the Serpents Teeth, and is not Bit?
Unties the snake, findes each Mysterious knot,
And turnes the Poyson into Antidott. (p. 5)

Laud was also mourned by various manuscript poems, for instance Cleveland's 'An Elegy upon the Death of William Laud Arch:Bishop of Canturbury', BL, Egerton MS 2725, fols. 8r-9v and Beinecke, Osborn MS b.93, pp. 121-23.

⁶⁶ Heylin was closely involved in the official print construction of Royalism, having edited *Mercurius Aulicus* for several months and contributing various supplements to the newsbook in 1643 and 1644, see Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 26.

⁶⁷ 'But God had given him such a measure both of strength and patience, that these afflictions, though most great and irksome, did make no more impressions on him, then an Arrow on a rocke of Adamant', p. 6. For Laud and Christian martyrdom, see Damian Nussbaum, 'Laudian Foxe-hunting? William Laud and the status of John Foxe in the 1630s' in *The Church Representation*, ed. by R. N. Swanson (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), pp. 329-42.

in print.⁶⁸ He emphasises the agency of the author in creating the perfect ‘Copy’ of a text; the only true account is that which has not been changed or interpreted in any way. Laud also rewrites the historical narrative of his life, claiming that the speech he gave shows ‘how he departed out of this world’. His martyrdom is physically represented by a written text.

By publishing a defiant justification of Laud and his policies, the Royalist establishment publicly renounced the actions of the malicious Parliament which judged him. Heylin is unequivocal, claiming that his execution was murder:

Thy brave attempt on Pauls in times to come
Shall be a Monument beyond a Tombe.
Thy Booke shall be thy Statues, where we finde
The image of thy nobler part, thy minde.
Thy name shall be thine Epitaph, and he
Which hear’s or read’s of that, shall publish thee
Above the reach of titles, and shall say
None could expresse thy worthes a braver way.
And thus though murder’d, thou shalt never dye,
But live renown’d to all Posterity
(‘Dignum Laude virum Musa vetat mori’ ll. 53–65).

Heylin plays with the notion of a lasting ‘text’, claiming that Laud will live on through being read privately and aloud. The notion of a life being ‘published’ or projected into the public sphere echoes the humanist conception that ‘Thy Booke shall be thy Statues, where we finde/ The image of thy nobler part, thy minde’.⁶⁹ Laud lives on in public spaces: St Paul’s; his published works; in discussion or recount of his life and achievements. The

⁶⁸ There is evidence to suggest that Laud became totemic for defeated Royalists after 1649. For instance, a miscellany collected by Sir John Gibson, of Welburn, Yorkshire, Captain of the Kings Horse in North Riding, and dedicated to his son from Durham castle in 1656, includes poems on the death of the King and a copy of ‘The Lord Arch-bishop of Canterbury, his Sermon on the Scaffold Jan: 10th 1644’, BL, Add. MS 37719, fols. 153v–55v.

⁶⁹ The phrasing also invokes Laud’s conscious shaping of Oxford as a microcosm of the state through his statues, and indicates that this conception is a worthy and lasting monument (and one which will endure). For Laud’s statues see Kevin Sharpe, ‘Archbishop Laud and the University of Oxford’ in *History and*

physical and public nature of Royalist elegy is to project a solid and immutable image of virtue, to demonstrate particular modes of behaviour, and to emphasise obedience. The Royalist audience of elegy is one which reiterates the virtues of the martyr through their assimilation of the text: 'Thy name shall be thine Epitaph, and he/ Which hear's or read's of that, shall publish thee'.

Heylin's hagiography of Laud was part of the semi-official trope of the elegiac volume. Not all elegies were official, however, but they shared a purpose and practice. Sir Bevill Grenville, a Cornish Royalist of some martial renown and great popularity, died at the battle of Lansdown on 5 July 1643.⁷⁰ In Oxford the response to his death was the production of an elegiac volume, quite different from those that had come before.⁷¹ It was not related to University volumes, despite the involvement of various figures closely associated with those texts. It was edited or collated by Henry Birkhead, like John Berkenhead a protégé of Laud's and fellow of All Souls.⁷² Whilst being produced from within the University city, the volume was not in the tradition of panegyric poetry of the 1620s and 30s. There is nothing about the collection to suggest that it is connected to the University; the title-page does not even specify a city of publication. The primary importance of the volume is in configuring a poetics of elegy to represent the dead hero, and to square this mournful style with a martial and masculine purpose.⁷³ As has been

Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper, ed. by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl and Blair Worden (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1981), pp. 146–65.

⁷⁰ See John Stucley, *Sir Bevill Grenville and his Times, 1596–1643* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1983).

⁷¹ 'Such features [lack of Latin verse, unusual order, identification by initial rather than name, status and college] suggest it was not constructed primarily as an act of collegiate or University self-representation, but participated instead in the broader polemical strategies of Royalism' Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 79–80.

⁷² See the introduction by Birkhead to the revised Restoration edition, *Verses by the University of Oxford on the Death of the Most Noble, and Right Valiant Sir Bevill Grenville* (Printed at Oxford in the Year of our Lord, 1643. And now Reprinted at London, 1684) [Wing O989].

⁷³ For a discussion of the influence and reception of the volume see James Loxley, "'Prepar'd at last to Strike with the Tyde?": Andrew Marvell and Royalist Verse', *The Seventeenth Century*, 10 (1995), 39–62.

stressed in Chapter Four, this collection was produced nearly simultaneously with *Musarum Oxoniensa Serenissimæ*, and shares authors, tropes and motifs with that volume. It is a far more codified and unified volume, however, if less complex as a consequence. There is a remarkable unity of sentiment and expression; the poems progress and develop in similar ways, sharing metaphorical schema, vocabulary and poetic dynamic. Dudley Digges castigates the ‘perjur’d Rebels’ (l. 33) and is followed by John Berkenhead attacking ‘this perjur’d Crowd’ (l. 7). The poems in this collection trace similar movements, in particular a visual interest in the scene of Grenville’s death.⁷⁴

The elegies are forced to address a problematic concept: that of celebrating and constructing an image of valorous masculinity using a corpse. The opening poem refuses to ‘beleeve mine Eye’ that Grenville is dead, finally forced to accept that ‘That Corps of Glory can be None’s but His’ (ll. 1, 8). The physical reality of the dead man is lost in his apotheosis: ‘The Souldier lives still, though the Man be gone’ (l. 12). This sentiment gives the verse a self-reflexivity that characterises the rest of the volume; the lasting monument to Grenville will be this collection of poems and his idealised life in Royalist propaganda and discourse.⁷⁵ Grenville’s life-blood is ‘texted on [...] [the] brow’ of his soldiers in John Berkenhead’s poem, it has attained a status as both language and militarised symbolic

⁷⁴ For this scene many of them draw upon Denham’s account of the stag hunt in *Coopers Hill*. The mob, thirsty for blood (l. 288), surround and attack the stag which ‘disdaines to die/ By vulgar hands’ (l. 292), surrendering only to the King, ‘proud to dye/ By such a wound, he fals, the Chrisall floud/ Dying he dies, and purples with his bloud’ (ll. 298–300). Poets in the *Bevil Grenville* volume pick out various parts of this narrative, in particular the blood, and reconfigure the concept of the noble animal happy to die for the King as the noble hero stoically accepting death in Charles’ service.

⁷⁵ Cp. also an interesting elegiac MS now Bod, Rawlinson Poet. MS 95. This collection memorialises Henry Earl of Cumberland, who died at York in 1643, by scribally publishing a presentation copy of his poetry: ‘Poeticall Translations of Some Psalmes and The Song of Solomon with other Divine Poems By that Noble & Religious Soule now Sainted in heauen The Right Honorable Earle of Cumberland, Lord Clifford, Viscount, Brumflet and Vessey, Lord of Westmoreland and of the Honor of Skipton’ (fol. 1r). Cumberland is unpublished elsewhere, and his poetry does not seem to have had much life in manuscript; this document is his only monument, and illustrates how manuscript mimicked the physicality of print in this fashion.

motivation ('The Villaines now are ripe', l. 2). The blunt reality of Grenville's dead body is replaced by an idealised and sanctified memory of the soldier he was. William Cartwright asserts that 'Much Good grew from my Life, Much from my Fall' (l. 102), and Jaspar Mayne's verse likewise addresses his double value as Royalist captain and Royalist icon, 'who dyed'st twice/ Our Souldier once, and once our Sacrifice' (l. 122).⁷⁶ The religious flavour of these lines is no coincidence; earlier in the poem Grenville's death had 'consecrate[d]' the now 'sacred Ground' of Landsdown Hill (ll. 112–13).⁷⁷ Henry Birkhead's later poem asserts that 'when he was most Conquerd, Conquerd All' and that his was an 'immortall death' (ll. 30, 1). Earlier in this poem Birkhead applauds his decision to offer himself 'a Resolv'd Sacrifice/ As sure to fall, as by thy Fall to Rise' (ll. 21–22). Grenville's martyrdom assures his afterlife in verse and Royalist praise; he also attains a saintly or Christ-like status as an invincible saviour, leading the troops from beyond the grave like 'some Martiall Deity', in Birkhead's phrase (l. 23). The space of his body therefore becomes a topos on which to inscribe a variety of concepts of loyalty, obedience and identity.

The poems in the collection configure a newly engaged poetic and reflects a movement that can be traced throughout Royalist verse of the first civil war; as James Loxley argues, 'Elegy is envisaged as a means of effecting a fundamental military aim' (*Royalism and Poetry*, p. 193). Poetry has an active part to play in the war effort, an important social function. W. B. highlights the convergence between martial action and

⁷⁶ Cartwright takes this theme up in a second poem 'Hallow my temples', asserting that 'though both fall together, and the blood/ Of Traitors and a Patriots make one flood/ They in the Shambles, He at the Altar dyes,/ They fall as Beasts, and He a Sacrifice', ll. 29–32.

⁷⁷ Many of the poets in *Bevill Grenville* turn the fashion of his death into a Royalist locus for virtue and loyalty: Henry Birkhead describes his blood 'Sprinkling the Ground, and Hallowing the Hill' ('It is not He', ll. 33–34) whilst P. M. envisages his death, 'Me thinks I now behold Him as He stood, [...] when like a

engaged poetry: 'a fierce Charge is a good Elegie' ('What we have Lost in Thee', l. 18).

The poets use Grenville's loyalty to emphasise the importance of engagement: 'Who is not Active, Modestly Rebels' (Cartwright, 'Not to be wrought by Malice', l. 20). They attack those who think it noble to 'retire/ With flegme, and coldnesse' (Mayne, 'Could I report', ll. 43–44). Mayne emphasises the 'cold precepts' and scholarly aspect which 'Learnedly make Man Pusillanimous' (ll. 38, 41). He attacks a learned retirement from public action: 'Had'st Thou, like Others, fought by Rule, and Line,/ Who call it valour Wisely to decline/ Assaults, and Dangers, and maintaine that there/ Can be no Fortitude, where there is no Feare;' (ll. 24–27). The poems actively engage with their polemic others, addressing the Parliament 'Yet boast not Senate' or 'Guilty and wretched Commons!' (P. M., 'Yet boast not Senate', l. 1; Digges, 'Thou Name of Valour!', l. 31). They establish a dialectic poetic that demands engagement and expressions of loyalty. W. B. allows the truth of some enemy discourse, but emphasises that it is the inflection of this truth that is the difference between the sides: 'What We have Lost in Thee, We need not write,/ Thine Enemies will doo't [...] We only need Beleeve They can speake True [...] Lets rather Weep for them, [...] Whose Best of Courage was but worst of Guilt' ('What We have Lost', ll. 1–12).

Dudley Digges' poem 'Thou Name of Valour' establishes a complex poetics of capitalist interaction with the public sphere of combat:

Thou Name of Valour! Heire of all that Worth,
Which Fates with constant Bounty have powr'd forth
On Grenvills honour'd Race! In whom did dye
More then their Army, more then Victory
Could recompence, which to that gallant Stand
We owe, from ruine snatcht by thy brave Hand
O I could curse the villaines odds! For when
We hazard, Gold, They, but the drosse of men.

Captaine Oake/ He led that underwood, and tooke that stroake/ Which should have feld the Grove: I see him stand/ Dispensing Valour by his brave Command/ And braver Actions' ('Yet boast not Senate', ll. 5–11).

Bate me the price of sinne, the citty pay,
And what they steale, in order to obey
The Houses Vote, more then one Regiment
I'le name, wherein not ten are worth what's spent
Barely in feeding muskets; wee'ue oft lost
Powder; to kill such Rogues doth not quit cost.

(ll. 1–14)

Digges uses a highly charged mercantile diction to establish that war is a commodity.⁷⁸ Beginning by emphasising the importance of genealogy and ancestry in honour and virtue, Digges is moved to attempt to quantify the loss of Grenville to his cause. He can only do this by reference to Parliament's baseness. He refers to Parliament's constant and unpopular Ordinances to raise money for men and arms, arguing that this demonstrates that the opposition's systems of loyalty are based on financial transactions ('pay'/'obey' are connected by a rhyme, ll. 9–10). The City of London is attacked for supporting the war; their money creates the regiments that fight, however poorly. Grenville, however, saves his side from 'ruin' through his valour and virtue. In the game of 'hazard' or chance that is war the Royalists stake or venture figures of a far higher symbolic value than the Parliament. Their soldiers are 'Sergeant-Major-Cobler' and 'Mechanick Colonell', and their deaths do not bring 'any sense/ Of Triumph, for what honour i'st to tell' of their fall (ll. 18, 19, 16–17). They are artisan workers; Parliamentary soldiers are defined by their relationship to the marketplace rather than through their family characteristics or innate virtues. They are unworthy and unequal to the fight, and the Royalists win a 'Sad Victory' as 'Iustice (though sacred name) was bought too deare' (ll. 25, 24). War is tainted by its association with mercantile interaction, and even the victory at Landsdown is hollow and ambivalent.

⁷⁸ Cp. the discussion of Cowley's construction of the mercenary Parliamentarian soldiers, above.

Throughout the poem, Digges is less concerned with Grenville than with the opposition; he uses Grenville's death as a locus in which to analyse and attack the political motivation of the enemy. The merchants and Commons that support such an army 'sell/ Your Soules [...] but to purchase Hell' (l. 36–37). Their excuse that 'you are forc't to fight' and to contribute money, 'Traitors are against your will', is attacked as an 'Unworthy, vaine excuse' (ll. 42, 45, 46). The mainspring of rebellion is seen to be the financial support for the army; if such 'Ayde' was withdrawn, this 'abused Strength', the 'few seducers' would fall victim to 'the long injur'd Law' (ll. 49, 48, 47). The freedom of the market which allows the commodification of services such as the mercenary soldier or facilitates the financial ascent of the 'few seducers' corrupts and destroys old systems of loyalty and hierarchy. Royalist systems rely on models of interaction that are not inflected by the marketplace. They are set up as oppositional to the open and free City of London. Digges articulates the struggle between the old monopolies of discourse with the new public sphere; the catalyst is freedom of the marketplace.

The poets make much of Grenville's physical and verbal example: the swords of his soldiers were 'whetted both by's example and his words' (P.M., 'Yet boast not Senate', l. 12). His unswerving loyalty to Charles is emphasised: 'Thy choyce was just and early, not adjourn'd/ 'Till the great seale at Keinton field was turn'd' (Berkenhead, 'The Villaines now are ripe', ll. 13–14). This implicitly allows for a strand of obedience or loyalty that had wavered early in the war: 'He might (like some Reserved Men of State),/ Who look not to the Cause, but to its Fate)/ Have stood aloof, engag'd on Neither Side,/ Perpar'd at last to strike-in with the Tyde' (William Cartwright, 'Not to be wrought by Malice', ll. 9–12).

Cartwright's second poem illustrates how Grenville's death is part of a cathartic process of cleansing and reconfiguration of the once guilty state:

Thou that in those black times dard'st to be good,
When Treason was best Virtue, when none coo'd
Be safe and honest; that almost alone
Dard'st love the King, when a whole Nation
Was growing one great Rebell; hast firme stood
And gave the first great stop to th'growing flood;
Thou Destiny of our new-moulded State,
That first did'st make it's greatness shrink; whom Fate
Prepar'd to save a Kingdome; and did give
Thee Virtue great enough to make it live;
(ll. 11–20)

Cartwright emphasises the 'new-moulded State', a reanimated institutional body. In comparison with Grenville's great loyalty, the entire country needs to be cleansed of its wavering guilt. The poem emphasises the newness of the situation after Grenville's death: 'How *Brooke* and *Hampden* quake/ To find themselves not safe, and that to dye/ Ha's only changed the Scene of Victory?' (ll. 22–24). The shade of Grenville will pursue them through eternity.⁷⁹ This cathartic progression affects poetry also:

Grenvill! The Cornish *Pæan* it shall be
And only heard in Songs of Victory!
Th'Eternall Theame of Poets! Which shall give
Strength to their Lines, and make their Verses live.
(ll. 7–10)

Cartwright posits a poetic model based on a Harveian physiology. Content, in particular victory or Royalist example, animates form and gives it life. Just as Harvey's work has reformed constitutional models, here it reconfigures poetic practice.⁸⁰ Cartwright's first

⁷⁹ The poem picks up on the innate importance of theatrical language in locating Royalist expressions of battle. Elsewhere in the volume Grenville's troops 'Wonder'd to see the Warre turn'd to a Sight' and became 'Idle spectators of their Victory', Jasper Mayne, 'Could I report', ll. 58, 64.

⁸⁰ The reconfiguration of constitutional theory, discussed in Chapters One and Two, is reflected in Henry Birkhead's second poem '*Heroick Martyr*' in which he deploys a body of England metaphor that owes much

poem in the volume acknowledges the changes in verse form that have been undergone by

Royalist discourse:

I should, I know, track Him through all the Course
Of his great Actions, shew their Worth and Force:
But, although all are Handsome, yet we cast
A more inventive Eye still on the last.

(‘Not to be wrought by Malice’, ll. 47–50)

Standard elegiac models are put aside in order to mobilise the verse in the King’s cause and focus on Grenville’s martyrdom. Poetic style and technique are consciously changed for this newly martial situation. Grenville is continually compared to Achilles, and the poets writing of him to Homer. Virgil is also continually invoked, and the title-page quotes the *Aeneid*. There is an element of political sacrifice in Grenville’s martyrdom; as Achilles had to die in order to allow Troy to be conquered, so Grenville’s fall will lead to the eventual destruction of London and all it stands for. There is also something of the national narrative attending this connection with Homer and Virgil.⁸¹ The poets use Grenville to configure an imperial national identity and history, hinting at a glorious destiny through adherence to duty and perseverance in the following of a cause.

5.5 Martin Lluellyn

The final lines in *Bevil Grenville* are by Martin Lluellyn, member and poet of Christ Church throughout the 1630s and a serving officer in the King’s army during the war:

THE CLOSE.

Thus slaine thy Valiant Ancestor did lye,

to Harvey: ‘When Rebell *Members* ‘gainst their Head aym’d Darts,/ Counting Him none, by Whom they all are Parts’, ll. 9–10.

⁸¹ For the importance of Virgil and Homer in fostering seventeenth-century ideas of nationalism see Gerald Maclean, *Time’s Witness: Historical Representation in English Poetry, 1603–1660* (Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), and Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*.

When His One Barke a Navy did defie;
When now encompass'd round, He Victor stood,
And bath'd His Pinnacle in his Conquering Blood;
Till all His Purple Current dry'd, and spent,
He fell, and made the Waves his Monument.
Where shall th'next famous *Grenvills* Ashes stand?
Thy Grandsire fills the Seas, and Thou the Land.

This poem is reminiscent more of Denham and Cleveland's terse epitaphs on Strafford than the expansive panegyric elegy of the rest of the volume. It has the epigrammatic quality of a monument inscription, and a manuscript in the Bodleian illustrates that it was intended or used for such a purpose.⁸² Various of the features and motifs of the poem — the metaphorical idealisation of Grenville, the Harveian conception of the blood's importance to the body, the establishment of a verse monument — echo the rest of the volume, and the verse inflects the collection with its emphasis on the physical nature of the funeral monument. It shares a concern for actualising remembrance with other elegiac works considered in this Chapter. The poem has a spatial function and manifestation. Inscription becomes at once fluid printed verse and cut stone. Both have a public function in the praising of Grenville. His ashes and legacy are both physical dust and panegyric verse. The poem is conscious of its own stability and unchanging nature as a testimony to Grenville's greatness. The piece is a call to arms; whilst it seems to be addressed to Grenville's genealogical ancestors, the final couplet suggests that there are many opportunities to attain similarly glorious and celebrated status. The personal pronouns 'thy' open a dialogue with the soldier's spiritual loyal followers, exhorting them to identify with his actions and look to replicate and better them. Far from suggesting that there will never be another of his

⁸² Bod, Gough Maps MS 44, fol. 149.

kind, the poem looks actively for his replacement, assuming that valour and valiant conduct are commonplace virtues of the addressed reader.

Lluellyn included an extended version of the poem in his first printed collection, *Men-miracles*.⁸³ The volume was published on or around the 27 June 1646. This was barely a month after Oxford fell to the Parliamentarian armies and the King escaped, cutting his hair and beard and dressing as a servant. The fall of the city was seen by many as the end of the King's chance of victory on the battlefield. John Ashburnham ends his *Narrative* there: 'I hold it fitt to give this state of things, that when His Majestie's Forces were reduc'd to the last period (which I take to be the time when Oxford was beseiged)'.⁸⁴ The timing of Lluellyn's publication gives it an elegiac quality as well as a tone of defiance. It is the final expression of the Oxford city-court discourse, encapsulating many of the unique elements which distinguished loyalist verse of the period.

The poems in *Men-miracles* were composed throughout Lluellyn's time at Oxford and include verses on various topical or contemporary subjects from a curse of Vulcan 'Occasioned by a great Fire in Oxford, which began at the roasting of a Pigge 1643' to elegies for Royalist figures great and insignificant.⁸⁵ The collection is defiantly located within the city-court: similarly to *The Puritan and the Papist*, the title-page identifies

⁸³ *Men-miracles, with other Poems. By M. Ll. St. of Christ Church in Oxon* ([Oxford][Henry Hall), 1646) [TT: E269 (20)]. Thomason annotated his copy 'June 29 oxon'.

⁸⁴ *A Narrative by John Ashburnham of his Attendance on King Charles the First* (London: Payne and Foss, Baldwin and Cradock, 1830), p. 63.

⁸⁵ The fire referred to is that which destroyed Leonard Lichfield's press:

And here an Honest Loyall Printer dwelt,
Who all the Furie of the Tempest felt,
One that had never yet deserv'd these Fires,
By trying how well Treason looks in Quires.
Nor Printing Votes, where letters forward lye,
But must be read still with an Hebrew Eye.
Where Truths runne Counter, that which way they goe,
Rabbines and Sea Crabs which goe backward, know.

(ll. 47–54)

Lluellyn's status as 'St. of Christ Church in Oxon'. The volume addresses a particular Royalist reader; the collection is dedicated to James, Duke of York. Lluellyn suggests that the Prince had already seen manuscript versions of the poems: 'Part of these Papers being already destin'd to your Highnesse's Recreation, the *Rest* (like divided Wormes) by reuniting to their *peices*, are link't againe into an *Entire Nothing*' (Sig. A3r-v).

The collection uses similar tropes and strategies as the volumes produced in 1643 and poetry written at Oxford throughout the war. *Men-miracles* has elements of the politicised and engaged poetics of the earlier Oxford collections, including a dedicatory poem by John Berkenhead, but is less optimistic than those texts discussed above. The use of the 1643 *Bevil Grenville* lines in a 1646 collection gives the volume a conscious intertextual connection. However, the recycling of earlier figures and motifs attains a distinctly elegiac quality. Gone is the hope and ebullience of the early Oxford poems, replaced by a weariness and distress. The subject of the *Grenville* address becomes unclear; the rewritten poem does not conceive of an audience, instead concentrating on Grenville's actions in a narrative form. Grenville is elegised at greater length than before, and the poem also mourns the loss of the assurance that attended the earlier volume. The elegy is compromised. Grenville is remembered as the 'Restorer o'th' Declining Day', his heroic actions an attempt 'to shun the Danger now drawne nigh' (ll. 50, 23). He, and his idealised memory, were not enough to avert the war turning against the King. Lluellyn gestures back to a politically and martially engaged but ultimately irrelevant volume. He reconfigures the final lines by recontextualising them, and the doubly elegiac mode picks out a hitherto unnoticed sadness in the verse: 'spent,/ He fell, and made the Waves his Monument' now no longer sounds noble and heroic, becoming instead a reference to the insubstantial and

ephemeral nature of fame and poetry. The final couplet rather mourns the fallen as irreplaceable than looks for his successor. The longer version of the poem stresses the seeming pointlessness of formal poetic elegy:

To build upon the merit of thy Death,
And raise thy Fame from thy expiring Breath,
Were to steale Glories from thy Life and tell,
The World, that Grenvil only did dye well.
(ll. 1–4)

Lluellyn's 1643 lines had been given physical longevity when they were inscribed on a monumental column to Bevil Grenville. They are now used to express the changed circumstances of a defeated city.

The collection is opened by John Berkenhead's dedicatory 'To my Ingenious Freind Captaine LL'. Berkenhead compounds the comparison to the earlier volumes by comparing Lluellyn to 'our Triumviri/ (Masters, Diggs, Cartwright)' (ll. 21–22). This reference in itself is tinged with regretful elegy given the death of Cartwright from camp-fever at Oxford in November 1643: 'They would have sprung New Mines, sav'd th' Old, if staid,/ As now they fill that Breach falne Angels made' (ll. 23–24). Lluellyn eulogises Cartwright later in the volume, and J. C. invokes the 'bright shade of Cartwright' to praise Lluellyn ('To the Author', l. 3). The dedicatory poems make great play of appointing Lluellyn sole heir to an English poetical tradition from Chaucer and Spenser to Jonson, Randolph and Cartwright (in particular 'To the Author' by E. G.). Lluellyn's role in the poetry of the 1630s, and his Westminster-Christ Church background, made him the obvious choice to inherit the line of wit. W. B. invokes Cartwright's spirit: 'In every sheet I view, methinks! See/ Thy Cartwrights Ghost appeare; For such was he' ('To the Author', ll. 11–12). This approbation looks to claim some poetic continuity. Berkenhead's poem concludes by

decrying the destruction of the golden age by the institutional and public revolutions of the war: 'Times once at best, mend not, and seldome stand,/ Tis thus, when Women preach, and Slaves command' (ll. 29–30). J. F. claims the healing power of Lluellyn's verse: 'Discord growes Musicke, greife it selfe delight./ Horror when he describes, leaves off t' affright' ('To the Author on his Poems, ll. 11–12).

The title of Berkenhead's poem emphasises Lluellyn's role as a member of Charles's army, a practically engaged Royalist whose 'Armed Thoughts hit those/ Whose Lungs are Blasphemy and Prose' (ll. 1–2). J. C.'s verse goes further, conceiving of a cavalier ideal:

But brutish pow'rs do rage all that is darke
Joynes 'gainst the ray of reason in the Arke,
Put on thy other fury, try to weare
Head-peice more Rough come forth in Steele and Speare,
That as th'ast taken Pen and Sword unsheath'd
When Mars with Hermes have thy Lawrell wreath'd,
Worke for Apelles then, or who else can
Give us to life the Scholler, Souldier, Man.
(*'To the Author'*, ll. 21–28)

Peace and reason are equated with the sun, defined negatively in relation to the darkness of ignorance. The Royalist cause seems to be conceived of as the Ark carrying God's chosen few safely above the deluge. Lluellyn is constructed as a Royalist ideal, one who can fight with both sword and pen, a scholar-soldier.⁸⁶ Poetry is unequivocally given a martial function. J. H.'s 'To the Author on his Poems' comments on the gestation of the poems within the combat: 'Bayes bred from Thunder and Alarmes,/ Th' whole, as thy Satyr, borne in Armes, [...] And Wit-Lawes given in Noise and Smoake (ll. 17–20). W. C. values the printed word above the sword:

⁸⁶ Compare Cowley's idealised version of Falkland, emphasising his 'Learning, Reason, Wit' as much as his martial prowess, *The Civil War*, III, 625.

In such an age as this, when Ignorance
Is sainted, and usurpes the chaire of sence.
What boldnes does impale thy brow dear freind,
That thou to arts and learning dar'st pretend?
Tis well thou wear'st a Sword! But when thy Wit
Is such, that foure yeares Warre but heightens it.
Thou need'st a stronger guard, that may outlooke
The sternest danger, and such is thy Booke.
Thus arm'd thou stand'st above the power of Fate.
And if bold Wickednesse should ruinate
The life and Nerves of purer arts, yet thou
Shouldest live, and a fresh lawrell crowne thy brow;
And the next age shall say, when Learning fell,
Thou onely wrot'st and wert Man-miracle,
('To the Author', ll. 1–14)⁸⁷

The book physically protects the author; engagement with the public domain arms and defends Lluellyn by giving him a lasting monument. The time of war makes scholarship and poetry seem foolhardy pursuits, but Lluellyn's wit and technique raise them to a level of engagement. The final lines quoted figure the fall of Oxford as the end of learning, the metaphor linking the University to the golden age before the war. Later in the verse the poet commands the verses to 'Go forth and Live, thou'lt stand an evidence/ This Age had wit; pray God the next have Sence' (ll. 23–24). Whilst the sentiment is ambivalent, the couplet allows the collection a physical manifestation in the public domain, a legally defined status ('an evidence').

The dedicatory poems define the new poetics of wit and engagement represented by

Lluellyn's collection:

This book's not sent to these, nor yet to such
That despise all that forces not a blush;
That with the Vouge, and Torrent of the time,
Take what in Prose is sin, for wit in Rime.
That only prize things that are vile and fierce,
A Carre-mans Dialogue put into a Verse.

⁸⁷ The *DNB* asserts that 'W. C.' is William Cartwright, but this is extremely unlikely given the date of publication and the tenor of the other dedicatory poems.

As if our Genius by our faults were sent,
And still our veine did flow from punishment.
Our fetters were our onely wreath and Prayse,
Were greater from our thackles, then our Bayes.
As if twere valour, and requir'd a Name,
For to be Daring in an Epigramme,
And were a deed as Noble, and as High
For to defame, as stay an Enemy.
In Chast, and even Paths tho[e]se Poems Tread.
A Recluse might them write, a Vestall reade,
There are no Philters here, no Magick dust,
To raise desire, and Pander out for lust.
But if Triumphant vice oth' looser Age
Commands to Lists, and forces forth just Rage.

(J. F., 'To the Author on his Poems', ll. 22–42)

Lluellyn's 'just Rage' takes to the field and attacks the unworthy verse-forms of the time. Slander and lust are characteristics of the unlicensed poetry and prose of the enemy, texts which use filters and magic to obscure their true colours. Dialogue poems voice the 'vile and fierce' sentiments of the poor and unworthy. J. F. constructs a version of puritan poetics that apes the 'valour', 'daring' and 'Noble' acts of Royalist verse but is coarse and debased in comparison. By using sinfully false prose pamphlets and Parliamentary Ordinances as their source-material these poets create witless verse.

The poet negatively constructs an audience ('This book's not sent to these') in similar fashion to W. B.'s advice to 'Go forth and Live', conceiving of the collection as a singular entity.⁸⁸ Both these dedications see the book as a tangible unit sent into the world. The structure and format of the volume precludes a certain audience and constructs meaning. Lluellyn himself imposes a Martial-like control of his volume by prefacing the collection with 'The Author's Account of his Poem' and 'The Argument of the Poem'. By

⁸⁸ W. B. also considers a disapproving audience: 'He that shall read and shall not like them well,/ Write him thy three and twentieth Miracle', ll. 9–10.

gesturing toward the tradition of the epigram book, Lluellyn emphasises his control of the text and preempts the later work of Fane, Herrick and Fanshawe:

In *Hesperides* such ambiguities are forestalled by a framework which refuses to divide composition from dissemination within its representations of poetry. The many epigrams addressed to friends, relatives, patrons and Royalty locate public interaction firmly within any moment of authorship (Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 230).⁸⁹

Lluellyn exerts control over the public nature of his text in similar fashion. He deploys similar strategies and verse models to Herrick, ranging from pastoral ballad and popular song to divine carol, lyric and satire. His poems are strictly arranged according to genre, and the collection concludes with a section of 'Divine poems' which emphasise liturgical and devotional loyalty. The volume is defiantly part of the Oxford discourse, firmly embedded in the moment of its composition. A closet poem, 'Verses made in bed to one studying in the same Chamber' comments upon the cramped conditions of the city and the military significance of domestic objects: 'All thou read'st there is Watch-word sure, and then/ Stead of a sword lies drawne a Valiant Pen' (ll. 5–6).⁹⁰ The account of the Oxford fire is located in the lanes and streets of the city:

And then you and your warme Tempestuous Trayne,
Followd by sent into a close by-Lane.
Where you had seiz'd the Mint, but that withall
Aurum Potabile was too Cordiall.

('A CURSE TO VULCAN, Occasioned by a great Fire in Oxford, which began at the roasting of a Pigge 1643', ll. 31–34)⁹¹

⁸⁹ See in particular Ann Baynes Coiro, *Robert Herrick's 'Hesperides' and the Epigram Book Tradition* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).

⁹⁰ There is a very domestic aspect of the volume, exemplified in this poem and others such as 'To L: C: H: P. Being at his Quarters on his Birth-day'. They construct a version of the poet's identity that is rooted in Oxford, and also address the nature of private space in the city.

⁹¹ Other sites of local interest appear: 'The double-Janus Church that lookes foure wayes' (St. Mary's) l. 69; 'Bacons Cause-way' (the Folly Bridge), l. 116; the Mermaid tavern is destroyed, ll. 61–66.

Poems address topical polemic issues and are actively engaged with the enemy. Popular ballads are reconfigured and located within military and martial spaces (for instance, 'Song. At the Holly-Bush Guard', p. 44).

The importance of contemporary print discourse to the collection becomes evident when Lluellyn turns the newsbook genre into a poem, 'The Spy of the Buttery, Or the Welsh Dove: Walias, Jacke Price the feirce To the Cooke Dicke Peirce. This newes was tell her, From the Kings Cellar' (pp. 53–59).⁹² The piece comments upon the nature of news and correspondence during the war:

Dicke, I had wrote to thee before,
But filthy Fairefax (say no more)
Thou knowst 'twould be a dismall hearing.
To send a Letter out pickearing.
Your Better sort of Letters goe.
With Pistols at the Saddle Bow,
And though surpriz'd they much condole,
May be dismiss'd upon Parole.
But mine once snapt goes sure to Prison,
Nay faith perhaps they'd slit her Weezon.
(ll. 1–10)

The poem is an account of the defence of Oxford from Fairfax's troops.⁹³ It draws upon the style and diction of the combat reports regularly printed in the city, and echoes *Mercurius*

⁹² There is a manuscript version of this poem bound in the separate miscellany Bod, Ashmole MS 36/37, fols. 83r–86v. This collection also contains the manuscript version of Berkenhead's 'Upon the meeting of the King & Queene upon Edge hill' (fol. 1r) discussed in Chapter Four. There is also a copy of 'Newes from Colchester, or a proper Newes Ballad of certain carnal passages betweene a Quaker and a Colt', often ascribed to Denham, which relates in poetic form events first narrated in *Mercurius Aulicus The fifty first Weeke* (1644), 17 December [TT: E80 (8)]. The survival of these separate versions of poems composed at Oxford indicates that there was a certain limited circulation and transmission of poems before they were printed, and certainly the fact that Lluellyn's poems were pirated in London suggests that manuscript copies were in existence. The provenance of the Ashmolean manuscript is unclear, although there is disputed evidence to suggest that Ashmole himself was in Oxford and therefore he may have collected the texts himself; a 'Mr Ashmole' appears as a resident of Brasenose College in 1644, Brasenose College Archives, MS A2.42 (Senior Bursar's Accounts, 1644–46), p. 71.

⁹³ 'Ralph's speciall Care, His Bill of fare. Or A Caveat to the Foes that they beware 'em starving Omnium Animarum' also refers to the event: 'When Oxford Towne full fortnight seige, / Fairefax withstood that dreadfull Maggot' (ll. 1–2).

Aulicus' versions of the Parliamentarian troops.⁹⁴ The news purports to be Royally ratified (if only from the cellar), and the piece ends with the repulse of the troops. The poem was thus probably written during the period between 27 April and the fall of the city, when Fairfax had barricaded the city and the King had fled.⁹⁵ There is a blind defiance about publishing a text that has been proven wrong-headed, but the piece also asserts a populist loyalty that will not be occluded by mere martial defeat.⁹⁶ Lluellyn refuses to address the concept of defeat; not for him the anguished wranglings of Cleveland's or Vaughan's poems, both titled 'The King's Disguise', which attempt to address and understand the unthinkable situation (see Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 138–47).

'The Spy of the Buttery' is similar to Cowley's *The Civil War*, although the epic style is often intentionally undercut for broad humour. Oxford is figured as a more successful Troy, and much of the opening description of the city echoes *The Iliad*.⁹⁷

Lluellyn describes the Parliamentarian camp in detail, lingering on Fairfax's tent:

'Twas flaming Crimson, Dick, which did portend,
O Oxford, Oxford thou art at an end!
Like some fell Comet sure this must affright us,
Like that or'e the fam'd City sackt by Titus.

⁹⁴ In particular, the continual references to food refer to the extensive siege preparations undertaken at Oxford after Waller and Essex's aborted siege in June 1644, 'Which Order hath since found such a cheerfull obedience by all sorts of people, that if the Rebels should attempt to Face the Town again as they did before; or to come neerer to it then they have done hitherto; they will have as little hope to *starve* it, as they had to *storne* it', *Mercurius Aulicus the 24 Weeke* (1644), 9 June [TT: E53 (5)].

⁹⁵ See *Sir Thomas Fairefax facing Oxford. And our Horse skirmishing within Musket-shot of the Towne. The Enemie forced into Oxford* (London: Printed by Elizabeth Purstow, May 4. 1646) [TT: E335 (13)], and *The Copy of a Letter from An eminent Commander in Sir Thomas Fairfax Army* (London: Printed for Francis Coles in the Old-baily, 1645) [TT: E285 (17)], two collections of letters and official communications printed by command of Parliament regarding the campaign at Oxford.

⁹⁶ Lluellyn's poems were probably circulated in London during early 1646, as the (possibly counterfeited) edition *The King Found at Southwell, and the Oxford Gigg playd, and Sung at Witney Wakes* (London printed for F. L., 1646) [TT: E336 (14)], which is an annotated version of the pastoral poems, attests. This volume was received by Thomason on 7 May 1646, indicating that Lluellyn's poems were written during the siege of the city.

⁹⁷ Cp. George Wharton's 1645 Oxford publication *Englands Iliads in a Nutshell or A briefe Chronologie of the Battails, Sieges, Conflicts and other most remarkable passages from the beginning of this Rebellion* (Oxford, printed in the yeare, 1645) [TT: E1182 (3)]

(ll. 55–58)

This epic and delicately elegiac image contrasts sharply with Fairfax's doggerel oration before the city: 'Oxford (quoth he) on thee I'll have no pity,/ For I am sent from far by the Committee' (ll. 67–68).

The poem is greatly concerned with the physical mapping of Oxford; the topographical motifs invoke the loyalist chorographic purpose of Denham's *Coopers Hill*. Lluellyn reads Oxford as a repository of loyalty, the physical walls and gates of the city repelling the Parliamentarian foe. There is extensive local detail: 'Botly Causeway, on our Words,/ Their Braines lay thicker then their Curds' (ll. 39–40). The conflict is inscribed upon the city, which becomes a symbol of defiance and fixed principle:

From every Port we kill'd the Maggots,
There's one, there's two, so on like Faggots.
The East line common souldiers kept,
The North the Honest Townesmen swept.
The West was man'd by th' Loyall Schollers,
Whose Gownes you slave are blacke as Colliers.
They taw'd it faith, their Gunnes would hit,
As sure as they had studied it.
They ramm'd their Bullet, they would hat in,
Bounce went the Noise, like Greeke and Latine.
[...]
Now for the South Port Dicke, why there I say
The Noble Loyall, stout Lord Keeper lay,
His men made th' Rascalls cry they were mistaken,
To shew their hungry teeth at Friar-Bacon.
They conjurd 'em yfaith and laid 'em dead,
As each there Helmet were a Brasen head.
(ll. 108–29)

The four gates of the city lie at each point of the compass, giving Oxford a fixed arithmetical shape and establishing the city as part of a hierarchically structured universe. The students are celebrated as scholar-soldiers, their superior intelligence allowing them to crush the enemy. Their martial exploits are a language themselves, an encoded

communication that can be studied and understood. Loyalist fighting has a linguistic function as a defence of the authority of the King; it expresses defiance and normality.

Folly Bridge, the location of Roger Bacon's study, is the site of the final skirmish as the city rejects the invasion of the 'hungry' and socially undesirable Parliamentary troops.⁹⁸

The diseased and transgressive 'Maggots' are forcibly excluded from the civilised urban space.

Lluellyn emphasises the hybrid genre of his piece by taking on a different voice than that used throughout the volume, which has often tended to seem authorial or autobiographical. He uses the characters of the mean soldier and the cook to reframe a hierarchical system of loyalty in which artisans know their place rather than attempt to preach or lead armies.⁹⁹ There is a metatextual element to the poem added by the brief 'Postscript':

Because her Inglis was no very better,
Was cote another rite this Letter.
But Aule before, and behind, and beside that riteings,
Was her owne naturall inditeings.
I rest, a matter of foure times thy thrice
humble Servant, Shon Price.

(ll. 1–6)

⁹⁸ Parliamentary reports of the siege were very different, emphasising the demoralised nature of the Oxford garrison: 'but the Enemie within are very tame; and in all our Skirmishes, betweene our horse and them we had but three horses shot, most of their foot walke about their Workes in a drooping posture, with their Armes behind them, and with their hands in their pockets', W. C. to Parliament from Garsington, 2 May 1646, printed in *Sir Thomas Fairefax facing Oxford*, p. 5.

⁹⁹ Compare *Mercurius Aulicus*' report following the brief siege of the city in 1644 of 'the ridiculous and prophane carriage of the Rebels at their *Mock-fast* at *Samford* (within 2 miles of *Oxford*) upon Wednesday *May 29*. being the last Wednesday in the Moneth, and the day in which they marched towards *Islip*. In which was nothing more observable then that they had that day foure Sermons one after another (for it is not *fast and pray* but *fast and preach* with the *Puritan* faction) all of them preached (if I may use so good a word to so ill a purpose) by their inspired *Lay-Mechanicks*: one of which was a *Tallow-Chandler*, now one of the greatest *lights* in their congregation and being of a *burning zeale* prayed to God most fervently *to deliver the King into their hands, that he might goe along with his Elect*, (such *Elect vessells* are they all, but especially this learned *Candlestick*)! No wonder if the souldiers did such gallant things that day as they passed by *Oxford*, having beene so encouraged and inflamed by this zealous *Exerciser*', *The 24 Weeke* (1644), 14 June [TT: E53 (5)].

The text is already filtered through the voice of a scrivener. The verse comments upon the changing notion of authorship and expression; in particular the circumstances of composition are addressed. Price's written word is an interpretation of the dictation of his customer. The discourse of the proletariat is controlled and defined first by the half-educated scribe and then by inclusion in the printed text of the University poet. The collection imposes structure and order upon the private letter. Modes of expression are elided: the title casts the piece as part of the epistolary literature of the London and Oxford news markets, whereas the final lines site the poem within a private discourse.

This concern with private and public space, and especially the status of published letters, is the subject of 'A SATYR, OCCASIONED BY The Author's Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, The Kings Cabinet Opened' which had been first produced in 1645 and was reprinted in *Men-miracles*. The text attacks the propriety of the 'transgressive interpretation and publication of the King's letters' (Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 132):

When Lawes and Princes are despis'd, & cheape,
High-pitcht Mischeifes all are in the heap;
Returns must still be had; Guilt must strive more
Though not to'Ennoble, yet to Enlarge her store.
Poore cheape Designes! the Rebell now must flie
To Packet Warre, to Paper-Treacherie.
[...]
Who now have waded through all Publicke aw,
Will breake through Secrets, and prophane their Law.
(ll.1–20)

The Parliament show their transgressive colours by ignoring and mocking the laws of the country; they step outside of institutional and national boundaries in order to find a language with which to attack the King. Print becomes the locus for the battle; the Royalist must reluctantly engage with the unlicensed and treacherous foe. Private communication is

a matter between individuals; Lluellyn asserts ‘a speaker’s authority over his or her words’ (Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 131). Print is a very different space, one which is engaged with by choice. It requires a different register of expression:

Two close safe Paths she [Nature] did bequeath to men,
In Presence, Whisper; and at Distance Penne.
Publicke Decrees and Thoughts were else the same,
Nor were it to Converse, but to Proclaime.
Conceipts were else Records, but by this care
Our Thoughts no Commons, but Inclosures are:
What bold Intruders then are who assaile,
To cut their Prince’s Hedge, and breake His Pale?
That so Unmanly gaze, and dare be seene
Ev’n then, when He converses with His Queene?
(ll. 33–42)¹⁰⁰

The natural law protects the sanctity of the private domain. To break in upon the intimate relations of two people inverts the order of the world, is an ‘Unmanly’ act. There are overtones of violation and voyeuristic surveillance. The issue is particularly one of control over a text. Lluellyn makes the distinction between ‘Publicke Decrees’ and ‘Thoughts’; the two domains are mutually exclusive, or should be. The monarchy must be allowed to portray itself to the people in any way it sees fit, rather than have itself laid open to misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

The spatial vocabulary illustrates how interlinked notions of physical property and textual freedom were to the Royalists: ‘Our Thoughts no Commons, but Inclosures are:/ What bold Intruders then are who assaile,/ To cut their Prince’s Hedge, and breake His Pale?’. Lluellyn extends his cartographic metaphor to the garden and the country estate.

¹⁰⁰ For the institutional and representational insolence of breaking Charles’ seals, compare Mildmay Fane’s ‘Upon Breaking ye Seals because of ye Kings Image on them. or ye States Polecy’:

Whilst policy doth thus prouide
Better Destroy than to be Destroy’d
More pittie I than wonder Lacke
For Seals & all yt goe to wrack

England is the text which Parliament has violated. By attempting to wrest control away from the King's discourse they have attacked the chorographic foundations of the country itself. They have destroyed the normal boundaries, as Fane's poem on Northampton established (quoted in the Introduction). Lluellyn's use of an agricultural enclosure metaphor creates a dissonance with his later pastoral poems. Enclosure of common land led to unemployment and depopulation, and Charles had been energetic in his efforts to prevent such measures (Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 471–73). However, the metaphor is more concerned with ownership of the absolute space of the nation than particular local problems. Lluellyn grounds Royalist identity in a Georgic sense of the agricultural nation state. This is developed throughout a series of poems deploying pastoral conventions and forms in similar fashion to Herrick's later *Hesperides*. The occasional poem 'To my Lord B. of S. on New-yeares Day, 1643' celebrates the high morale and successes of that year:

Though Combates have so thicke and frequent stood,
That we at length may raise,
A Calendar of dayes,
And stile them foule or faire,
By their successe not Aire:
And signe our Festivalls by Rebels bloud.
(ll. 19–24)¹⁰¹

Lluellyn creates a Royalist calendar to celebrate a newly militarised court, government and populace. Ritual celebration is important to the collection, closing as it does with a sequence of Carols addressed to the King sung on various Christmas occasions between

Harvard, fMS Eng. 645, p. 31, ll. 1–4.

¹⁰¹ Compare Cowley's use of the saint's calendar to commemorate and celebrate the death of the Parliamentarian commander Brooke in the cathedral close at Lichfield: 'Chad and his Church saw where their enemy lay,/ And with just Red new markt their Holiday', *The Civil War*, 1, 373–74. See also Loxley on William Cartwright's creation of a 'deliberately partisan Stuart calendar' and polemic deployment of the 'politics of festival' in his poem 'November', *Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 82–83.

1643 and 1645.¹⁰² The collection combines reverence for Laudian religious ceremonial doctrine with an understanding of the importance of pastoral celebration imported from the *Book of Sports*.¹⁰³ Popular pastimes and ritual celebrations, particularly those associated with Christmas or May Day, were increasingly politicised during the 1630s and 40s after Charles' reissue of this volume in 1633 (see Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 351–59). Leah Marcus argues that 'the fostering of old festival pastimes became very closely tied to the vexed matter of enforcing religious conformity, and the pastimes were increasingly perceived as extensions of liturgical worship' (*Politics of Mirth*, p. 5). Her study looks at the reaction of Royalist poets to the suppression of traditional pastimes by Parliament during the 1640s, but her examples (Lovelace, Marvell and particularly Herrick) post-date the fall of Oxford and their pastoral defiance is somewhat tainted by the imminence of defeat.¹⁰⁴ In contrast, poetry of the early 1640s was full of zesty attacks on Parliament's dismantling of the festive calendar:

From holy dayes, and all that is holy;
 From May poles and Fidlers and all that is Jolly,
 From Latin, and Learning, since all that is folly
 Good Lord deliuer us.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Christmas Day 1644, 1645; New Year's Day 1643; Twelfth Night or Epiphany, 1644, 1645. There are manuscript copies of the Christmas Day poems at Bod, Tanner MS 466, fols 32r–33v and Lluellyn has a limited life in manuscript which post-dates the publication of *Men-miracles*.

¹⁰³ For the *Book of Sports* in poetry see in particular Leah S. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986). Lluellyn's volume also contains a lengthy elegy for Laud 'AN ELEGIE ON THE MOST REVEREND FATHER in God Willam, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury', pp. 129–39.

¹⁰⁴ Marcus does argue that Herrick's poems were composed and transmitted during the 1640s; however, they were not published until 1647/8, a fact which inflects their use of the pastoral and invocation of the *Book of Sports* nonetheless. Her discussion sees Lovelace and Marvell constructing a new sense of popular pastimes in the absence of the King and Court, pp. 213–65. See also Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, pp. 250–51.

¹⁰⁵ 'The new Letany', BL, Egerton MS 2725, fols. 166r–67v, ll. 69–72. Compare also the poem 'The Green Regiment of Murmuring and grutching Anti-Royalists' in *Insignia Civicus, Or, The Anti-Royalists, Described In their Kinds and Colours* ([London, 1643]) [TT: E251 (5)]:

While every Cobler was a States-man growne,
 Knowing how to mend the Common-Wealth, these Fooles
 Would have no King, no Learning, nor no Schools.
 No Crosses, Bells, no Service that's Divine;

Lluellyn's use of the pastimes is not coloured by defeat; far from being a 'language of covert opposition', the poems celebrate the vibrant life of the country (Marcus, *Politics of Mirth*, p. 21). There are Anacreonic lyrics that echo Herrick's conscious and political use of examples from antiquity.¹⁰⁶ An extended section describes the local Witney fair.

Oxfordshire is a locus of contained populist loyalty, their traditional celebrations and pastimes 'practised freely only within lawful limits' (Marcus, *Politics of Mirth*, p. 5).

Importantly, Witney is a carnivalesque space located outside of the civilising walls of Oxford. There are brief epigrammatic poems on Morris dancers, fiddlers, taberers, harpers and pipers. The poet is present at the fair, having visited to 'sippe againe and tast,/ Of the Nut Browne Lasse and Ales' ('The Wake', ll. 6–7). He constructs an observing persona who nonetheless orchestrates the proceedings. His descriptions of the various performances are inflected with politicised diction from the 'Roundheaded sinner' ('Enter the Country Fidler', l. 15) to the Taberer's musical 'Pass' and 'Tattoo' ('Enter the Taberer', ll. 2, 3).¹⁰⁷ They are figures of misrule, noisily affirming their way of life. The celebrations are recounted for the glory of the King:

Epilogue. The Witney Prayer.

Now God a blesse King Charles, and send him to be merry.
And bring our Noble Queene a safe over the Ferry.
The Prince, marry save him, and the Duke his owne Brother.
God a blessing light upon him, he is eene such another.
I say the Dukes Worship, for and whose sweet sake
Was a cheifely intended we of Witney, and the Wake.

But Sermons made in Tubs, and Casks of wine'
ll. 26–30.

¹⁰⁶ 'Song Against Ale', p. 63. For Herrick and Anacreon see Robin Somerby, *The Classical Legacy in Renaissance Poetry* (London and New York: Longman, 1994), pp. 154–56.

¹⁰⁷ The last example highlights the contemporary focus of the poem: according to the *OED*, 'tattoo' was only coined in 1644. The ancient customs and rituals are revived and changed by the importation of new concepts and diction. They take on a newly charged significance.

Public ceremonial culture is used to praise and glorify the Royal family. They are a form of expressive populist panegyric. Their celebrations are *for* the King, Queen and Princes; the actions of the revellers express their loyalty and obedience. The thanksgiving epilogue gives the proceedings a religious or liturgical framework.¹⁰⁸ The Fair is part of the ceremonial structure of the Caroline Laudian Church, 'an extension of sacred space' (Marcus, *Politics of Mirth*, p. 5). The stock figures act in prescribed fashion; their expressions and celebrations are contained and fettered. Their behaviour is controlled by print.

These pastoral poems were first printed in *The King Found At Southwell*. The status of this edition is somewhat problematic. It is ostensibly by 'Mr Loyd, Student of Christ Church in Oxford, and a Captaine of that Garison', a misreading of the 'M. LL.' who signs the dedication. This dedication is that of *Men-miracles*, and the poems are identical, linked by pieces of theatrical action recounting the visit to Witney. Lluellyn was circulated in manuscript, but not widely.¹⁰⁹ He may have transmitted these pastoral poems in London, but the lack of textual variants and any extant manuscript evidence for this would suggest that this is not the case. It seems probable that this edition was a pirated counterfeit, which might indicate that Lluellyn intended to print *Men-miracles* earlier than June 1646 and had prepared the text accordingly. It is odd that only a few poems are excerpted, however, and it is tempting to postulate an authorial hand in the edition.

¹⁰⁸ 'support for the *Book of Sports* implied support for a feudal or immediately postfeudal mode of social and economic organisation in which the Church was bound up with communal agrarian subsistence', Marcus, *Politics of Mirth*, p. 144

¹⁰⁹ The only exception being 'Pym's Ghost' (which did not make it into *Men-miracles*). There is a manuscript copy of 'The Spy of the Buttery' entitled 'News from Oxford' in Bod, MS Ashmole 36/37, fols. 83r-86v.

The text emphasises the importance of codes of behaviour to the configuration of Royalist identity. It examines the cavalier engagement with pastoral activities. The soldiers and courtiers have to leave Oxford, the site of civilised discourse, in order to observe the discordant antics of the peasantry, dance with the 'Country Lasses', and indulge themselves: '[the] Oxford Garison went to the Wakes to bee merry, where they sung and drank themselves out of all their sences' (p. 4). The first poem is sung by this company as 'they went out of Oxford', emphasising the liminal movement between the controlled space within the city walls and the wilder unbounded site of the fair (p. 4). The misrule is kept in check by the 'running-masque' style construction of the fair in print, and the role of the 'Oxford Poet' in arranging the proceedings: 'he acted his part and he falls to singing for he was still to be the Poet and act his part as Jester upon them all' (p. 6). The poet attains a shamanistic status, controlling and sustaining the polyphonic voices of the fair. His voice controls and interprets the actions of the various musicians and dancers, producing sanitised caricatures of the carnivalesque population. This voice in turn is subsumed into the framing theatrical structure of the piece. This text illustrates the choices made in the publication of *Men-miracles*, in particular with reference to this controlling of a polyvocal model. Both Lluellyn, and later Herrick, stress the controlled deployment of pastoral or pastime tropes outside of a physical Fair narrative. The poet retains his status as observer, imposing meaning and order onto the sports. *Men-miracles* dispenses with the dramatic structure of *The King Found at Southwell* to enable Lluellyn to step away from the text and assert the authority of his voice.

Lluellyn's poems were published in the immediate aftermath of shocking and terrible defeat. They bridge the conceptual movement from the optimism of 1643 and 1644

to the radical transformations Royalist expression underwent in mid-1646. These changes are figured in Cleveland's poem 'The King's Disguise': 'Y'are not i'th'presence, though the King be there' (l. 33). James Loxley has shown in depth how Cleveland's poem can only work 'by effecting a reversal of the strategies for dealing with *The King's Cabinet Opened* deployed by Lluellyn' (Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 145).¹¹⁰ The fall of Oxford and the flight of the King led to the enforced reconfiguring of the representational modes and discourses espoused by the poets discussed in this Chapter, and throughout this thesis.¹¹¹ The perceived defeat led to the wholesale decamping of the Royalist intelligentsia to the continent. The poets that stayed moved on in their political theorising and defence of the monarch; those that went increasingly turned to translation and burlesque in an attempt to establish a new mode of expression, a means of cultural survival.¹¹² The enforced absence of the King and the centralising influence of his court led to a fragmentation in Royalist identity and discourse which never again attained the homogeneity or control of the years at Oxford. The confidence and assurance of the loyalist text was destroyed as comprehensively as the Royalist institutional project itself. Subjection became a more relative notion. Despite his continuing authority, the absolute space defined by the King had been irreparably ruptured.

¹¹⁰ 'For Vaughan and Cleveland there is no extratextual monarch to anchor meaning. They have created the very version of the King that Lluellyn's Satyr was designed to prevent', Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 147. '[Cleveland's] poem is the beginning of Royalist lament - although it is *sui generis* - the first indications in the disguise of the King's game being truly up', Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, p. 279.

¹¹¹ Political theory also shifted greatly, see Ian Michael Smart, 'An interim period in Royalist Political Writing, 1647-48', *Durham University Journal* (1983), pp. 25-31.

¹¹² Denham, Fanshawe, Cowley, Thomas Stanley, Sir Edward Sherburne, Thomas Hobbes, James Howell and John Evelyn all considered or executed translations at some point during exile. In particular, the prefaces to Sherburne's *Poems and Translations* and Stanley's *Poems* (both 1651, published by Humphrey Moseley) [Wing S3222A; TT: E1422 (1)] redefined translation as an act of Royalist political significance. For a brief discussion of the courts in exile see P. H. Hardacre, 'The Royalists in Exile during the Puritan Revolution 1642-1660', *HLQ*, 16 (1952), 353-71.

Conclusions

This towne famous, being a bulwarke against the Scots; all the power of Scotland could never win it, since the walls were built; but of late being assisted by the English, was stormed, our churches and houses defaced, the ornaments of both plundered, and carried away, the crowne of our heads is fallen, woe now unto us, for we have sinned.¹

¹ *Chorographia, Or A Survey of Newcastle Upon Tine* (Newcastle: Printed by S.B., 1649) [Wing G1975], p. 38.

In the 1649 tract *Oxonii Lachrymae, Rachel Weeping for her Children*, the anonymous author — according to the title-page, an Oxford Scholar ‘not yet exil’d’ by the 1648

Visitation — imagines the victorious Parliamentarians erecting their victory monument, a building that will pretend to impose a new definition of space upon the nation and Oxford in particular:

they have moulded their hellish signes, and proceeded without fear or wit, to the raising of what ever was Religious or Learned amongst us: onely this we see some few Pillars (by indulgence) remaining, which yet are made useless for supportation and stand as bewailed Monuments of a once stately Fabrick; nor can we think they will be of a long continuance, sithence their white boys flock hither a pace with Spades and Mattocks of silver to clear the Foundation. Oh what a glorious building are they now erecting! Yes sure, another Babel for the honour of their Dignities, wherein nothing but ‘Tohe and Bohu’ is like to have its habitation.²

In particular, the construction of this space is seen to be based in language; the ‘hellish signes’ which are the perverted codes of communication and the building bricks for a new architectonics of nationhood. It is particularly significant that the initial space conquered is Oxford, as during the 1630s and particularly the 1640s the town had been the central locus for Royalist definitions of the state. The site of Laudian experiment and the King’s last glorious court, as well as the humanist centre of reason and educated discussion, is being trampled underfoot and its very foundations razed. *Oxonii Lachrymae* concludes with a list of loyalist scholars ‘expelled’, forcibly removed from the institution that had defined their roles and identity. In the late 1640s the language of exclusion in Royalist texts became even more significant, inflected as it was by the very real notion of exile from the centre of power and the home nation itself. *Oxonii Lachrymae* articulates this sense that the ‘once stately Fabrick’ of the nation and of national identity has been fundamentally and irreparably destroyed.

As I have argued throughout this thesis, the Royalist project was concerned with the construction of a particular partisan identity through the deployment of spatial metaphor and a denial of the interpenetrability of text and audience. Proclamations and Royal protocols polemically reconfigured the institutional life of the country. Licensing of the presses provided a controlled textual mediation of information and imposed particular definitions of national identity. Using this official discourse Charles and his court constructed a definition of Royalism and Royalist identity based upon a model of absolute space which inflected and created social relations and in particular definitions of allegiance. Modes of behaviour which seemed outside the bounds of institutionally and socially defined normality were caricatured as external, alien and other. Loyalist identity depended upon basic discourses of inclusion and exclusion; from the beginning, Royalism was predicated upon centrally defined spatial metaphors. Poets and prose writers themselves read and engaged with the institutional definitions of the Royalist project and created works of propaganda which delineated identity and behaviour. Susan Wiseman has recently criticised literary historians who focus too much on the court:

This concentration on canonical and courtly texts [...] has produced readings which tend to see the text as always at the service of the King, and conceptualise the early modern subject as unable to think outside models of power produced by monarchist discourse. Therefore such criticism has difficulty in responding to conscious and articulate challenges to authority.³

My thesis has attempted to show that monarchist discourse itself did not conceive that the early modern subject was able to think outside such 'models of power'; the text *was* always at the service of the King. The court at Oxford responded to 'conscious and articulate challenges to authority' in a consistent and concerted fashion. That the project failed in the

² *Oxonii Lachrymae, Rachel weeping for her Children, or, a Patheticall Relation of The present Grievances of the late famous University of Oxford* (London, Printed in the year, 1649) [TT: E555 (17)], p. 2.

short-term is neither here nor there. The model of Royalism postulated throws into new relief studies of Parliamentary texts, and restructures our thinking about allegiance, text and identity during the Civil War period.

³ *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 15.

Appendices

Appendix I

British Library, Harleian MS 6851, fol. 117 r–v: Arrangement of the King's quarters
Hand of Sir Edward Walker

Our will and pleasure and Wee doe streightly require and Comand all the respectiue officers of our Chamber and household whome these ensueing orders may in any sort concerne to Obserue the same in each particular as they and each of them Will avoyde our high displeasure for their neglect thereof:

First our Will is that two gromes of y^e Guard stand Constantly at the foote of the Stayres leading to y^e presence and privy Chamber and not to permit any unknowen or meane person to pass upp the Stayres toward that Rome,

Secondly that a Gent usher y^e Wayter constantly attend at our presence and privy Chamber door, and if any unknowen or meane persone (not giueing a good accompt of his being) shall haue passe the Guard, not to permitt such to goe any farther or to enter that Rome

Thirdly at the vpper end of our presence and privy chamber a Gent Vsher repayre and not to permitt any to enter the Withdrawing Chamber but our Nobilit, Councillors, Judges Bishoppes or the Comissioners of our Councell of War:

Fourthly at y^e Back stayer one of the Page of y^e Bedchamber constantly to attend and not to suffer any to enter y^e Withdrawing Chamber but y^e Nobility Councillors of State Judge Bippes Councillors of War or of our Bedchamber

Fiftly that fower Guard of y^e Troope (appoynted by the Captain) ~~dayly~~ giue there dayly attendance in y^e presence and privy Chamber and neere our person

When wee goe abroad to bee neere vs and to bee vigilant in obserueinge all persone makinge any addresse towarde vs or comeinge neere our person

6tly When wee shall walke into y^e Gardens our will is that 2 or more yeoman of y^e Gaurd keepe and attend at the Doores and not to permitt any meane or unknowne persone to enter:

Seauently When wee ride abroad our pleasure is that the Capt of our Guard still attend vs and the St of our Pencioners with fower or more of that band they to bee ready and giue theire attendance on vs on horsebacke and to wayte neere and about our person

~~Oxford~~ the Giuen on, the 26th of January 1642

(by permission of the British Library)

Appendix II

British Library, Egerton MS 2978, fols 133r–134v: List of offices granted at Oxford 1642–46

Hand of Sir Robert Heath

133r

- The Office of cheife Clarke of the Pleas in the Kings Bench granted to Thomas Elliott Esq in revercon after Robert Henley and Samuel Wightwicke
The Office of Keeper of the privie Seale granted to the Earle of Bath
The Office of Treasurer at Warr granted to Sir Wm Wardale
The Office of Captaine of the Pendennis Castle granted to John Arundell Esqr for life, and afterwards to his Son
The Office of Apothecarie to the Prince granted to Mr Metcalf in revercon after John Chase
The office of Examiner to the great Seale granted to Robert Benbow
The office of keeping the new parke neere Richmond granted to Mrs Katharine Murrey and her daughter
The Office of Mr of the Jewell house granted to Sr Wm Howard in revercon after Sir Henry Myldmay
The Office of Mr of the blacke rodd to Mr Maxwell, and Mr Thayne

133v

- The Office of President of Munster granted to the Earle of Portland
The office of one of the Judges of Wales granted to Mr Jenkins
The Office of Mr of the Rolls granted to Sr John Culpeper
The Office of Mr of the Court of Wards and Lyveries granted to the Lord Cottington
The Office of Knt Marchall of the Kings Household granted to Sr Edward Sydenham
The Office of one of the Searchers of Grauesend granted to Thomas Wards after John Robinson
The Keepership of Laughier point neere Harwich granted to Captaine Blague
The Office of Salle to the Duke of Yorke granted to Mr Everon
The Office of Auditor of the Court of Wards granted to Mr John, and Mr Robert Heath
The Office of prothonotaries and Clarke of the Crowne in severall Counties in Wales to one in possession, and another in Revercon
The Office of one of the Tellers in the Excheqr granted to Edward Herbert after John Brooks Arthur Squibb, John Savile Lawrence Squibb Lawrence Suretnann, Arthur Squibb and John Lovinge, and Wm Pinkney

134r

The office of Stewards of the Manor of Erematon in Cornwall granted to Mr John Coryton
The Office of Constable of Flint Castle granted to James and Endymion Phillips after
Thomas Edwards

The Office of President of the province of Conaugh granted to the Lord Wilmot, and Lord
Dillon

The Office of Waiter in the Customer house granted to Wm Wakeseiles after Samuel
Sprode John Glascook Edward Duncombe Richard Blake and 12 more

The Office of Keepinge the Rolls in the Comon pleas granted to Sir Orlando Bridgeman
and Mr Chadwell sunofsiuely at the nominacon of Mr Ashburnham after Sr Henry
Compton, Edward Hyde, and John Glyn

The Office of Reccier of the princes Revenue granted to Mr Edward Kirton after Thomas
Jermyn and David Cunningham

The Office of Keepinge of Nonsuch parke granted and confirmed to Sr Wm Killigrew Tho
Jermyn Henry Seymour, & Henry Killigrew

The Office of Surveyor Genr to the Prince granted Mr Hen: Killigrew

The Office of Escheatur, and Fadarie in the Duchy of Cornwall, and the Constablenesship of
the Castle of Launceston granted to Robert Brooking after John Sorrell

134v

The Office of Reader of the Civill Law Lecture in Oxford granted to Henry Janson after
Richard House

The Office of Bayliff, and the Bayliorcke of Richmonds in Coud Etax granted to the Duke
of Richmond

The Office of Solle genll granted to Sir Tho Gardiner

The Office of one of the Messengers in the Excheqr granted to Henry Davison after Isaac
Jaylion, Robert Benbow, Thomas Benbow Robert Johnson Richard Amys and Wm Cope or
3 of them

The Office of Attorney Genll to prince Charles granted to Sr Robert holborne

The Office of Receiur of the Kinges Reavenue in Lincolnshire to John Harvy, and Wm
Halk at the nominacon of Mr Edward Proger after John and Daniel Harby

The Office of keeper of Richmond parke in Surrey granted to the Earle of Portland

The Office of Usher of the Court of Wards granted to Mr John Houston and Mr Francis
Heath

(by permission of the British Library)

Appendix III

Archives of Merton College, Oxford, MS 1.3 (College Register 1567–1731), pp. 360–1: Inventory of the goods in the Warden's lodgings

More belonging to ye Lodging

The little Chamber at ye South end of the Gallery hanged wth Coarse Arras

One Bed & bolster bedsteld with greene silke Curtaines & Vallance two blanketts & one silke greene quilte

All wch at ye Queens coming were disposd of by Mr Greaves except ye hangings

In ye Dineing Roome where ye Queene lay

A drawing Table wth a Turkey worke Carpett

a Court Cupboard A side table all with suteable Turkey worke Chaire 12 Turkey-worke backt

Chaires 2 paire of brasse Andirons

In ye great hall

A long Table a long forme A still

(by kind permission of the Warden and Fellows of Merton College, Oxford)

Pagination Error

Bibliography

PRIMARY**Anonymous pamphlets (arranged chronologically)**

- *A True Christian Subject Under a Heathen Prince: Or Tertullians Plea for Allegiance, argued in time of the sixth Persecution, under the Emperour Severus. Ann. Dom. 204. With a Briefe Application, to the Citizens of London, Written by a Member of the House of Commons* (Oxford, Printed for Henry Hall 1642)
- *A Letter from a Scholler in Oxfordshire to his Unkle a Merchant in Broadstreet, upon occasion of a Book Intituled A Moderate and most Proper Reply to a Declaration, Printed and Published under His Majesties Name, Decemb. 8 intended against an Ordinance of Parliament for Assessing, &c. Sent to the Presse by the Merchant, who confesseth himselfe converted by it* (Printed in the Yeare 1642)
- *The Discovery of A Great and Wicked Conspiracie against this Kingdome in generall, and the City of London in particular. Being a Letter sent from the Hague in Holland, and directed to Secretary Nicholas, but intercepted by the way, and read in both Houses of Parliament on Saturday the 26 of November, 1642* (London. Printed for John Wright, 1642)
- *A Letter sent from a Private Gentleman to a Friend in London, In Justification of his owne adhering to His Majestie in these times of Distraction: With Arguments induceing him thereunto, both from the Law of God and Man* ([London] Printed for V. N., 1642)
- *No Parliament without a King: Or, The Soveraigns Person is required in the great Councils or Assemblies of the State, aswell at the Consultations as at the Conclusions* (Oxford: Printed for Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1642)
- *A Treatise in Justification of the King* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1642)
- *A Great Discrovery of the Queen's preparation in Holland to assist the King in England. Also, how Her Majesty hath sent Her Standard, with the rest of her Regiments over to New castle. As it was sent in a Letter from Rotterdam, Dated Decemb. 16. Stilo nuovo, and directed to M. Iohn Blackston a Member of the House of Commons. Die Veneris 16 Decemb. 1642.* (Ordered by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that this Letter shall be forthwith printed and published I. Brown Cler. Parliamentorum. London: Printed for J. Wright in the Old-bayly, Decemb 17. 1642)
- *A Declaration of the King Most excellent Majesties proceeding With his Army at Oxford, And elsewhere, As it was related by a Student from thence* (London, Printed for I. Wright, and are to be sold in the Old Baily. 1642)
- *The Queenes Proceedings in Holland. Being the Copie of a Letter sent from the Staple at Middleborough to Mr Vanrode a Dutch Marchant in London* (London: Decemb. 30 Printed by T. F. for I. M. 1642)
- *Plaine Truth, without Feare, or Flattery Being a Case of Conscience tryed at Oxford* (Printed for H. I. and Ro. Smith, 1642)
- *The Humble Petition Of the House of Commons* ([?Oxford], 1643)
- *Insignia Civicus, Or, The Anti-Royalists, Described In their Kinds and Colours* ([London, 1643])

- *A Sad Warning to all Prophane Malignant spirits who reproach True Protestants with the name of Roundheads. Wherein is declared five sad examples of Gods fearfull and just Judgements upon them* (London, Printed for H. U. 1642[3])
- *Powers to be Resisted: Or A Dialogue arguing The Parliaments lawfull Resistance of the Powers now in Armes against them* (London: Printed for Henry Overton in Popes-head-Alley, 1643)
- *The Necessity of Christian Subjection* (Oxford, Printed in the Yeere 1643)
- *Mercurius Davidicus, or A Patterne of Loyall Devotion. Wherein King David sends his Pietie to King Charles His Subjects* (Published by His Majesties Command. Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1643)
- *Two Intercepted Letters from Sr William Brereton to the Earle of Essex, and M. Pym; concerning the Rebels affaires in the North. The Originalls whereof were sent by an Expresse to the Earle of Essex, according to His Majesties direction, this 8 of Iuly, 1643* (Printed Verbatim according to the Originalls, by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1643)
- *An Elegy on the Death of the Right Honourable Spencer, Earle of Northampton, who died a Conquerour at the Battaile of Hopton-heath* ([Oxford, 1643])
- *Sober Sadnes: Or Historicall Observations Upon The Proceedings, Pretences, & Designes of a prevailing party in both Houses of Parliament. With the resolution of all loyall Subjects, and true Protestants of the Church of England thereupon* (Printed for W. Webb Book-seller, neer Queens Colledge, 1643)
- *An Examination of the Observations upon His Majesties Answers Wherein the absurdities of the Observators Positions, and Inferences are discovered* (Printed in the Yeare of our Lord, 1643)
- *The Grounds and Motives inducing His Maiesty to agree to a Cessation of Armes for one whole yeare, with the Roman Catholiques of Ireland* (Printed by His Majesties Command at Oxford, Octob. 19. By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1643)
- *A Briefe Discourse, Declaring The impiety and unlawfulness of the new Covenant with the Scots. Together with the Covenant it selfe* ([Oxford] Printed Anno Dom. 1643)
- *A New Wind-Mill, A New* (At Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1643)
- *A Remonstrance of the present state of Yorkshire: together with a letter sent to the House of Commons of Colonell Gorings landing at Newcastle with ten thousand arms, twenty pieces of ordnance, twenty thousand pounds, etc.: he hath likewise brought over with him a standard from the Queen, which is to be advanced in the head of the Lord of Newcastles army, which is called the Catholique army.* (London: Printed for E. Husbonds and J. Frank, 1643)
- *A Letter Written to a friend, Declaring his Opinion, Being such tenets, as are contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England, and of all the Reformed Churches; yea, and the Universall Church in all ages: which opinions are worthy of learned mens Consideration and Confutation* ([Oxford] Printed in the yeare, 1643)
- *A Copie Of certaine Letters Which Manifest the Designe of the late discovered Plot. First, His Majesties Letter to the City of London. Secondly, The Lord Digbies Letter to Sir Bazill Brooke. Lastly, Other intercepted Letters touching the same Businesse* ([London] Printed in the Yeare, 1643)
- *A Declaration of the Proceedings of the Honourable Committee Of the House of Commons, At Merchant-Taylors Hall, For Raising the People of the Land as one Man.*

- Under the command of Sir William Waller. August 3. 1643. Ordered by the Committee to be printed* (London: Printed by T. Pain and M. Simons. 1643)
- *The Cambridge Royallist Imprisoned* (BL, TT: E62 (15), Thomason ascription 'July 31 1643', n.d. or publisher)
 - *The Protestation and Declaration of the Well affected young men and Prentises, in and about the City of London, and other parts adjoyning. Wherein they declare their resolutions to live and die in defence of the true Protestant Religion now profest* (London: Printed for Henry Gibson, Febr. 13 Anno Dom 1643)
 - *Two Speeches spoken by the Earl of Manchester and Jo: Pym Esq; As A Reply To His Maiesties Answer to the City of Londons Petition, sent from His Majesty By Captain Hearn, And read at a Common-Hall on Friday the 13th of January 1642* (London: Printed for Peter Cole and are to be sold at his shop at the sign of the Glove and Lyon in Cornwall, neer the Royall Exchange, 1643)
 - *The Grand Question concerning Taking up Armes against the King Answered, by Application of the holy Scriptures to the Conscience of every Subject* (Printed in the Yeare of our Lord, 1643)
 - *An Answer to a Seditious Pamphlet, intituled Plain English. Wherein the Reasons against an Accomodation are Answered; the miseries of the Kingdome in generall laid open, and shewn to be kept up, for the maintenance of a few persons of decayed Fortunes: And An Application to the much wronged City* (Printed in the Yeare, 1643)
 - *No Post from Heaven, Nor yet from Hell: But a true Relation, and Animadversions, written, and sent as an Antidote, to all Unbelieving Brownists, Prophane Anabaptists, Schismaticall Monsters, And such like Incendiaries of the State* (Oxford: [Leonard Lichfield], 1643)
 - *A Letter to a Noble Lord from a Friend at Oxford: Upon occasion of the late Covenant taken by both Houses* (Printed, 1643)
 - *A Letter from a Protestant in Ireland to a Member of the House of Commons in England. Upon occasion of the Treaty in that Kingdome* ([Oxford, by Leonard Lichfield] Printed, 1643)
 - *Three Letters: the First, From an Officer in His Majesties Army to a Gentleman in Glocestershire. Upon occasion of certain Querees scattered about that Country. The Second, A Letter from a grave Gentleman once a Member of the House of Commons, to his friend, (remaining a Member of the same House) in London. Concerning his reason why he left the House, and concerning the late Treaty. The Third, A Letter to a Gentleman of Leicestershire, shewing, that all the Overtures, which have been made for Peace and Accomodation have proceeded from His Majesty onely* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield May 24, 1643)
 - *A Copy of a Letter from the Speakers of both Houses of Parliament in England, dated July 4. 1643. To the Lords, Justices, and Councell, of the Kingdome of Ireland* (Printed by His Majesties Command at Oxford, Novemb. 18. By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1643)
 - *A Copy of a Letter, from the Members of Both Houses Assembled at Oxford, To the Earle of Essex: Dated the 27 of January, 1643. With The names of those who Signed it, desiring a Treaty of Peace. Printed by Order, to be published to the whole Kingdom* (Printed At Oxford, January 30. By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1643)
 - *The Copy of a Letter from Colonell Francis Anderson to Sir Thomas Glenham, January 20. 1643, touching the Invasion of Scotland. The Copy of a Letter from the Marques of*

- Argyle and Sir William Armyne, to Sir Thomas Glemham January 20. 1643. The Copy of Sir Thomas Glemhams Letter in Answer to the Lord Marquesse of Argyl's, and Sir William Armyne's* (By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, Anno Dom. 1643)
- *Christus Dei, The Lords Annoynted Or, A Theologicall Discourse, wherein is proved, that the Regall or Monarchicall power of Our Sovereigne Lord King Charles is not of Humane, but of divine Right, and that God is the sole Efficient cause thereof and not the people* (Printed by His Maiesties Command At Oxford. 1643)
 - *The Iniquity of the Late Solemne League, or Covenant Discovered: By way of a Letter to a Gentleman desiring information upon the Poynt. Whereunto is Subjoynd the Covenant itself* ([Oxford] Printed, March 9. 1643)
 - *A Speech made by Alderman Garroway, At a Common-Hall, On Tuesday the 17 of January. Upon occasion of a speech delivered there the Friday before, by M. Pym, at the reading of His Majesty's answer to the later petition* ([Oxford], Printed in the Yeare 1643)
 - *Counter-Votes: Or, An Arraignment, and Conviction of the Votes at Oxford* ([London, 1644])
 - *Confessions and Proofes of Protestant Divines of Reformed Churches, That Episcopacy is in respect of the Office according to the word of God, and in respect of the Use the Best. Together, With a briefe Treatise touching the Originall of Bishops and Metropolitans* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall, in the Yeare 1644)
 - *Sampsons Foxes Agreed to fire a Kingdom: Or, the Jesuit, and the Puritan, met in a Round, to put a Kingdom out of a Square* ([Oxford, 1644])
 - *The Sea-Gull, or the New Apparition in the Star-Chamber at Westminster* ([Oxford] Imprinted, 1644)
 - *An orderly and plaine Narration of the Beginnings and Causes of this Warre. Also A conscientious Resolution against the Warre on the Parliaments side* ([?Bristol] Printed, Anno 1644)
 - *Vindex Anglicus, or, The Perfections of the English Language, Defended, and asserted* [Oxford, by H. Hall, 1644], reprinted in *The Harleian Miscellany*, II (London: Printed for T. Osborne in Gray's-Inn, 1742)
 - *Ahab's Fall by his Prophets Flatteries: Being the Substance of Three Sermons, upon 1. King. 22. 22.* (Printed by R. A. for J. Wright in the Old-Baily. 1644)
 - *Of Will-Worship* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall Printer to the Universitie, 1644)
 - *An Answer by Letter to a Worthy Gentleman Who desired of a Divine some reasons by which it might appeare how Inconsistent Presbyteriall Government is with Monarchy* ([Oxford, Leonard Lichfield] Printed, Anno 1644)
 - *Certain Disquisitions and Considerations Representing to the Conscience the unlawfulness of the Oath, entituled, A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation &c. As also the insufficiency of the Arguments used in the Exhortation for taking the said Covenant* (Published by Command. Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University 1644)
 - *Artificial Fire, or, Coale for Rich and Poore. This being the offer of an Excellent new Invention, by Mr. Richard Gesling Engineer (late deceased) but now thought fit to be put in Practice* (London: Richard Cotes for Michael Spaek Senior, 1644)
 - *Of Resisting the Lawfull Magistrate Under colour of Religion* (Oxford: Printed for H. H. and W. W. 1644)

- *The Gentle Lash, Or the Vindication of Dr Featley, a knowne Champion of the Protestant Religion* (Imprinted, 1644)
- *Mercurius Cœlicus: Or, A Caveat To all people of the Kingdome, That now have, or shall hereafter happen to reade the counterfeit, and most pernicious Pamphlet written under the name of Naworth: Of, a New Almanacke, and Prognostication For the yeare of our Lord and Saviour Iesus Christ 1644. (Said in the Title Page thereof to be) Printed at Oxford by His Majesties Command* (London, Printed by J. Raworth, for John Partridge [1644])
- *The Fallacies of Mr William Prynne, Discovered and Confuted: In A short View of his late Bookes intituled, The Sovereignty of Parliaments, Opening of the Great Seale, &c.* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1644)
- *A Letter From a Member of the House of Commons, To a Gentleman now at London, touching the New Solemne League and Covenant* (Oxford: Printed by H. Hall, 1644)
- *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate the L. Archbishop of Canterbury: With, a more perfect Copy of his Speech, and other passages on the Scaffold, than hath beene hitherto imprinted* (Oxford, Printed in the Yeare 1644)
- *Newes from Smith the Oxford Jaylor. With the Arraignment of Mercurius Aulicus, who is sentenced to stand in the Pillory three Market dayes, for his notorious Libelling against State and Kingdome* (London, Printed for J. B. 1645)
- *Letters from the Marquesse of Argyle, the Earle of Lanerick, Lord Warriston, and others now at Edenburgh, to their friends at London. Intercepted by Sir Richard Willyes Governour of Newarke, and Printed faithfully by the Originals* (Oxford: Printed by Henry Hall, Printed to the University. 1645)
- *The Copy of a Letter from An eminent Commander in Sir Thomas Fairfax Army, to severall worthy Members of the Honourable House of Commons assembled in Parliament. Dated at Marston, within a mile and a little more of Oxford, May 24. 1645* (London: Printed for Francis Coles in the Old-baily. 1645)
- *A Letter, in which the Arguments of the Annotator, And three other Speeches Upon their Majesties Letters Published at London, are Examined and Answered* ([Oxford] Printed in the yeare 1645)
- *The Malignants Lamentation in which All sorts of Royalists, bemoan the miseries which have fallen upon them for taking up Armes against the Parliament. Together with an Acknowledgement of their former Errors* (London, Printed by J. M. 1645)
- *No Peace 'till the King prosper. A Letter writ from a true lover of Peace. To one that is both, modestly inquiring, and Discovering the true and false Paths to a present Peace. That if the Parliament prevaile against the King, Peace cannot be; But if the King prevaile, it must be; And if neither prevaile, it will not be* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645)
- *The King's Cabinet opened: or, Certain Packets of Secret Letters & Papers, Written with the King's own Hand, and taken in his Cabinet at Naseby-Field, June 14, 1645* (London: for Robert Bostock at the Signe of the Kings-Head, 1645)
- *The Oxford Character of the London Diurnall Examined and Answered* ([London, 1645])
- *A Key to the Kings Cabinet ; or Animadversions upon the three Printed Speeches, of Mr Lisle, Mr Tate, and Mr Browne, spoken at Common Hall in London, 3 July 1645.*

- Detecting the Malice and Falshood of their Blasphemous Observations made upon the King and Queenes Letters* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645)
- *Parliaments Power, in Lawes for Religion. Or, an answere to that old and groundles Calumny of the Papists, nick-naming the Religion of the Church of England, by the name of a Parliamentary Religion. Sent to a friend, who was troubled at it, and earnestly desired satisfaction in it* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall Printer to the Universitie, 1645)
 - *An Elegie on the Most Reverend Father in God William Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* ([Oxford], 1644[5])
 - *The Character of an Oxford-Incendiary* ([London, 1645])
 - *Some Observations upon Occasion of the Publishing their Majesties Letters* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645)
 - *A Full Answer to a Scandalous Pamphlet, Intituled, A Character of a London Diurnall Published by Authoritie* (London, by E.P for Francis Coles and Lawrence Blaikeloke, and are to be sold at their shops, in the Old-Bayly, and at Temple-Barre. 1645)
 - *A Character of the New Oxford Libeller, In answer to his Character of a London Diurnall. Published according to Order* (London, Printed by M. S. for H. B. at the Castle in Cornhill, 1645)
 - *A Looking Glasse for the Oxford Juncto, And all others that have advised to, or are promoters and fomoters of our present, unnaturall, bloody, and destructive dissentions. Being a most serious and seasonable Exhortation both to the King and Subjects, yet at last to imbrace and preserve Peace, and abandon Civill Wars, after so much wofull experience of the miserable effects thereof: With other matters worthie of Consideration* (London; Printed by E. P., for Thomas Vere, and are to be sold at his Shop at the upper end of the Old-Bayley. Novemb. 3 1645)
 - *A message from His Majestie, to the speaker of the House of Peeres, pro tempore to be communicated to the Lords and Commons in the Parliament assembled at Westminister, and to the commissioners from the Parliament of Scotland* (Newcastle: Printed by Stephen Bulkley, 1646)
 - *Sir Thomas Fairefax facing Oxford. And our Horse skirmishing within Musket-shot of the Towne. The Enemie forced into Oxford* (London: Printed by Elizabeth Purstow, May 4, 1646)
 - *An Answer sent to the Ecclesiasticall Assembly at London. By the reverend, noble, and learned man, John Deodate, the famous professour of divinity, and most vigilant pastour of Genevah* (Newcastle: printed by Stephen Bulkley, 1647)
 - *The Kings possessions: written by His Majesties own hand; annexed by way of notes, to a letter sent to the Ecclesiasticall Assembly at London: in answer to a letter sent from them* (Newcastle: Printed by Stephen Bulkley, printer to the Kings Majesty, 1647)
 - *Oxonii Lachrymae, Rachel Weeping for her Children, or, a Patheticall Relation of The present Grievances of the late famous University of Oxford* (London, Printed in the year, 1649)
- Ashburnham, John, *A Narrative by John Ashburnham of his Attendance on King Charles the First From Oxford to the Scotch Army and From Hampton-Court to the Isle of Wight: Never before printed. To which is prefixed a Vindication of his Character and Conduct, from the Misrepresentations of Lord Clarendon, by his lineal Descendant and*

- present Representative* (London: Payne and Foss, Pall Mall; Baldwin and Cradock, Paternoster-Row, 1830)
- Armagh, J., *The Soveraignes Power and the Subiects Duty: Delivered in a Sermon, at Christ-Church in Oxford, March 3. 1643* (Oxford, Printed for W. W., 1644)
- Bertie, Montague, (Earl of Lindsey), *A Declaration and Justification; of the Earle of Lindsey, Now prisoner in Warwicke-Castle, wherein hee makes apparent the Iustice of His Maiestyes cause in ta-king armes for the preservation of his Royall person and Prerogative. As is was sent in a letter to the Right honourable Henry, Earle of Newarke, now resident with His Maiesty at Oxford. Ianuary. 26. 1643. It being a true Character of loyalty and myrrour of obedience for all His Maiestyes louing Subiects* (Oxford printed by Leonard Leychfield, Printer to the Universitie of Oxford)
- B., J., *The Oxonian Antippodes, or the Oxford Anty-Parliament* (London, Printed for Richard Lounds, and are to be sold at his shop neere Ludgate, 1644)
- Birkhead, Henry, *Poematia in Elegiaca, Iambica, Polymetra, Antitechnemata et Metaphrases, Membratim Quadripertita* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1656)
- John, Earl of Bristol, *Two Speeches Spoken at the Councell-Table at Oxford. The one, by the Right Honourable John Earle of Bristol, in favour of the continuation of the present Warre. The other, by the Right Honourable Edward Earle of Dorset, for a speedy Accomodation betwixt His Majestie, and his High Court of Parliament.* (Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, And now reprinted at London for Iohn Harson.)
- Burke, Edmund *Reflections on the Revolution in France, and on the Proceedings in Certain Societies in London Relative to that Event*, ed. by Conor Cruise O'Brien (1790; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986)
- de Cardenas, Alonso, *A Speech, or Complaint, Lately Made by the Spanish Embassadour to his Majesty at Oxford, upon occasion of the taking of a ship called Sancta Clara in the Port of Sancto Domingo, richly laden with Plate, Cocheneal, and other commodities of great value, By one Captaine Bennet Strafford, and by Him brought to Southampton. Being a matter of high concernment betwixt the two kings of Spaine and England. Also a Proclamation prohibiting the buying or disposing of any the lading of the ship called the Sancta Clara, lately brought into Southampton. Translated out of the Spanish, in Oxford, By S^r Torriano, an Italian* (London, Printed for Nathaniel Butter, Jan. 17. 1643)
- Cambridge, University of, *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis: Ob paciferum Serenissimi Regis Caroli* (Cambridge: Roger Daniel, 1641)
- Carew, Thomas, *The Poems of Thomas Carew with his Masque Coelum Britannicum* ed. Rhodes Dunlap (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949)
- Cavendish, William, *A Declaration Made by the Earle of New-Castle, Governour of the Towne and County of New-Castle And Generall of all His Majesties Forces raised in the Northerne parts of this Kingdome, for the Defence of the same. For his Resolution of Marching into Yorkshire. As also a Just Vindication of himselfe from that unjust aspersion laid upon him for entertaining some Popish Recusants in his Forces. With other passages of consequence* (Printed for W. Webb 1643)
- Chillenden, Edmund, *The Inhumanity of the Kings Prison-Keeper At Oxford. Or a true Relation of the most transcendent cruelties, cheatings, cozenings, and base dishonest dealings of William Smith, Provest Marchall General of the Kings Army, against the Parliament Prisoners under his custody. As it was delivered at the Barre in the House of Commons* (London: Printed for G. D. for John Bull, 1643)

- Chillingworth, William, *A Sermon Preached At the publike Fast Before his Maiesty at Christ-Church in Oxford* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall. 1644)
- Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, *History of the Rebellion* 6 vols, ed. by W. Dunn Macray (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959)
- Cleveland, John, *The Poems of John Cleveland* ed. by Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)
- Cleveland, John (unattributed), *The Character of a London Diurnall* (?London: Printed in the year 1644)
- Cleveland, John (unattributed), *The Character of a London Diurnall* (?Oxford: Printed in the year 1644)
- Corbett, Richard, *The Poems of Richard Corbett* ed. by J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955)
- Cowley, Abraham, *Poems* (London: For Humphrey Moseley, 1656)
- , *The Civil War*, ed. by Allan Pritchard (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973)
- Crashaw, Richard, *The Poems English Latin and Greek of Richard Crashaw* ed. by L.C. Martin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957)
- George, Lord Digby, *The Lord George Digbies Apologie for Himselfe, Published the fourth of January, Anno Dom. 1642* (Printed at Oxford, 1642)
- Dell, John, *Christ Held forth by the Word, the onely way to the Father OR a Treatise discovering to all, the difference between Lawes, Bondage and the Gospels Liberty* (London printed by J. C. For William Learner, at the signe of the Blackamore in Bishopsgate streete, and are to be sould at his Shop [1646])
- Denham, Sir John, *The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham* ed. by Theodore Howard Banks, Jr. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1928)
- Digges, Dudley, *The Unlawfulnesse of Subjects taking up Armes against their Sovereigne* ([Oxford] Printed in the Yeare 1643)
- Donne, John, *Poems, by J. D. with Elegies on the Authors Death* (Menston: The Scholar Press Limited, 1969)
- Edward, Earl of Dorset, *Two Speeches Spoken at Oxford, By the Right Honourable Edward, Earle of Dorset, before His Majesty, and the Lords of His Privy-Councell. The one, At his receiving the Office of Lord Privy-Seale. The other, At his being made President of His Majesties Councell. Shewing his good affection to the Parliament, and the whole state of this kingdome* (First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for Edward Hartley [1642])
- Duppa, Brian, *Prince Charles His Gracious Resolution Concerning the present Affaires of this Kingdome, presented to His sacred Maiesty by Doctor Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury, in a Speech delivered in the Princes behalfe, for a sudden Accomodation of Peace between His Majesty, and His High Court of Parliament. As also, His Highnesse humble request to His Maiesty, in behalfe of Sundry Commanders taken prisoners by the Kings Army* (First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for John Rivers. [1642])
- Fane, Mildmay, *Otia Sacra* (London: Printed by Richard Cotes, 1648)
- Fanshawe, Lady Ann, *The Memoirs of Ann Lady Fanshawe wife of the Right Honble. Sir Richard Fanshawe, Bart., 1600-72 Reprinted from the Original Manuscript in the Possession of Mr. Evelyn John Fanshawe of Parsloes, with Four Photogravure Portraits & Twenty-nine other Reproductions* (London: the Bodley Head, 1907)

- Fanshawe, Sir Richard, *Il Pastor Fido, The faithfull Shepheard With An Addition of divers other Poems Concluding with a short Discourse of the Long Civill Warres of Rome. To His Highnesse The Prince of Wales* (London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, and are to be sold at his Shop at the Princes Arms in S. Pauls Church-yard. 1648)
- , *The Poems and Translations of Sir Richard Fanshawe*, 2 vols, ed. by Peter Davidson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997, 1999)
- Ferne, Henry, *A Sermon Preached at the Publique Fast the Twelfth day in April At St Maries Oxford, before the Members of the Honourable House of Commons There Assembled* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1644)
- , *A Reply unto severall Treatises Pleading for the Armes now taken up by Subjects in the pretended defence of Religion and Liberty* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University. 1643)
- , *Conscience Satisfied That there is no Warrant for the Armes now taken up by Subjects* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University, 1643)
- , *The Sovereignty of Kings* (Printed at London, 1642)
- Fuller, Thomas, *A Sermon of Reformation. Preached at the Church of the Savoy, last Fast day, July 27. 1643* (London: Printed by T. B. for John Williams, at the signe of the Crowne in Pauls Church-yard. 1643)
- Godolphin, Sidney, *The Poems of Sidney Godolphin* ed. by William Dighton (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1931)
- , *The Passion of Dido for Æneas. As it is Incomparably exprest in the Fourth Book of Virgil. Translated by Edmund Waller & Sidney Godolphin Esqrs.* (London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley at the Prince's Armes in St Pau's Church-yard. 1658)
- Kissing the Rod: an Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Women's Verse* ed. by Germaine Greer, Jeslyn Medoff, Melinda Sansome, Susan Hastings (London: Virago, 1988)
- Gray, William, *Chorographia, Or a Survey of Newcastle Upon Tine. The Estate of this Country under the Romans. The Building of the famous Wall of the Picts, by the Romans. The Ancient Town of Pandon. A briefe Description of the Town, Walls, Wards, Churches, Religious Houses, Streets, Markets, Fairs, River and Commodities; with the Suburbs. The Ancient and present Government of the Town. As Also A Relation of the County of Northumberland, which was the bulwark for England, against the inrodes of the Scots. Their many Castles and Towers. Their ancient Families and Names. Of the Tenure in Cornage. Of Cheviot-Hills. Of Tinedale, and Reedsdale, with the Inhabitants* (Newcastle, Printed by S.B. 1649)
- [Greaves, Edward], *Morbus Epidemius Anni 1643 Englands New Disease most Contagious at present in Oxford. With the Signes Causes Remedies. Published by His Majesties Command* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University [1643])
- Habington, William, *Castara The first part* (London, Printed by Anne Griffin for William Cooke, and are to bee sold at his shop neare Furnivals Inne gate in Holburne. 1634)
- , *The Poems of William Habington* ed. Kenneth Allot (London: University Press of Liverpool at Hodder and Stoughton, 1948)
- Hartford, William Lord, *A Speech delivered by the right honourable William Lord Marquesse Hartford, in the Councill-chamber at Oxford, To The Kings most Excellent Majesty, and the Lords of His Privie Councill, on Saturday Ianuary 14 1642. Wherein he fully sets downe his opinion concerning the present Warres, and an Accommodation of Peace between His Majesty and his high Court of Parliament* (London: Printed for Henry Benson, 1642[3])

- Harvey, William, *De Motu Cordis & Sanguinis in animalibus Anatomica exercitatio* (London: John Mair [1639])
- , *De Motu Cordis & Sanguinis in animalibus Anatomica exercitatio* ([no place], ?Sebastian Sardum, 1643)
- Harwood, Richard, *The Loyall Subiect's Retiring-Roome, Opened in a Sermon at St Maries, on the 13th day of Iuly (being Act-Sunday) in the Afternoone, A. D. 1645, Before the Honourable Members of both Houses of Parliament, Assembled in Oxford* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645)
- Hausted, Peter, *Ad Populum: Or, a Lecture to the People* ([Oxford] Printed in the Yeare 1644)
- Herrick, Robert, *Hesperides, or, the Works Both Humane & Divine of Robert Herrick Esq* (London: Printed for John Williams, and Francis Eglesfield and are to be sold by Tho: Hunt, Book-seller in Exon. 1648)
- Heylyn, Peter, *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate the L. Archbishop of Canterbury* ([Oxford, by Henry Hall], 1644[5])
- , *The Rebells Catechisme. Composed in an easy and familiar way; To let them see, the Hainousnesse of their Offence, the weaknesse of their strongest Subterfuges; and to recall them to their duties, both to God and Man* ([Oxford] Printed, 1643)
- , *The History of That most famous Saint and Souldier of Christ Iesus; St George of Cappadocia; Asserted from the Factions, of the Middle Ages of the Church; and opposition, to the present. The Institution of the most Noble Order of St. George, namd the Garter. A Catalogue of all the Knights thereof untill this present* (London: Printed for Henry Seyle, and are to be sold at his Shop, the signe of the Tygers-head in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1631)
- Holborne, Robert, *The Reading In Lincolnes-Inne, Feb. 28. 1641. Upon the Stat. Of 25. E. 3. Cap. 2. Being the Statute of Treasons* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. Anno Dom. 1642[3])
- Hollar, Wenceslaus, *The Kingdome of England & Principality of Wales, Exactly Described With euery Sheere, & the small townes in euery one of them, in Sixe Mappes, Portable for euery Mans Pocket. Usefull for all Comanders for Quarteringe of Souldiers, & all sorts of Persons, that would be informed, Where the Armies be; neuer so Commodiously drawne before this. 1644. Described by one that trauailed throughout the whole kingdome, for its purpose* (Sold by Thomas Jenner at the South entrance of y^e Exchange, W: Hollar fecit)
- Howell, James, *Ah, Ha; Tumulus, Thalamus: Two Counter Poems, The First, an Elegy Upon Edward late Earl of Dorset, The Second, an Epithalamium to the Lord Marquess of Dorchester. Invicem cedunt Dolor & Voluptas Funera, Tædæ* (London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, and are to be sold at his shop at the Prince's Armes in St. Paul's Church-yard. 1654)
- Hunt, James, *Spirituell Verses and Prose of James Hunt, concerning Angels of Light, and angels of darkness* (London: Printed for J. H., 1643)
- Hutchinson, Lucy, *Lucy Hutchinson's Translation of Lucretius: De rerum natura* ed. by Hugh de Quehen (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996)
- , *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson with the Fragment of an Autobiography of Mrs. Hutchinson* ed. by James Sutherland (London, Toronto and New York: Oxford University Press, 1973)

- J., W., *Obedience Active and Passive due to the Supream Power, By the word of God, Reason, and the Consent of divers moderne and Orthodox Divines; Written not out of Faction, but Conscience, and with desire to informed the Ignorant, and undeceive the Seduced* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, Anno 1643)
- Jonson, Ben, *The Staple of News* ed. by Anthony Parr (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1988)
- , *The Workes of Benjamin Jonson* (London: Printed by Richard Bishop, and are to be sold by Andrew Crooke in St. Paules Church-yard, 1640)
- , *The Workes of Benjamin Jonson. The Second Volume* (London: Printed for Richard Meighen, 1640)
- , *The Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (London: Printed by William Stansby, 1616)
- Josselin, Ralph, *The Diary of Ralph Josselin, 1616–1683* ed. by Alan Macfarlane (London: The British Academy and Oxford University Press, 1976)
- K[illigrew?], H[enry?], *A Sermon Preached Before the Kings Most Excellent Majesty at Oxford* (Oxford, Printed for W. Web. 1643)
- Langbaine, Gerald, *The Foundation of the University of Oxford* (London, published by M. S. for Thomas Jenner, and are to be sold at his shop, at the south-entrance of the Royal-Exchange, 1651)
- Laud, William (Archbishop of Canterbury), *Works*, 7 vols, ed. by P. Bliss (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847–60)
- , *A True Copy of Certain Passages of the Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury His Speech Spoken on the Scaffold on Tower-Hill immediately before his Death Jan. 10 1644* (Oxford, Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1644)
- , *A Letter Sent from the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury (Now prisoner in the Tower) to the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, and the rest of the Convocation at Oxford, Intimating his humble desires to His Majesty, for a speedy reconcilment between Him and His High Court of Parliament* (Ordered to be printed, First at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for Edward Vere [1642])
- [Lilbourne, John?], *The Examination and Confession of Captaine Lilbourne and Captaine Viviers, Whoe were taken at Braine-ford by his Majesties Forces, and had their triall at Oxford, on Saturday the tenth of this instant December, before the Lord Heath, other Lords of his Maiesties privy Councell being present, who were iudged as Ring-leaders of the Round-heads, to lost their lives on Wednesday, being the 14 day of this Moneth. Being sent in a letter from Mr Daniel Felton, a Scholar of Trinity Colledge, to one Mr Tho. Harris in Lincolne Innes Fields* (London printed for T. Wright, 1642)
- Lithgow, William, *A True Experimentall and Exact Relation upon That famous and renowned Siege of Newcastle, The diverse conflicts and occurances fell out there during the time of ten weeks and odde dayes: And of that mightie and marveilous storming thereof, with Power, Policie, and prudent plots of Warre. Together with a succinct commentarie upon the Battell of Bowden Hill, and that victorious battell of York or Marston Moore, never to bee forgotten. By him who was an eye wisse to the siege of Newcastle, William Lithgow* (Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Bryson, 1645)
- Lluelyn, Martin, *Men-miracles, with other Poems. By M. Ll. St. of Christ Church in Oxon* ([Oxford], 1646)
- , [attrib. to 'Mr Loyd'], *The King Found at Southwell, and the Oxford Gigg playd, and Sung at Witney Wakes: Witfh the Masque shewed before divers Courtiers, and*

- Cavaliers, that went thither from Oxford, and severall Ketches and Songs at the said Wakes* (London printed for F. L., 1646)
- , *A Satyr, Occasioned by the Author's Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, the Kings Cabinet Opened* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1645)
- Lovelace, Richard, *Lucasta: Epodes, Odes, Sonnets, Songs, &c. To which is added Aramantha, A Pastorall* (London: Printed by Tho. Harper, and are to be sold by Tho. Euvster, 1649)
- Maria, Henrietta, *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria, including her private correspondence with Charles the First. Collected from the Public archives and Private libraries of England and France*, ed. by Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Richard Bentley, 1857)
- Martin, Richard, *A Speech Delivered, to the Kings most Excellent Majesty in the name of the Sherriffs of London and Middlesex* (Printed at Oxford for William Webb; And reprinted for Anthony Vinson, 1643)
- May, Thomas, *A Breviary of the History of the Parliament of England Expressed in three parts: 1. The causes and beginnings of the Civil War of England. 2. A short mention of the Progress of that Civil War 3. A compendious Relation of the Original and Progress of the Second Civil War. Written by Thomas May Esq* (London, Printed for Anne Brewster, 1680)
- Milton, John, *The Riverside Milton* ed. by Roy Flannagan (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1998)
- , *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler (Harlow: Longman, 1971)
- , *Areopagitica; A Speech of Mr John Milton For the Liberty of Unlicenc'd Printing, To the Parlament of England* (London, Printed in the Yeare, 1644)
- Oxford, University, *Verses by the University of Oxford on the Death of the Most Noble, and Right Valiant Sir Bevill Grenville, alias Granvill, Kt* (Printed at Oxford in the Year of our Lord, 1643. And now Reprinted at London, 1684)
- , *Musarum Oxoniensium, Serenissimæ Reginarum Mariæ ex Batavia Feliciter Reduci Publico Voto D.D.D.* (Oxford: 1643, by L. Lichfield)
- , *Verses on the Death of the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenville, Knight. Who was slaine by the Rebels, on Landsdown-hill neare Bath, Iuly. 5. 1643* ([Oxford: Leonard Lichfield] Printed, 1643)]
- , *Eucharistica Oxoniensia In Exoptatissimum & Auspicatissimum Caroli* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1641)
- , *Musarum Oxoniensium Charisteria* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1638)
- , *Musarum Oxoniensium Pro Rege Soteria* (Oxford: I. L. G. T., 1633)
- Parliament, Houses of, *The Late Letters From both Houses of Parliament, Concerning their purpose of delivery of a Petition to His Majesty* (Printed by His Majesties Command at Oxford, and now re-printed at London for R. Royston. 1642)
- Philipott, Thomas, *Poems. By Thomas Philipott, Master of Arts, (Somtimes) Of Clare-Hall in Cambridge* (London, Printed by R. A. for John Wilcox, and are to be sold at the Crown in Pauls Church-yard. 1645[6])
- Pierrepoint, Henry (Marquess of Dorchester), *Two Speeches spoken in the House of Lords, By the Lord Viscount Newarke. The first Concerning the rights of Bishops to sit in Parliament, May 21, 1641. The second about the lawfulness and conveniency of their intermedling in Temporal affairs, May the 24th. following* (London, Printed 1641)

- , *My Lord Newarks Speech to the Trained-bands of Nottingham-shire at Newark, 13 July, 1642. Concerning His Maiesties Commission of Array* (London, Printed by Edward Griffin. 1642)
- [Pinke, Dr. Robert], *A Letter Sent from the Provost Vice-Chancellour of Oxford, to the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembroke Lord Chancellour of Oxford* (London: Printed by L. N. for E. Husbands and J. Franck and are to be sold at their shops in the Middle-Temple, and next door to the Kings head in Fleet-street, 1642)
- Prynne, William, *Canterburies Doome. Or the First Part of a Compleat History of The Commitment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of William Laud Late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury* (London, Printed by John Macock, for Michael Spark senior, at the sign of the Blue Bible in Green Arbour. 1646)
- , *The Sovereigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes* (Printed at London for Michael Sparke Senior, 1643)
- Quarles, Francis, *The New Distemper Written by the Author of the Loyall Convert* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1645)
- , *The Shepherds Oracle Delivered in an Eclogue* ([Oxford], 1644)
- Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, 3 vols, ed. by George Saintsbury (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905)
- Rupert, Prince Elector of the Palatine, *A Speech Spoken by His Excellence Prince Rupert To his Sacred Majesty, and the Lords of his Privie Councell, at his returne from Redding to Oxford: Wherein is freely delivered his opinion concerning the present Warre, With his advise for the erecting of Forts and Garrison Towns in this Kingdom, and calling in the old English Regiments out of Holland* (Printed at Oxford by L. Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for John Rivers. 1642)
- Spelman, John, *The Case of our Affaires, in Law, Religion, And other Circumstances briefly Examined, and Presented to the Conscience* ([Oxford] Printed in the Year, 1643)
- Spinkes, Richard, *A Sermon Preached in Oxford Before the Kings Maiesty, April 19 1643* (London, printed in the yeare, 1643)
- Stamp, William, *A Sermon Preached before his Maiestie at Christ-Church in Oxford, On the 18 of April 1643* (Oxford, Printed in the yeare 1643)
- Stapleton, Robert, *The First Six Satyrs of Juvenal; With Annotations clearing the obscurer places out of the History, Lawes, and Ceremonies of the Romans. By Sir Rob: Stapleton Knight, Gentleman in Ordinary of the Privy-Chamber to the Prince* (Oxford, Printed by Hen: Hall for Thomas Robinson, 1644)
- , *Pliny's Panegyricke: A Speech in Senate: Wherein publicke thankes are presented to the Emperour Traian, By C. Plinius Cæcilius Secundus Consul of Rome. Translated out of the Originall Latin, illustrated with Annotations and dedicated to the Prince, By Sr Rob. Stapleton Knight, Gent in Ordinary of the Privy Chamber to His Highnesse* (Oxford, Printed in the yeare 1644)
- , *Dido and Aeneas the fourth booke of Virgils Aeneis now Englished* (by Robert Stapleton Esqr. Printed for William Cooke at Furnivalls Inn gate in Holborne [1634])
- Stewart, Adam, *An Answer to a Libell Intituled, A Coole Conference Betweene the cleered Reformation and the Apologetical Narration, Brought together by a Wel-willer to both* (Imprinted at London, 1644)

Charles Stuart

- *His Maiesties Last Speech, To the Lords of his Privie Councell, and others, at His first notice of the intentions of the City of London, concerning their Petition for Peace: Wherein is briefly exprest the royall disposition of His excellent Majesty toward that honourable City, and his good inclination toward the kingdome in generall.* CR. (First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for Iohn Rogers)
- *His Maiesties Last Speech, and Protestation, which hee made on Sunday. the fifth of this instant February, in the Cathedrall Church of Oxford, the Lords and the cheife of the University being present, before the receiving of the Sacrament, for the re-nouncing of Popery. With the Pious Ioy of a True Heart enlarged upon the contemplation, and assurance of so great a happinesse, to the great comfort of all His Majestyes subjects, which will live and dye in the Protestant Religion and abhore Popery.* (Oxford Printed for W. Web, and since reprinted at London for R. Sutton)
- *His Majesties Letter and Declaration to the Sherriffes and City of London. Ianuary 17. 1642. Printed, by His Majesties Command, at Oxford, Ianuary 18.* (By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1642)
- *An Oath To Be Administred Unto all Officers, Souldiers, and such other persons as are or shall be within the Garrison of Oxford. Published by Authority.* Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. And reprinted at London for Matthew Walbancke. 1646
- *His Maiesties Gracious Answer To The Different Opinions of the Earles of Bristol and Dorset concerning Peace and War. Wherein is intimated to all His Loyall Subjects the earnest desire He hath of a faire attonement betwixt Himselfe and his High Court of Parliament.* CR (First Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and now reprinted at London for John Rivers [1642])
- *The Kings Maiesties Speech, As It was delivered the second of November before the University and City of Oxford. Together With a gratulatory Replication expressed by that learned Man Doctor William Strode, Orator for the famous University of Oxford* (First printed at Oxford, and now re-printed at London, 1642)
- *Two Speeches delivered by The Kings most Excellent Maiestie at Oxford: The First, to his Excellence Prince Rupert, the Generall of his Horse, at his departure with the Army. The other, to some Lords and others, at a Conference concerning accomodation with his High Court of Parliament. The following Copies being sent from Oxford in a Letter, from a Gentleman of good account at Court, to a person of quality in this City, and by him published* (First Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and reprinted at London for Iohn Turner)
- *Two Speeches, The first spoken by the Kings most Excellent Majesty. At a generall Councell held at Oxford, Decemb. 29. Wherein his Maiesty declares his inability to maintaine the Warre any longer, without the Lords shall rayse present supply of Money, for the maintenance of the said Army. The Second, spoken by the Earle of Northampton, in answer to his Majesties Demands. Ianuary, 2* (Printed for I.H. and W. Whightfield, 1643)
- *Two Letters of His Sacred Maiesty, One, In Vindication of Him, touching the Irish Affaires; The other, Concerning a late Mis-interpretation of one maine Passage in his late Letters* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the Universitie, 1645)
- *A Declaration of The Kings Majesties Most Gracious Messages for Peace: Sent to the two Houses of Parliament at Westminster. Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University. 1645. With a full Answer thereunto in the behalf of the*

Parliament (And Reprinted at London for Matthew Walbank, February 2. 1645. With the Answer)

- *A Speech Delivered By the Kings Most Excellent Maiestie, in The Convocation House at Oxford, To The Vice-Chancellour, and other Doctors, and Students of the Universitie, expressing his intentions of abiding there. Together with his gracious acception of their service and dutie to Him. As also his thanks for a Present offered Him by the said Vice Chancellour in the name of the whole Universitie. CR* (Printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the Universitie, 1643)
- *A Message sent from the Lords of his Majesties Most Honourable Privie Counsaile, now resident with His Majestie, Directed to the Citizens of London. Wherein is contained divers remarkable and considerable grounds and motives perswading to peace, which is the desire of all good men. Pax optima rerum* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1642)
- *By the King. His Majesties Proclamation for the Adjournment of part of Michaelmasse Term. Given at Our Court at Shrewsbury, the fourth day of October, in the eighteenth year of Our Reign* (Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1642)
- *BY THE KING. A Proclamation for the ease of the City of Oxford, and Suburbs, and of the County of Oxford, of unnecessary Persons lodging or abiding there.* [Oxford, Leonard Lichfield 1643].
- *His Maiesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects, Upon occasion of a late Printed Paper, Entituled, A Declaration and Protestation of the Lords and Commons in Parliament to this Kingdom, and the whole World, of the 22^d of October. Printed by His Majesties Command At Oxford* (By Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University. 1642)
- *By the King: A Proclamation declaring His Majesties expresse Command, That no Popish Recusant, nor any other, who shall refuse to take the two Oathes of Allegiance and Supremacie, shall serve Him in His Army: And that the Souldiery commit no rapines upon the People, but be fitly provided of necessaries for their money. Given at Our Court at York the tenth day of August, in the eighteenth year of our reign. 1642.* (Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most royall maiesty)
- *His Majesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects, Upon Occasion of his late Message to both Houses of Parliament, and their refusall, to treat with Him for the Peace of the Kingdom* (Printed by His Maiesties Command At Oxford By Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University. 1642)
- *His Majesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects upon occasion of the late Ordinance and Declaration of the Lords and Commons for the Assessing all such who have not contributed sufficiently for raising of Money, Plate, &c. 1642, Decemb. 8*
- *BY THE KING. A Proclamation for the free and safe passage of all Clothes, Goods, Wares, and Merchandize to Our City of London. 1642*
- *BY THE KING. A Proclamation for the Payment of His Majesties Rents, and Revenues into His Receipt of His Exchequer, at His City of Oxford. Given at His Majesties Court at Oxford, the Eight day of February, in the Eighteenth yeare of His Reigne*
- *His Majesties Speech Delivered The Twenty second of Ianuary, 1643. At Oxford.* (Printed At Oxford, By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1643)
- *His Majesties Speech to the Lords and Commons of Parliament Assembled at Oxford, Delivered at their Recesse, April 26. 1644. Printed by His Majesties Command, at the*

desire of the Lords and Commons of Parliament assembled at Oxford (By Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1644)

- *BY THE KING. A Proclamation for the ease of the City of Oxford, and Suburbs, and of the County of Oxford, of unnecessary Persons lodging or abiding there.* Given at Our Court at Oxford, the Seventeenth day of January, in the Eighteenth yeare of Our Reigne
- *BY THE KING. A Proclamation of His Majesties Grace, Favour, and Pardon, to the Inhabitants of His County of Willts.* Given at Our Court at Oxford, this second day of November, in the Eighteenth yeare of Our Reigne.

Symmons, Edward, *A Militarie Sermon, Wherein By the Word of God, the nature and disposition of a Rebell is discovered, and the Kings true Souldier described and characterized: Preached at Shrewsbury, May 19. 1644 to His Majesties Army there under the Command of the High and most illustrious Prince Rupert* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall in the Yeere 1644)

—, *A Loyall Subjects Beliefe, Expressed in a Letter to Master Stephen Marshall, Minister of Finchingsfield in Essex, from Edward Symmons a neighbour Minister, occasoined by a conference betwixt them* (Oxford, Printed for W. Webb, 1643)

Taylor, John, *Mad Verse, Sad Verse, Glad Verse and Bad Verse* ([Oxford, 1644])

—, *Some Small and Simple Reasons, Delivered in a Hollow-Tree, in Waltham Forrest, in a Lecture, on the 33 of March last by Animada Blower a Devout Bellows-mender of Pimlico Shewing The causes in generall and particular, wherefore they doe, might, would, should, or ought, except against and quite refuse the Lithurgy or Book of Common-Prayer* ([Oxford, 1643])

—, *Mercurius Aquaticus, Or, The Water-Poets Answer to all that hath or shall be Writ by Mercurius Britannicus. Ex omni ligno non fit Mercurius* (Printed in the Waive of the Moone Pag. 121, and Number 16, of *Mercurius Britannicus* 1643 [Oxford, by L. Lichfield])

[Ussher, James], *A Geographicall and Historicall Disquisition, Touching the Asia properly so called, the Lydian Asia (which is the Asia so often mentioned in the New Testament) the Proconsular Asia, and the Asian Diocese* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall, 1643)

[Walker, Sir Edward], *Iter Carolinum, Being A Succinct Relation of The Necessitated Marches, Retreats, and Sufferings Of His Majesty Charles the I. From January 10. 1641. till the time of His Death 1648. Collected by a daily Attendant upon his Sacred Majesty during all the said time* (London, Printed by W. Bodbid over against the Anchor Inne in Little Brittain. 1660)

Waller, Edmund, *The Passion of Dido for Æneas. As it is Incomparably exprest in the Fourth Book of Virgil. Translated by Edmund Waller & Sidney Godolphin Esqrs.* (London Printed for Humphrey Moseley at the Prince's Armes in St Paul's Church-yard. 1658)

—, *Poems, &c. Written by Mr Ed. Waller of Beckonsfield, Esquire; lately a Member of the Honourable House of Commons. All the Lyrick Poems in this Booke were set by Mr. Henry Lawes Gent. of the Kings Chappell, and one of his Majesties Private Musick. Printed and Published according to Order* (London: Printed by T.W. for Humphrey Moseley, at the Princes Arms in Pauls Church-yard, 1645)

Walsingham, Edward, *Alter Britannicæ Heros: Or the Life of the Most Honourable Knight, Sir Henry Gage, Late Governour of Oxford, Epitomiz'd* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1645)

- , *Britannicæ Virtutis Imago. Or, The Effigies of True Fortitude, Expressed to the life, in the famous actions of that incomparable Knight, Major Generall Smith, Who is here represented, June, 1644* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall, in the Yeare 1644)
- Warmstry, Thomas, *Ramus Olivæ; or, an Humble Motion for Peace: Presented to His Sacred Majesty, and the Honourable Houses of Parliament: And commended to the consideration of the people, for the composing the miserable Distractions of this Kingdome, and for the prevention of the farther shedding of Christian Bloud* (Oxford, Printed by H. Hall, 1644)
- Washbourne, Thomas, *Divine Poems, written By Thomas Washbourne* (London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, at the Princes Arms in S. Paul's Church-yard. 1654)
- Whitelocke, Bulstrode, *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke 1605–1675*, ed. by Ruth Spalding (Oxford: Oxford University Press and the British Academy, 1990)
- George Wilde, *A Sermon Preached upon Sunday the Third of March in St Maries Oxford, Before the Great Assembly of the Members, of the Honourable House of Commons There Assembled* (Oxford, Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University. 1643)
- Williams, Gryffith, *A Sermon Preached at the Publique Fast the eighth of March in St Maries Oxford before the Great Assembly of the Members of the Honourable House of Commons There Assembled And Published by their speciall Command* (Oxford, Printed by Henry Hall. 1644)
- Wood, Anthony à, *The Antient and Present State of the City of Oxford. Containing an Account of its Foundation, Antiquity, Situation, Suburbs, Division by Wards, Walls, Castles, Fairs, Religious Houses, Abbeys, St. Frideswede's, Churches, as well those destroyed as the present, with their Monumental Inscriptions; Mayors, Members of Parliament, &c. The whole chiefly collected by Mr. Anthony à Wood; with additions by the Rev. Sir J. Peshall, Bart.* (London: Printed for J. And F. Rivington, in St. Paul's Church-yard, and sold by the Booksellers of Oxford and Cambridge, 1723)
- , *Athenæ Oxonienses. An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops Who have had their Education in The most ancient and famous University of OXFORD, from The Fifteenth Year of King Henry the Seventh, Dom. 1500, to the End of the Year 1690. The Second Volume* (London: Printed for Tho. Bennet at the Half-Moon in S. Pauls Churchyard, 1692)
- Wright, Abraham [ed], *Parnassus Biceps, or Severall Choice Pieces of Poetry, Composed by the best Wits that were in both the Universities before their Dissolution* (London: Printed for George Eversden at the Signe of the Maidenhead in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1656)

SECONDARY

- Anon, *Mr. Cartwright's Pictures – a Seventeenth-Century Collection* (Suffolk: Catalogue of the Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1987)
- Achinstein, Sharon, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994)
- , 'The Politics of Babel in the English Revolution', in *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* ed. by James Holstun (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 14–45
- Adair, John, *By the Sword Divided: Eyewitness Accounts of the English Civil War* (Bridgend: Sutton, 1998)
- Alpers, Svetlana, *The Art of Describing* (London: University of Chicago Press & John Murray, 1983)
- Althusser, Louis, 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)' in *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays* trans. by Ben Brewster (London: NLB, 1971), pp. 121–177
- Anselment, Raymond A., *The Realms of Apollo: Literature and Healing in Seventeenth Century England* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1995)
- , *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988)
- , 'The Oxford University Poets and Caroline Panegyric' in *John Donne Journal*, 3 (1984), 181–201
- Appert, Lucile G., 'Towards a British Academy: The Poet and the King in the Commonwealth of Learning' in *Renaissance Papers 1998* ed. by T. H. Howard-Hill and Philip Rollinson (Rochester, New York, and Woodbridge: Camden House, 1998), pp. 115–125
- Ashton, Robert, *The English Civil War: Conservatism and Revolution 1603–1649* (London: Phoenix Giant, 1978)
- Atherton, Ian, "'The Itch Grown a Disease": Manuscript Transmission of News in the Seventeenth Century in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* ed. by Joad Raymond (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 39–66
- Aveling, Hugh, *Northern Catholics: the Catholic Recusants of the North Riding of Yorkshire 1558–1790* (London, Dublin, Melbourne: Geoffrey Chapman Ltd., 1966)
- Aylmer, G. E., *The King's Servants* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961)
- , 'Presidential Address: Collective Mentalities in mid-Seventeenth-Century England: II. Royalist Attitudes', *Transactions of the Royal History Society*, 37 (1987), 1–31
- Bawcutt, Nigel, *The Control and Censorship of Caroline Drama: The Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels 1623–73* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- Beal, Peter, *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)
- English Song 1600–1675: Facsimiles of Twenty-six Manuscripts and an Edition of the Texts* (12 volumes) ed. with Introductions by Elise Bickford Jorgens (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1986) vol. 2, *British Library Manuscripts, Part II*
- English Song 1600–1675: Facsimiles of Twenty-six Manuscripts and an Edition of the Texts* (12 volumes) ed. with Introductions by Elise Bickford Jorgens (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1986) vol. 2, *British Library Manuscripts, Part IV*

- Bloxam, John Rouse, *A Register of the Presidents, Fellows, Demies, Instructors in Grammar and in Music, and other Members of Saint Mary Magdalen College in the University of Oxford, from the Foundation of the College to the present time* volume 2: The Chaplains, Clerks, and Organists (Oxford: J. H. Parker and H. Hammans, 1857)
- Bond, Maurice, 'The Formation of the Archives of Parliament, 1497–1691' in *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 6 (1957), 151–8
- Boswell, Jackson, *Milton's Library: A Catalogue of the Remains of John Milton's Library and An Annotated Reconstruction of Milton's Library and Ancillary Readings* (New York and London: Garland, 1975)
- Bradford Alan T., 'Stuart Absolutism and the 'Utility' of Tacitus', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 46 (1983), 127–55
- Brenner, Robert, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550–1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Burke, Victoria, 'Women and Early Seventeenth Century Manuscript Culture: Four Miscellanies', *The Seventeenth Century*, 12 (1997), 135–50
- Burner, Sandra A., *James Shirley: A Study of Literary Coteries and Patronage in Seventeenth Century England* (London and Boston: University Press of America, 1988)
- Burrow, Colin, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)
- Butler, Judith, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997)
- Butler, Martin, 'Politics and the Masque: *Salmacida Spolia*' in *Literature and the English Civil War* ed. by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 59–74
- , 'Entertaining the Palatine Prince: Plays on Foreign Affairs 1635–37', in *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from English Literary Renaissance* ed. by Arthur F. Kinney and Dan S. Collins (Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1987), pp. 265–93
- , *Theatre and Crisis 1632–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)
- de Certeau, Michel, *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other* trans. by Brian Massumi (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986)
- Cain, T. G. S., "'A Sad Intestine Warr': Mildmay Fane and the Poetry of Civil Strife' in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 27–52
- , 'The Bell/ White MS: Some Unpublished Poems', *English Literary Renaissance*, 2 (1972), 260–70
- Calhoun, Craig, ed., *Häbermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1992)
- Capp, Bernard, *The world of John Taylor the Water-Poet 1578–1653* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994)
- , 'Popular Literature' in *Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* ed. by Barry Ray (London: Routledge, 1988), pp. 198–244
- Carlton, Charles, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983)
- , *Going to the Wars – The Experience of the British Civil Wars 1638–1651* (London: Routledge, 1992)
- Cave, Terence, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979)

- Chan, Mary, *Music in the Theatre of Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980)
- Chartier, Roger, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries* trans. by Lydia G. Cochrane (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994)
- , ed., *The Culture of Print: Power and the Uses of Print in Early Modern Europe* trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Oxford and Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989)
- Chernaik, Warren, *The Poetry of Limitation: A Study of Edmund Waller* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968)
- , 'Waller's *Panegyrick to My Lord Protector* and the Poetry of Praise', *Studies in English Literature*, 4 (1964), 109–25
- Clarke, Elizabeth, 'The Garrisoned Muse: Women's Use of the Religious Lyric in the Civil War Period', in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 130–44
- Clough, E. A., *A Short-Title Catalogue arranged Geographically of Books printed and distributed by printers, publishers and booksellers in the English provincial towns up to and including the year 1700*
- Clyde, William M., 'Parliament and the Press II', *The Library* 4th Series, 14 (1934), 39–56
- , 'Parliament and the Press, 1643–7', *The Library* 4th Series, 13 (1933), 399–425
- Coiro, Ann Baynes, *Robert Herrick's 'Hesperides' and the Epigram Book Tradition* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988)
- Collinson, Patrick, and Craig, John, *The Reformation in English Towns, 1500–1640* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998)
- Corns, Thomas N., 'Thomas Carew, Sir John Suckling and Richard Lovelace' in *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry: Donne to Marvell* ed. by Thomas Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 200–221
- , *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)
- , *The Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius* (London: Frank Cass, 1987)
- Costin, W.C., *The History of St. John's College Oxford, 1598–1860* (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society at the Clarendon Press, 1958)
- Coward, Barry, *The Stuart Age: England 1603–1714* (Harlow: Longman, 1994)
- Cust, Richard, and Hughes, Ann, eds., *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603–42* (Harlow: Longman, 1989)
- Crawford, Patricia, *Denzil Holles, 1598–1680: A study of his political career* (London: Royal History Society, 1979)
- Cressy, David, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980)
- Cromartie, A. D. T., 'The Printing of Parliamentary Speeches November 1640–July 1642', *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990), 23–35
- Culler, Jonathan, 'Literary Competence' in *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 101–118
- Curry, John T., 'A Seventeenth-Century Plagiary', *Notes and Queries* (1901), 457–59
- Daly, James, 'The Implications of Royalist Politics, 1642–1646', *Historical Journal*, 27 (1984), 745–55

- Davidson, Peter, *Poetry and Revolution: an Anthology of British and Irish Verse 1625–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)
- , 'The Notebook of Henry Rainsford', *Notes and Queries*, 229 (1984), 247–250
- Debord, Guy, *The Society of the Spectacle* trans. by Donald Nicholson-Smith (New York: Zone Books, 1994)
- Delany, Paul, *British Autobiography in the Seventeenth-Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969)
- Donnelly, M. L., 'Caroline Royalist Panegyric and the Disintegration of a Symbolic Mode' in *The Muses Common-Weale: Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century* ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988), pp. 163–77
- Duncan, James, 'Sites of Representation: Place, Time and the Discourse of the Other' in *Place/Culture/Representation* ed. by James Duncan and David Ley (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 39–57
- Dunn, Kevin, 'Milton among the monopolists: Areopagitica, intellectual property and the Hartlib circle', in *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* ed. by Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 177–192.
- Dunn Macray, William, *A Register of the Members of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford. From the Foundation of the College* volume 3: Fellows 1576–1648 (London: Henry Frowde, 1901)
- Dutton, Richard, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991)
- Edgar, F. T. R., *Sir Ralph Hopton: the King's Man in the West (1642–1652), a study in Character and Command* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968)
- The Connoisseur Period Guides: The Stuart Period 1603–1714* ed. by Ralph Edwards and L.G.G. Ramsey (London: The Connoisseur, 1957)
- Engberg, J., 'Royalist Finances during the English Civil War 1642–46', *The Scandinavian Economic History Review*, 14 (1966), 73–97
- Fish, Stanley, 'Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics' in *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 70–101
- , *Surprised by Sin: the Reader in Paradise Lost* (London: Macmillan, 1967)
- Fordham, Sir George, 'A Note on the "Quartermaster's Map," 1644', *Geographical Journal*, (1927), 50–52
- Foucault, Michel, *The Birth of the Clinic* trans. by A. M. Sheridan (London: Routledge, 1997)
- , *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by Alan Sheridan (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991)
- Fowler, Thomas, *The History of Corpus Christi College with lists of its Members* (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society at the Clarendon Press, 1893)
- Frank, J., *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper 1620–1660* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1961)
- French, Roger, *William Harvey's Natural Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Friedrich, Carl J., *The Age of the Baroque 1610–1660* (New York City: Harper and Brothers, 1952)

- Frow, John, *Time and Commodity Culture: Essays in Cultural Theory and Postmodernity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)
- Gadd, Ian, 'The Mechanics of Difference: a study in Stationer's Company Discourse in the seventeenth century' in *The Stationer's Company and the Book Trade 1550–1990* ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1997), pp. 93–113
- Gibson, Jonathan, 'Significant Space in Manuscript Letters', *The Seventeenth Century*, 12 (1997), 1–9
- Giddens, Anthony, 'Jurgen Habermas' in *The Return of Grand Theory in the Human Sciences* ed. by Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 121–40
- Globe, ----, *Peter Stent: London Printseller circa. 1642–1665* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1985)
- Gouws, John, 'Nicholas Oldisworth and MS. Don. c. 24', *Bodleian Library Record*, 15 (1994–6), 158–66
- Griffiths, Antony, 'The Etchings of John Evelyn', in *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts – Essays in honour of Sir Oliver Millar* ed. David Howarth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 51–67.
- Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* trans. by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, 1992)
- , *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society* trans by Thomas McCarthy (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press with Basil Blackwell, 1997; 1st German edition, 1981)
- , *Theory and Practice* trans. by John Viertel (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press with Basil Blackwell, 1988; 1st German edition, 1963)
- Halasz, Alexandra, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Hallyn, Fernand, *The Poetic Structure of the World: Copernicus and Kepler*, trans. by Donald M. Leslie (New York: Zone Books, 1993)
- Hanson, Laurence, 'The King's Printer at York and Shrewsbury, 1642–3', *The Library*, 4th Series 23 (1943), 129–31
- , 'English Newsbooks 1620–41', *The Library*, 4th Series, 18 (1938), 355–85
- Hardacre, P. H., *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956)
- , 'The Royalists in Exile during the Puritan Revolution 1642–1660', *HLQ*, 16 (1952), 353–71
- Havran, Martin J., *Caroline Courtier: the Life of Lord Cottington* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1973)
- Helgerson, Richard, *Forms of Nationhood: the Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992)
- Hibbard, Caroline M., *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983)
- Hill, Christopher, *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill: Volume I – Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985)
- , *Milton and the English Revolution* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1977)

- , 'William Harvey and the idea of Monarchy' in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* ed. by Charles Webster (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), pp. 160–182
- , (as general editor) *The English Civil War A Contemporary Account Volume 3: 1643–1647* (London: Caliban Books, 1996)
- Hillis Miller, J., *Topographies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995)
- Hinds, Hilary, *God's Englishwomen: Seventeenth-century radical sectarian writing and feminist criticism* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996)
- Hobbs, Mary, *Early Seventeenth Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992)
- Hotson, Leslie, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1928)
- Howarth, David, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485–1649* (London: Macmillan, 1997)
- , *Lord Arundel and his Circle* (London: Yale University Press, 1985)
- Howarth, R.G., 'Some Unpublished Poems of James Shirley', *Review of English Studies*, 9 (1933), 24–29
- Howell Jr., Roger, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution: A Study of the Civil War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)
- Hughes, Ann, 'The King, the Parliament and the localities during the English Civil War' in *The English Civil War* ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London and New York: Arnold, 1997), pp. 261–287
- , *Women, Men and Politics in the English Civil War* (Stoke-on-Trent: Paramount for Keele University, 1997)
- , *Politics, Society and the Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- Hutton, Ronald, 'The Structure of the Royalist Party, 1642–1646', *Historical Journal*, 24 (1981), 553–69
- Huxley, Gervase, *Endymion Porter: the Life of a Courtier* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1959)
- Iser, Wolfgang, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974)
- Jackson, Kevin, *Invisible Forms: A Guide to Literary Curiosities* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999)
- Jackson, Peter, *Maps of Meaning: An Introduction to Cultural Geography* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995)
- Jaffe, Michael, 'The Standard Bearer: Van Dyck's Portrayal of Sir Edmund Verney', in *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts: Essays in honour of Sir Oliver Millar* ed. by David Howarth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 90–106
- Jardine, Lisa, and Grafton, Anthony, "'Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy', *Past and Present*, 290 (1990), 30–79
- Johns, Adrian, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998)
- Johnson, Charles, *English Painting from the Seventeenth-Century to the Present Day* (London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd., 1932)

- Johnson, Frances R., *Astronomical Thought in Renaissance England: A Study of the English Scientific Writings from 1500-1645* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1937)
- Jones, John, *Balliol College: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Jones, Kathleen, *A Glorious Fame: The Life of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, 1623-1673* (London: Bloomsbury, 1988)
- Jouhaud, Christian, 'Readability and Persuasion: Political Handbills' in *The Culture of Print: Power and the Uses of Print in Early Modern Europe* ed. by Roger Chartier, trans. by Lydia G. Cochrane, (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, 1989), pp. 235-61
- Kay, Dennis, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)
- Kaplan, M. Lindsay, *The Culture of Slander in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Kerrigan, John, 'Thomas Carew', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 74 (1988), 311-51
- Knowles, James, "'Infinite Riches in a little room": Marlowe and the Aesthetics of the Closet' in *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/ Bodies/ Spaces, 1580-1690* ed. by Gordon McMullan, (DETAILS?), pp. 3-30
- , 'Cecil's shopping centre: the rediscovery of a Ben Jonson masque in praise of trade', *Times Literary Supplement*, 7 February 1997, 14-15
- Kelsey, Sean, *Creating a Republic: the Political Culture of the English Commonwealth 1649-1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997)
- Kishlansky, Mark, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (Harmondsworth: Penguin/ Allen Lane, 1996)
- Kogan, Stephen, *The Hieroglyphic King: Wisdom and Idolatry in the Seventeenth-Century Masque* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1986)
- Kuchta, David, 'The Semiotics of Masculinity in Renaissance England' in *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe* ed. by James Grantham Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 233-47
- Lambert, Sheila, ed., *Printing for Parliament, 1641-1700* (List and Index Society, 20: 1984)
- Larkin, James, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations volume II: Royal Proclamations of King Charles 1624-1646* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)
- Lathey, R.T, Parsons, E.J.S. and Philip, I.G., 'A Contemporary Map of the Defences of Oxford in 1644', *Oxoniensa*, 1 (1936), 161-73
- Leslie, Marina, 'Antipodal Anxieties: Joseph Hall, Richard Brome, Margaret Cavendish and the Cartographies of Gender', *Genre*, 30 (1997), 51-79
- Liman, Jerzy, *The Masque of Stuart Culture* (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990)
- Lindley, Keith, *Popular Politics and Religion in Civil War London* (London: Scholar Press, 1997)
- Loftis, John, ed., *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann, Lady Fanshawe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979)
- Loomie, Albert J., *Ceremonies of Charles I: The Note Books of John Finet Master of Ceremonies, 1628-1641* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1987)
- Love, Harold, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)

- , *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993)
- Low, Anthony, 'New Science and the Georgic Revolution in Seventeenth-Century English Literature' in *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from English Literary Renaissance*, ed. by Arthur F. Kinney and Dan S. Collins (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), pp. 317–47
- Loxley, James, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997)
- , "'Prepar'd at last to Strike with the Tyde?": Andrew Marvell and Royalist Verse', *The Seventeenth Century*, 10 (1995), 39–62
- McCullough, Peter E., *Sermons at Court: Politics and religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- McDowell, Linda, 'The Transformation of Cultural Geography' in *Human Geography: Society, Space and Social Science* ed. by Derek Gregory, Ren Martin and Graham Smith (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), pp. 146–74
- McIlwraith, A.K., 'The Virgin's Character', *Review of English Studies*, 4 (1928), 64–8
- Maclachlan, Alastair, *The Rise and Fall of Revolutionary England: An Essay on the Fabrication of Seventeenth-Century History* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996)
- Maclean, Gerald M., *Time's Witness: Historical Representation in English Poetry, 1603–1660* (Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990)
- The Country and the City Revisited: England and the Politics of Culture, 1550–1850* ed. by Gerald Maclean, Donna Landry, Joseph P. Ward (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- Maclean, Douglas, *A History of Pembroke College, Oxford, Anciently Broadgates Hall, in which are incorporated short historical notices of the more eminent Members of this House* (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society at the Clarendon Press, 1897)
- Madan, Falconer, *Oxford Books: A Bibliography of Printed Works Relating to the University and City of Oxford or Printed or Published there. Vol. 2: Oxford Literature 1450–1640, and 1641–1650* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912)
- Malcolm, Joyce Lee, *Caesar's Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642–1646* (London and New Jersey: Royal Historical Society/ Humanities Press Inc., 1983)
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Milton's Readers' in *The Cambridge Companion to Milton* ed. by Dennis Danielson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 236–53
- , *Milton's History of Britain: Republican Historiography in the English Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)
- Marcus, Leah S., *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986)
- Marotti, Arthur F., *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993)
- Mardock, James, 'The Spirit and the Muse: the Anxiety of Religious Positioning in John Taylor's Prewar Polemics', in *The Seventeenth Century*, 14 (1999), 1–14
- Martin, G. H., and Highfield, J. R. L., *A History of Merton College, Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Maslen, M., *Woodstock Chamberlain's Accounts 1609–50* (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1993)
- Mathew, David, *The Social Structure in Caroline England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948)

- Mendle, Michael, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the publics 'privado'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)
- Millar, Oliver, 'Abraham Van Der Doort's Catalogue of the Collection of Charles I', *Walpole Society*, 37 (1960)
- Miller, Lucasta, 'The Shattered *Violl*: Print and Textuality in the 1640s', in *Essays and Studies 1993* ed. by Nigel Smith (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993), pp. 25–39
- Milton, Anthony and Kilburn, Terence, 'The Public Context of the Trial and Execution of Strafford', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641* ed. by J. F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 230–52
- Moore, J.K., *Primary Materials Relating to Copy and Print in English Books of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1992)
- Moore Smith, G. C., 'Thomas Randolph', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 13 (1927), 79–123
- Morrill, J. S., *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1993)
- , *The Revolt of the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630–1650* (London: Longman, 1976)
- Moss, Ann, *Printed Commonplace Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- Newlyn, Lucy, *Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)
- Newman, P. R., 'the King's Servants: Conscience, Principle and Sacrifice in Armed Royalism' in *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays presented to G. E. Aylmer* ed. by John Morrill, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 225–42
- , *The Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War, 1642–46* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993)
- Newman, William R., 'George Starkey and the selling of secrets' in *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* ed. by Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 193–210
- Nevo, Ruth, *The Dial of Virtue: A Study of Poems on Affairs of State in the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963)
- Nicholas, Donald, *Mr Secretary Nicholas (1593–1669): his Life and Letters* (London: the Bodley Head, 1959)
- Norbrook, David, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- , 'Lucy Hutchinson's "Elegies" and the Situation of the Republican Woman Writer (with text)', *English Literary Renaissance*, 27 (1997), 465–521
- , 'Lucy Hutchinson vs. Edmund Waller: an unpublished reply to Waller's "A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector"', *The Seventeenth Century*, 11 (1996), 61–86
- , 'The Reformation of the Masque' in *The Court Masque*, ed. by David Lindley, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), pp. 94–110
- , *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984)
- Nussbaum, Damian, 'Laudian Foxe-hunting? William Laud and the status of John Foxe in the 1630s' in *The Church Representation* ed. by R. N. Swanson (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), pp. 329–42.

- O Hehir, Brendan, *Expans'd Hieroglyphicks: A Critical Edition of Sir John Denham's Coopers Hill* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969)
- , *Harmony From Discords: A Life of Sir John Denham* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968)
- Orgel Stephen, *The Illusion of Power* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1975)
- Ornstein, Martha, *The Role of Scientific Societies in the Seventeenth-Century* (Chicago and Cambridge: University of Chicago Press/ Cambridge University Press, 1938)
- Parker, Geoffrey, 'The World beyond Whitehall: British Historiography and European Archives' in *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* ed. by R. Malcolm Smuts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 274–82
- Parker, Martin, "'To my friend G. N. from Wrest": Carew's Secular Masque' in *Classic and Cavalier: Essays on Jonson and the Sons of Ben* ed. by Joseph Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982), pp. 171–91
- Parry, Graham, *The Golden Age restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981)
- Patterson, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (London and Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984)
- Paulin, Tom, *Minotaur: Poetry and the Nation State* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1992)
- Peacock, Edward, ed., *The Army Lists of the Roundheads and Cavaliers, containing the names of the Officers in the Royal and Parliamentary Armies of 1642* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1874)
- Peacock, John, 'The Visual Image of Charles I' in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* ed. by Thomas Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 176–240
- Pearl, Valerie, *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution: City Government and National Politics, 1625–43* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961)
- Pearson, Jacqueline, 'Women Writers and Women Readers: the Case of Amelia Lanier' in *Voicing Women: Gender and Sexuality in Early Modern Writing* ed. by Kate Chedgzoy, Melanie Hansen and Suzanne Trill (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), pp. 45–55
- , *The Prostituted Muse: Images of Women and Women Dramatists 1642–1737* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1988)
- Peck, Linda Levy, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 1991)
- Pennington, Richard, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Etched Work of Wenceslaus Hollar, 1607–1677* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- Pevsner, Nikolaus and Sherwood, Jennifer, *The Buildings of England: Oxfordshire* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974)
- Philip, I. G., ed., *Journal of Sir Samuel Luke*, 3 vols (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1947–50)
- Pickles, John, 'Texts, Hermeneutics and Propaganda Maps' in *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape* ed. by Trevor J. Barnes and James S. Duncan (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 193–231

- Pinto, David, *'for ye Violls': the Consort and Dance Music of William Lawes* (Richmond: Fretwork Editions, 1995)
- Pocock, J. G. A., 'Texts as Events: Reflections on the History of Political Thought' in *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 21–35
- Potter, Lois, 'The Politics of Language in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 34 (1995), 536–42
- , *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- Purkiss, Diane, 'Dismembering and Remembering: the English Civil War and Male Identity' in *The English Civil War in the Literary Imagination* ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 220–41
- , 'Desire and Its Deformities: Fantasies of Witchcraft in the English Civil War', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 27 (1997), 103–33
- Rambuss, Richard, 'Pleasure and Devotion: The Body of Jesus and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric' in *Queering the Renaissance* ed. by Jonathan Goldberg (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994), pp. 253–41
- Raylor, Timothy, *Cavaliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture: Sir John Mennes, James Smith, and the Order of the Fancy* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994)
- The Dean's Register of Oriel 1446–1661* ed. by Rev. G.C. Richards & Rev. H.E. Salter (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society at the Clarendon Press, 1926)
- Raymond, Joad, 'Popular Representations of Charles I' in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* ed. by Thomas Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 47–74
- , 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century' in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* ed. by Joad Raymond (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 109–41
- , *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641–1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- , 'The Daily Muse: Or, Seventeenth-Century Poets Read the News', *The Seventeenth Century*, 10 (1995), 189–218
- Reid, Stuart, *All the King's Armies: A Military History of the English Civil War 1642–1651* (Kent: Spellmount, 1998)
- Ricks, Christopher, *Essays in Appreciation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- Roebuck, Graham, 'Cavalier' in *The English Civil War in the Literary Imagination* ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 9–27
- Rogers, John, *The Matter of Revolution: Science, Poetry and Politics in the Age of Milton* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1996)
- Rogers, Malcolm, 'Portraits of Thomas Killigrew' in *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts – Essays in honour of Sir Oliver Millar* ed. by David Howarth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 220–43
- Rollin, Roger B., 'Robert Herrick's Housekeeper: Representing Ordinary Women in Renaissance Poetry' in *Representing Women in Renaissance England* ed. by Claude J.

- Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1997), pp. 201–16
- Roy, Ian, “‘This Proud Unthankfull City’: A Cavalier View of London in the Civil War”, in *London and the Civil War* ed. by Stephen Porter (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 149–175
- , *The Royalist Ordnance Papers 1642–1646 Part 1* (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1963–4)
- , ‘The Royalist Council of War 1642–6’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 35 (1962), 150–69
- Rubinstein, Hilary L., *Captain Luckless: James, First Duke of Hamilton 1606–1649* (Edinburgh and London: Scottish Academic Press, 1975)
- Rushforth, Marjorie, ‘Two John Taylor Manuscripts at Leonard Lichfield’s Press’ in *The Library*, 11 (1931), 179–93
- Sanders, Julie, *Caroline Drama: The Plays of Massinger, Ford, Shirley and Brome* (Plymouth: Northcote, 1999)
- Sanderson, John, ‘*But the people’s creatures*’: *The Philosophical basis of the English Civil War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989)
- Sawday, Jonathan, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995)
- , “‘Mysteriously divided’: Civil War, madness and the divided self’ in *Literature and the English Civil War* ed. by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 127–47
- Sessions, William K., *Bulkley and Broad, White and Wayt* (York: Ebor Press, 1986)
- Shadwell, Charles Lancelot, *Registrum Oriense: an Account of the Members of Oriel College, Oxford*, 2 vols (London: Henry Frowde, 1893)
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Reading Revolutions: the Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000)
- , ‘Representations and negotiations: texts, images and authority in Early Modern England’, *Historical Journal*, 42 (1999), 853–81
- , *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992)
- , *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1989)
- , *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987)
- , ‘The image of virtue: the court and household of Charles I, 1625–1642’ in *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* ed. by David Starkey (Harlow: Longman, 1987), pp. 226–260
- , ‘Archbishop Laud and the University of Oxford’ in *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper* ed. by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl and Blair Worden (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1981), pp. 146–65
- Culture and Politics in Early Modern England* ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1994)
- Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwickler (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1987)
- Sherman, Sandra, ‘Printing the Mind: The Economics of Authorship in *Areopagitica*’, *ELH*, 60 (1993), 323–49

- Sherman, William H., *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995)
- Shields, Rob, *Places on the Margin: Alternative Geographies of Modernity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992)
- Skinner, Quentin, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Smith, Neil, and Katz, Cindi, 'Grounding Metaphor: Towards a Spatialized Politics' in *Place and the Politics of Identity*, ed. by Michael Keith and Steve Pile (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 67–84
- Smith, Nigel, *Literature and Revolution in England 1640–1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994)
- Smuts, Malcolm R., 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, c.1590–1630' in *Culture and Politics in Early Modern England* ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1994), pp. 21–45
- , 'Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change at the Court of James I' in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 99–113
- , *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987)
- Somerby, Robin, *The Classical Legacy in Renaissance Poetry* (London and New York: Longman, 1994)
- Stallybrass, Peter, 'Worn Worlds: Clothes and Identity on the Renaissance Stage' in *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture* ed. by Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 289–320
- , "'Wee feaste in our Defense": Patrician Carnival in Early Modern England and Robert Herrick's "Hesperides"' in *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from English Literary Renaissance*, ed. by Arthur F. Kinney and Dan S. Collins (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), pp. 348–67
- , *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (REF)
- Starkey, David, 'Intimacy and innovation: the rise of the Privy Chamber, 1485–1547' in *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* ed. by David Starkey (Harlow: Longman, 1987), pp. 71–119
- , 'Representation through Intimacy' in *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross-cultural Studies in Symbolism* ed. by Ioan Lewis (London and New York: Academic Press Ltd, 1977), pp. 187–225
- Steiner, Thomas R., 'Precursors to Dryden: English and French Theories of Translation in the Seventeenth Century', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 7 (1970), 50–81
- Stevenson, Allan H., 'Shirley's Publishers: The Partnership of Crooke and Cooke', *The Library*, 25 (1945), 140–62
- Stone, Lawrence, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965)
- Strachan, Micheal, *Sir Thomas Roe 1581–1644: A Life* (Lymington: Michael Russell, 1989)
- Strasser, Gerhard F., 'Closed and open languages: Samuel Hartlib's involvement with cryptology and universal languages' in *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* ed. by Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 151–162
- Stucley, John, *Sir Bevill Grenville and his times, 1596–1643* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1983)

- Thomas, Max W., 'Urban Semiosis in Early Modern London', *Genre*, 30 (1997), 11–29
- Thomas, P.W., *Sir John Berkenhead 1617–1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)
- Thorold Rogers, J.E., *Oxford City Documents: Financial and Judicial 1268–1665* (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society at the Clarendon Press, 1891)
- Tillotson, Geoffrey, 'The Commonplace Book of Arthur Capell', *Modern Language Review*, 27 (1932), 381–392
- Toynbee, Margaret, *The Papers of Captain Henry Stevens, Waggon-Master-General to King Charles I* (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1962)
- , and Young, Peter, *Strangers in Oxford: a side light on the First Civil War 1642–1646* (Chichester: Phillimore Press, 1973)
- Traub, Valerie, 'Gendering mortality in early modern anatomies' in *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects* ed. by Valerie Traub, M. Lindsay Kaplan and Dymphna Callaghan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 44–92
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *Archbishop Laud 1573–1645* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1988)
- Trubowith, Rachel, 'Female Preachers and Male Wives: Gender and Authority in Civil War England' in *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* ed. by James Holstun (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 112–34
- Turner, James, *The Politics of Landscape: Rural Scenery and Society in English Poetry 1630–1660* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979)
- Tyacke, Nicholas, 'Science and Religion at Oxford before the Civil War' in *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History presented to Christopher Hill* ed. by Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 73–94
- Underdown, David, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- , *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985)
- , *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1973)
- Unwin, George, *The Gilds and Companies of London* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1908)
- Varley, F.J., 'Oxford Army List for 1642–6', *Oxoniensa*, 2 (1937), 141–152
- , *Cambridge during the Civil War 1642–1646* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and sons, 1935)
- , *The Siege of Oxford: an Account of Oxford during the Civil War, 1642–1646* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932)
- Veevers, Erica, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- Venuti, Lawrence, *Our Halcyon Dayes: English Prerevolutionary Texts and Postmodern Culture* (London and Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1989)
- Vickers, Brian, *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)
- , 'On the Practicalities of Renaissance Rhetoric' in *Rhetoric Revalued: Papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric* ed. by Brian Vickers (New York: Centre for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1982), pp. 133–43
- Wainwright, Jonathan P, *Musical Patronage in Seventeenth-Century England: Christopher, First Baron Hatton (1605–1670)* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997)
- , 'The King's Music' in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* ed. by Thomas Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 162–176

- Wall, Wendy, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993)
- Wedgewood, C.V., *The Great Rebellion: The King's War 1641–1647* (London: Collins, 1958)
- Weinstock, Maureen M. B., *Hearth Tax Returns, Oxfordshire 1665* (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1940)
- Wikelund, Philip R., 'Edmund Waller's Fitt of Versifying: Deductions from a Holograph Fragment, Folger MS. X.d.309', *Philological Quarterly*, 49 (1970), 68–91
- Wilding, Michael, *Dragon's Teeth: Literature in the English Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)
- Wily, Michael, *Romantic Geography: Wordsworth and Anglo-European Spaces* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998)
- Williams, Raymond, *Culture and Society 1780–1950* (London and Toronto: Chatto and Windus, 1967)
- Wiseman, Susan, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- , 'Pamphlet Plays in the Civil War News Market: Genre, Politics and "Context"' in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* ed. by Joad Raymond (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 66–84
- , "'Adam, the Father of all Flesh": Porno-political Rhetoric and Political Theory in and After the English Civil War' in *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* ed. by James Holstun (London and Oregon: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 134–58
- Withington, Eleanor, 'Mildmay Fane's Political Satire', *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 11 (1957), 40–64
- , 'The "Fugitive Poetry" of Mildmay Fane', *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 9 (1955), 61–78
- Woods, T. P. S., *Prelude to Civil War 1642: Mr Justice Malet and the Kentish Petitions* (Salisbury: Michael Russell, 1980)
- Woolf, Daniel, 'Conscience, Constancy and Ambition in the Career and Writings of James Howell' in *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays presented to G. E. Aylmer* ed. John Morill, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 243–79
- Woudhuysen, H. R., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- Young, Brigadier Peter and Emberton, Wilfrid, *The Cavalier Army: Its Organisation and Everyday Life* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974)

MANUSCRIPTS

Balliol College, Oxford

BLCA C (Battel Books 1642–53)
BLCA D. (Buttery Book 1641–2)
BLCA E. (Bursar's Treasury Books 1637–89)
BLCA F.11.2 (Bursar's Computi 1615–62)
BCLA G. (Bursar's Book of Caution money 1640–1750)
MS 259 (Sermons of James Ussher)
MS 335 (Diary of Nicholas Crouch)
MS 336
MS 337
MS 359 (Commonplace Book of Nicholas Crouch)

Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscript Library, Yale University

James Marshall and Marie-Louise Osborn Collection:

MS b.62
MS b.93
MS b.104
MS b.133
MS b.197 (Commonplace book of Tobias Alston)
MS b.200
MS b.205
MS fb.106
MS fb.155 (Papers of John Browne)

Printed books with marginalia:

1983.219 (*Cooper's Hill*, 1653 exemplum)
Osborn MS pb.53 (*Cooper's Hill*, 1668 exemplum)

Bodleian Library, Oxford University

MS 28189
MS Additional A. 380
MS Additional C. 209
MS Additional D. 114
MS Ashmole 36–37 (bound together)
MS Ashmole 38 (Commonplace book of Nicholas Burghe)
MS Ashmole 51
MS Ashmole 57
MS Dodsworth 85–86 (bound together)
MS Don d. 55
MS Don d. 58
MS Don e. 6
MS Douce 357

MS Douce f. 5
MS Dugdale 19
MS Eng. misc. e. 13
MS Eng. poet c. 50 (the Daniell MS)
MS Eng. poet e. 14
MS Eng. poet f. 24
MS Eng. poet f. 25
MS Firth c.1
MS Firth e. 4
MS Jones 56
MS Malone 13
MS Rawlinson B. 121
MS Rawlinson D. 1092
MS Rawlinson D. 1099
MS Rawlinson Poet. 26
MS Rawlinson Poet. 62
MS Rawlinson Poet. 71
MS Rawlinson Poet. 84
MS Rawlinson Poet. 95
MS Rawlinson Poet. 110
MS Rawlinson Poet. 116 (Commonplace Book of William Elyot)
MS Rawlinson Poet. 117
MS Rawlinson Poet. 142
MS Rawlinson Poet. 147 (compiled by Henry Some)
MS Rawlinson Poet. 152
MS Rawlinson Poet. 174
MS Rawlinson Poet. 206
MS Rawlinson Poet. 210 (compiled by Henry Some)
MS Rawlinson Poet. 211
MS Savile 37 & 41 (Bound together)
MS Savile 47
MS Tanner 58
MS Tanner 306
MS Tanner 338
MS Tanner 465 (compiled by William Sancroft)
MS Tanner 466 (compiled by William Sancroft)
MS Top. Oxon b.167
MS Wood F.34

Pamphlet Collections compiled by Anthony Wood (with his MS notes):

Wood 90
Wood 364
Wood 368

Brasenose College, Oxford

A1.2 (Vice-Principal's Register 1594-1710)
A8.11 (Junior Bursar's Accounts, 1641)

A8.11* (Junior Bursar's Accounts, 1644)
B2.42 (Senior Bursar's Accounts, 1644–6)
UB22 (Bursar's Account Rolls 1642–48)

British Library

Additional MS 14295
Additional MS 15750
Additional MS 18980
Additional MS 18981
Additional MS 18982
Additional MS 19832
Additional MS 22602
Additional MS 22603
Additional MS 24863
Additional MS 25901 (Lucy Hutchinson's Memoirs)
Additional MS 27879 (Bishop Percy's Folio)
Additional MS 29550 (Hatton/ Finch papers Volume I)
Additional MS 30982
Additional MS 33233 (Papers and correspondence of Sir Edward Walker 1639–70)
Additional MS 33596 (Jermyn correspondence)
Additional MS 36779
Additional MS 36913 (Aston Papers)
Additional MS 37719
Additional MS 46172
Additional MS 46375
Additional MS 46375a
Additional MS 47111
Additional MS 71164
Egerton MS 1994
Egerton MS 2421
Egerton MS 2619 (Correspondence of Henrietta Maria)
Egerton MS 2725
Egerton MS 2978
Egerton MS 2982
Harleian MS 1163 (Sir Simond D'Ewes Journal of the Long Parliament)
Harleian MS 1628 (Sir Simond D'Ewes Journal of the Long Parliament)
Harleian MS 3511 (Commonplace Book of Arthur Capell)
Harleian MS 3791
Harleian MS 4931
Harleian MS 6804
Harleian MS 6851 (Papers of Sir Edward Walker)
Harleian MS 6917 (Calfe MS)
Harleian MS 6918 (Calfe MS)
Harleian MS 6988
Harleian MS 7623
Lansdowne MS 223
Sloane MS 542 (Commonplace book of Nathaniel Highmore)

Sloane MS 1417 (Medical Collections)
Sloane MS 1467
Sloane MS 2118 (Mathematical Collections)
Sloane MS 2119 (Collectiones ex Pappo Alexandrino et Archimede)
Sloane MS 2346 (Medical Prescriptions)
Sloane MS 3087
Sloane MS 3575 (Marborum diagnostica et prognostica)
Sloane MS 3576 (Adversaria Medica)

Printed books with marginalia:

Aleman, Mateo, *Primera Parte de Guzman de Alfarache* (Madrid, 1600), C.1 a.18 (1)
(notes by William Laud)
Aratus, of Soli, *Ἀρατου Σολεως* (Paris: Apud G. Morelium, 1559), C.60.1.7 (notes by John Milton)
[Parker, Henry], *Observations upon some of his Majesties late Answers and Expresses*
([London, 1642]), 100.D.56

Cambridge University Library

MS Add. 42 c (collections by Samuel Knight)
MS Add. 8447 g (Commonplace Book of Sir Henry Rainsford and his son Colonel Henry Rainsford)

Christ Church, Oxford

MS Dean and Chapter b.2 ('The Subdean's Book')
MS xii b. 86. (Disbursement Book 1642–1643)
MS xii b. 87. (Disbursement Book 1643–1644)
MS xii b. 88. (Disbursement Book 1644–1645)
MS xi b.46 (Receipts 1642–1643)
MS xi b.47 (Receipts 1643–1644)
MS xi b.48 (Receipts 1644–1645)

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

C/1/1/10 (Libri Magni, 1642–59)
MS C268 (MS version of *Iter Carolinum*)
MS C298
MS C328

Exeter College, Oxford

ECA AI.6 (College Register 1619–1737)
ECA AII.10 (Computis Rectoris 1639–1734)
ECA AII.16 (Rector's Accounts 1616–48)
ECA FIV.1:1643 (Extract from College Statutes)
ECA JIV: 1642 (Buttery Book 1642)
ECA JIV: 1644 (Buttery Book 1644)

Folger Shakespeare Memorial Library, Washington DC

MS V.a. 96
MS V.a. 97
MS V.a. 103
MS V.a. 124
MS V.a. 125
MS V.a. 152
MS V.a. 160 (Compiled by Matthew Day)
MS V.a. 162
MS V.a. 169
MS V.a. 170
MS V.a. 245
MS V.a. 246
MS V.a. 262
MS V.a. 282 (in memory of William Poley)
MS V.a. 319
MS V.a. 322
MS V.a. 339
MS V.a. 345
MS V.a. 439
MS V.b. 43
MS V.b. 110 (Compiled by Sir Henry Oxinden)
MS V.b. 151
MS W.b. 600 (Typescript Diary of Sir Humphrey Mildmay)
MS X.d. 27
MS X.d. 78
MS X.d. 490

Houghton Library, Harvard University

bMS Eng. 1107 (Gell Commonplace Book)
fMS Eng. 626
fMS Eng. 636
fMS Eng. 645 (Mildmay Fane's 'Fugitive Pieces')
fMS Thr. 7
MS Eng. 178
MS Eng. 178.2
MS Eng. 686
MS Eng. 703 (Cholmley MS)
MS Eng. 740
MS Eng. 946
MS Eng. 1050
MS Eng. 1078 (Memoirs of Henry Guthry)
MS Eng. 1091
MS Eng. 1356

Lincoln College, Oxford

Bursary Archives (Calculus) Box 2: Calculus Book 1641
Bursary Archives (Calculus) Box 2: Calculus Book 1642

Bursary Archives (Calculus) Box 2: Calculus Book 1643
Bursary Archives (Calculus) Box 2: Calculus Book 1644
C/1645 (Calculus Book 1645)
Bursary Archives (Calculus) Box 2: Calculus Book 1646
COR/8 (Correspondence of Robert Sanderson)
LC EN.7 (MS notes on Hollar's *Quartermaster's Maps*, pub. 1644)

McFarlane Library, Magdalen College, Oxford

Box 206 (Bursar's Rolls 1639–47)
CS/1/3 (Documents relating to College Plate)
C.6.5 arch (Historical Documents relating to Magdalen College)
CA CB/31–4 (Bursar's Accounts, 1642–6: Expenditure)
CS 40/9/1–3 (Papers relating to Strangers in College)
CS/41/1/1–7 (Documents relating to the Spur Royals)
LCE/27 (Bursar's Accounts, 1642: Receipts)
LCE/29 (Bursar's Accounts, 1643–55: Receipts)
Misc. 396
MS 730 (9) (Dean's Register)

Merton College, Oxford

MCA 1.3 (College Register 1567–1731)
MCA 3.2 (Bursar's Accounts 1633–52)
MCA Q.2 1641 (Battels 1641)
MCA Q.2 1643 (Battels 1643)
MCA Q.2 1645 (Battels 1645)

National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth

MS 5308E
MS 5390D
MS 12443A
MS Wynnstay 161
MS Wynnstay 165
MS Wynnstay 166
MS Wynnstay 167
MS Wynnstay 168
MS Wynnstay 170
MS Wynnstay 171
MS Wynnstay 173

New College, Oxford

NCA 1206 (Bursar's Receipt Bundles, 1640–48)
NCA 4203 (Bursar's Accounts and Receipts 1640–41)
NCA 4204 (Bursar's Accounts and Receipts 1643–44, 1644–45)
NCA 4205 (Bursar's Accounts and Receipts 1645–46, 1646–47)
NCA 7661 (Bursar's Rolls: Expenditure 1639–40)
NCA 7665 (Bursar's Rolls: Expenditure 1641–42)
NCA 7666 (Bursar's Rolls: Receipts 1641–42)

NCA 7668 (Bursar's Rolls: Expenditure 1643–44)

NCA 11,364 (Vouchers, 1649)

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Bell/ White MS 25

Nottinghamshire Record Office

MS DD. Hu/1 (The Commonplace Book of Lucy Hutchinson)

Northumberland Record Office

ZAN M17/ 51 (Bakers and Brewers Company of Newcastle upon Tyne, Accounts 1638–1696)

ZAN M13/A4 (Glover's Company, Newcastle upon Tyne, Minutes 1630–1677)

ZAN M12/A4 (MS Notes on Newcastle Companies, Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne)

Oriel College, Oxford (with thanks to the Provost and Fellows)

Buttery Book 1643–4 (no callmark)

Buttery Book 1644–5 (no callmark)

SIC1 (Style Book, 1583–1649)

SIIG6 (Dean's Register 1442–1671)

Oxford City Archives

Madan, Falconer, *Oxford City Records*, Archive Handlist (1887)

L5.3 (Hanaster's register 1639–1663)

PAR/207/4/F1/1 (St. Martin's Church, Oxford: Churchwarden's Accounts, 1540–1680)

PAR/208/4/F1/65-8 (St. Mary Magdalene, Oxford: Churchwarden's Accounts, 1642–6)

PAR/209/4/F1/32-7 (St Mary the Virgin, Oxford: Churchwarden's Accounts, 1642–6)

Public Record Office

LC/3/1

LC/5/135 (Lord Chamberlain: Miscellaneous Warrant Books 1641–4)

LS/8/1 (Lord Steward: Accounts of Creditors not paid by Salary 1641–4)

LS/8/2 (Lord Steward: Accounts of Creditors not paid by Salary 1644–5)

PC/2/53 (Privy Council Register 1640–5)

Wren Library, Trinity College, Cambridge

MS R. 5.5

Tyne and Wear Record Office: Newcastle City Archives

543/27 (Chamberlain's Accounts)

MD/NC/1/1 (Newcastle Common Council Book 1636–56)

Gu/BS/2/1 (Incorporated Company of Barber Surgeons and Chandlers, Newcastle, Minute Book 1616–86)

Gu/BU/1/1 (Incorporated Company of Butchers, Newcastle, Company Book)

Gu/CF/2/2 (Incorporated Company of Furriers, Feltmakers, Armourers and Hatters, Newcastle, Company Book 1635–1941)

Gu/MS/2/1 (Incorporated Company of Masons, Newcastle, Minutes)
Gu/TH/21/1 (The Fraternity of Masters and Seamen of Trinity House, Newcastle, Receipt
Book 1622–45)

University College, Oxford (with thanks to the Master and Fellows)

BU2/F1/1 (General Account Book 1632–1667)

BU4/F/4 (Buttery Book 1642–3)

BU3/F1/6 (Bursar's Book 1643–4)

EB2/F/1 (Fine Book, 1639–1821)

GB3/A1/1 (College Register 1509–1722)

MA30/3/F/2

MA30/3/F/3

MA30/3/MS/13–17

MA30/3/MS/20

MA30/3/MS/31

MA30/3/MS/32

MA30/3/MS/57

MA30/3/MS/69 ('Per Visitatores')

THESES

- Burke, Victoria, *Women and Seventeenth-Century Manuscript Culture: Miscellanies, Commonplace Books, and Song Books Compiled by English and Scottish Women, 1600–1660* (D.Phil, University of Oxford, 1996)
- Cannon, James, *The Poetry and Polemic of English Church Worship c.1617–1640* (Ph.D., Cambridge, 1998)
- Loxley, J. W. S., *Royalist Poetry in the English Civil War* (Ph. D., Royal Holloway, University of London, 1994)
- Norbrook, David, *Panegyric of the Monarch and its Social Context under Elizabeth I and James I* (D.Phil, University of Oxford, 1978)
- O’Callaghan, Michelle Frances, *Three Jacobean Spensarians: William Browne, George Wither, and Christopher Brooke* (D.Phil, University of Oxford, 1993)
- Parsons, E. J. S., *The Proclamations Issued by Charles I during the years 1642–1646, both during his Progress to Oxford and his Residence there until the Surrender of the City in 1646, relating especially to Oxford and Neighbouring Counties*, 2 volumes (B.Litt, University of Oxford, 1935)
- Raymond, Joad, *The Crisis of Eloquence: Reading and Writing English Newsbooks, 1641–1649* (D.Phil, University of Oxford, 1994)

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Danielson, Dennis, “Milton and the hermeneutics of location: Cosmological reflections, then and now”, unpublished article
- Biographical entry for ‘Richard Wynn’, courtesy of Andrew Thrush and Stephen Roberts, eds, 1640–60 section, History of Parliament Trust
- ‘Diary of the Oxford Parliament, January 1644’, transcript of Huntington Library, MS HA 8060, courtesy of Andrew Thrush, History of Parliament Trust

WEBSITES

- Downs-Gamble, Margaret, ‘New Pleasures Prove: Evidence of Dialectical Disputatio in Early Modern Manuscript Culture’, *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 2 (1996), <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/02-2/downonn.html>
- Hunt, Russell A., ‘Literacy as Dialogic Involvement: Methodological Implications for the Empirical Study of Literary Reading’, <http://www.stthomasu.ca/%7Ehunt/igel3.htm>
- , ‘Conditions of Reception, Conditions of Construction: The Strange Case of “Mons, Anzac and Kut”’, <http://www.stthomasu.ca/%7Ehunt/anzacart.htm>
- Stallybrass, Peter, ‘The Value of Culture and the Disavowal of Things’, *Early Modern Culture*, <http://eserver.org/emc/1-1/stallybrass.html>