'The Shaping of Military Culture in England before the Civil Wars: A Study of Preaching to the Artillery Companies, 1600-1643'

George Ross Tanton

Canterbury Christ Church University

Thesis Submitted

for the Degree of MA by Research

2016

To my Mother and Father, with love and honour

Contents

ABSTRACT

This thesis began as an investigation into Old Testament warmongering prior and during the English Civil War. However, to sharpen the scope of the writing, the research focused on 'artillery sermons' preached by mainly puritan clergymen to Martial Companies in London, Coventry, Bristol and in East Anglia. These 'artillery clerics,' within their preaching, entrenched principles of warlike masculinity and stalwart nationalism. God was honoured as a warrior and a 'Man of War,' whilst the legitimacy of defensive war against barbarous and tyrannical enemies, such as Imperial Spain and the German Catholic Reich, was considered lawful. More generally, Parliamentarian preaching in the 1640s began to justify taking up weapons against Englishmen who exercised tyranny and barbarity over their fellow countrymen in the wake of the Ship Money extortions, the unlawful billeting of troops and wielding of martial law upon civilian jurisdiction. It is argued that through both covert and non-covert rhetoric, the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Strafford, and Charles I's lord and deputy-lieutenants, sergeants-at-arms, sheriffs and other lawmen, were tarred as enemies of the state.

The virtues of this thesis present a largely disregarded collection of sources, being the artillery sermons, and instigate a revised line of enquiry into the shaping of military culture prior to the English Civil War. Additionally, the thesis investigates the later preaching of the artillery preachers and discovers how their rhetoric condoning armed revolt against Charles' government was witnessed in both the House of Commons and within the ranks of Parliamentarian armies. Thus, the thesis sheds light on a collection of printed military sermons, prior the armed rebellion of 1642, that present the Artillery Yards and Martial Companies as actively promoting the lawfulness of taking up weapons and armaments against 'barbarous' tyrants, which supported the shaping of military culture in the early Stuart period.

Introduction

The key sources for this thesis will be the 'artillery sermons', preached from 1617 to 1643 to 'Londons armed infantrie' from the Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate, the Military Company of St Martin's Fields, the Military Yard of Westminster and the Martial Yard of Southwark. Similar sermons were also preached to the Artillery Companies of East Anglia, Coventry, Bristol, Derby and Nottingham. The phrase 'Artilleryman' originated as a 16th century military terminology for a foot-soldier armed with a weapon, such as a crossbow or hackbut which allowed him to skirmish enemies from afar. These troops executed weapons drill in 'Artillery Yards' which were otherwise known as 'Martial Yards' or 'Military Grounds'. Hence, the companies they established were 'Artillery Companies', 'Martial Companies', and 'Military Companies'.[1]

This thesis provides a discussion of the military ethos in England and a more nuanced context for the discussion of 'resistance theory' in the years before the English Civil War by examining the preaching to the artillery companies. As we might expect, the preachers utilised rhetoric concerning warfare to illustrate the battle against Man's sin and in particular the combat of drunkards, whoredom, brigandage and lawlessness. They advocated godly, sombre and pious behaviour, which would restore the nation to a God-fearing commonwealth. In the context of speaking to the Artillerymen, the principles of spiritual warfare could easily be applied to earthly combat and at times there was an elision between the two. Part of their preaching was aimed at justifying a defensive war against barbarous tyrants abroad as a lawful and honourable military action. At times this rhetoric was vague enough to be applied to the political situation in England.

Robert Zaller in his essay on The Figure of the Tyrant in English Revolutionary Thought, discussed how Charles I's government has become part of a long legacy of tyrannical constructs "from Herod to Hitler"[2] within the English political discourse. Indeed, the Petition of Right, executed by Parliament in 1628, forced the King to address state grievances, which

[1] Keith Roberts, 'Citizen Soldiers: The Military Power of London' in Stephen Porter, London and the Civil War (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996) p. 95

[2] Robert Zaller, 'The Figure of the Tyrant in English Revolutionary Thought' in Journal of the History of Ideas, Volume 54, Number 4, October 1993, pp. 585-610, University of Pennsylvania Press, JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2709825, Accessed: 22/10/15) p. 585

were associated with tyrannical government such as the unlawful billeting of soldiers on unarmed households and the enforcement of martial law. Parliament saw these grievances as a breach of Magna Carta of 1215, a similar measure that had been rejected by King John and had resulted in the Barons' War of 1216-1217. In 1649, a military junta "would not only brand [Charles I] with the name of tyrant but also bring him to judgement and execution as one."[3] The artillery company preaching was heavily influenced by the Old Testament rhetoric of warfare and applied enemy constructs of the Syrians and Philistines as parallels to England's national foes - Imperial Spain and the Catholic states of Germany. However, the Old Testament also provided justification in the artillery sermons for the taking up of weapons against barbarous and corrupt tyrants. "David and Goliath, Sampson and the Philistines, were symbols of revolt against tyranny. Existing corrupt society was designated as Sodom, Egypt [and] Babylon."[4] For the artillery company preachers, "biblical tyrants provided a means to discourse of tyranny without making direct allusions to Charles."[5] Consequently, the artillery sermons employed warlike Scripture as moral justification to engineer war against rulers. Furthermore, through both non-covert and covert rhetoric, the artillery preaching targeted internal engines of the state, in particular Charles I's political and military advisors, the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Strafford, as well as the lord-lieutenants, sheriffs, lawmen and sergeants-at-arms, who were suspected of executing savagery and barbarity against their own countrymen. In the lead up to the Great Rebellion, the Artillery Yards began to promote an eagle-eyed guard on men of violence judged to be internal enemies of the state, who were damned for enforcing armed savagery on English soil and engineering the destruction of civil society. Initially the artillery sermons attributed the vices of 'barbarousness', 'savagery', 'brutality', 'tyranny' and 'corruption' to Spanish and German Catholic troops. However, they began to increasingly discredit their own countrymen suspected to be state infiltrators, conspirators and tyrants as 'barbarous', 'savage' and 'brutal'. The artillery preacher John Davenport of Warwickshire, born in Coventry and a minister at Cole-man Street in London, preached to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen on the 23rd June 1629 at their general muster. There he explained that all men had the calibre to be corrupt and brutal tyrants, comparable to beasts of prey and equal in savagery to, "Lyons,

[3] Ibid. p. 590
[4] Christopher Hill, 'God and the English Revolution' in History Workshop, Number 17, Spring 1984, pp. 19-31, Oxford University Press, JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable4288543, Accessed: 22/10/15) p. 24
[5] Robert Zaller, 'The Figure of the Tyrant in English Revolutionary Thought', p. 596

Leopards, Wolves…inciting men to battle,"[6] and hunting and destroying unarmed men. Other artillery clerics, such as Ralph Knevet, who was a local chaplain at Oxnead in Norfolk[7], preached to the Martial Yard of Norwich in 1628 comparing enemies of the English people to "birds of prey…the fierce Eagle"[8] and "hungry vultures.[9]"

In 1628, Captain Henry Waller of the Bishopsgate Artillery Company, criticised the King's government, in particular the Duke of Buckingham, for planning to employ 200 German mercenaries and deploy them in England to reinforce the laws regulating military taxation. Waller had a staunch concern for military expenditure and on May 24th of the same year, he was selected as an expert witness to be on an investigative committee for framing a bill for locating weapons and regulating the power of the Lieutenancy. However, on the 4th June 1628, Waller was informed that armaments and ammunition had been covertly seized from the Tower of London without lawful authorisation and were suspected to have been 'sold to our enemies'. Waller also exposed the scandal of 44 tons of artillery ammunition being exported to foreign governments whilst discovering the exportation of a further 500 artillery pieces since the 1628 Parliamentary session.[10]

Waller's findings were incendiary as they suggest that the King's government itself was fuelling the strength of foreign powers by exporting weaponry and ammunition to them, thus aiding the enemies of Protestant England. The fact that Charles was debating mobilising foreign troops to enforce military taxation was a great fear to Englishmen. Consequently, this illustrates why the principles of a just war fought as a defensive action against barbarous foreign enemies was so readily preached in the artillery sermons.

The artillery sermons as printed sources can be compared to the printed literature concerning the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham in Portsmouth harbour on the 23rd August 1628

---

[6] John Davenport, A Royal Edict for Military Exercises (1629) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd ed.)/6313, in Harvard University Library, Reel Position: STC/1200:01) p. 7

[7] Alastair Fowler, 'Knevet, Ralph (bap. 1602, d. 1672)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15712, accessed 18 Oct 2016]

[8] Ralph Knevet, A Discourse of Militarie Discipline Shewing the Necessitie Thereof According to these Perilous Times (1628) Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition)/15037, in Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery), p.22

[9] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden (1635) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition)/19155, in British Library) p. 4

[10] Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris, The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604-1629 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) Henry Waller [c.1587-1631] of Watling Street, London and Enfield, Middlesex

by the battle maimed, rogue soldier John Felton. The "Buckingham/Felton affair"[11], according to James Holstrun, established within English politics, "a battlefield riven by sharply defined and antagonistic political parties,"[12] which either justified or condemned the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham. Whilst Felton was executed under martial law, his legacy spearheaded opposition to Charles I's government.[13] Whilst Buckingham's assassination literature is beyond the scope of this thesis, as printed examples of anti-establishment warmongering in the 1630s, they mirror the attitudes that arise in the published artillery sermons from 1638. James Holstun in his paper, *"God Bless Thee, Little David!": John Felton and his Allies,'* identifies one anonymous anti-Buckingham poem, 'Upon the Duke of Buckingham', which states that "after the hunters slay the buck, the nation rejoices."[14]

In the case of the Earl of Strafford, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ireland, Parliamentary rhetoric on the condemnation of barbarous tyrants was directed at him during his impeachment in 1641 for authorising the unlawful billeting of troops and enforcement of martial law on civilians after the aftermath of the Bishops' Wars. His governorship of Ireland witnessed a rule of club and cudgel; "a lawless frontier under barbarian pressure can be governed only by authoritarianism backed by military force [and] perverting the forms of the law…[Strafford] imposed such a government on Ireland with gusto, and the effect was to exaggerate his latent brutality, his impatience of restraint."[15] John Kenyon provides a damning depiction of Strafford; "[Strafford] was essentially a man of the frontier [who was feared] for the smell of blood and mud about him."[16] Kenyon further explains that in November 1640 "Strafford was found to be [covertly] negotiating with Spain for military assistance"[17] to annihilate Parliamentary revolt. Antonia Fraser, in her biography of Oliver Cromwell, explained that the "spectre of an Army-Plot"[18] in 1641, by the King's troops in Cumbria, Yorkshire and Northumbria to seize London and to liberate the Earl of Strafford from execution at the hands of Parliament, forced Parliamentarian insurgents to seize

[11] James Holstun, '"God Bless Thee, Little David!": John Felton and his Allies' (ELH, Vol. 59, No. 3, Autumn, 1992, pp. 513-552, The John Hopkins University Press, JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2873441, Accessed: 06/10/2016) p. 516
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid. p. 521
[14] Ibid. p. 522
[15] John P. Kenyon, The Stuarts: A Study in English Kingship (London: Fontana/Collins, 1970) p. 82
[16] Ibid. pp. 82-83
[17] John P. Kenyon, Stuart England (London: Book Club Associates, 1978) p. 125
[18] Antonia Fraser, Cromwell: Our Chief of Men (London: Phoenix, 2002) p. 89

weapons against Charles I's "armed government."[19] These examples help to explain why the artillery preachers' sermons became so politically sensitive from 1638.

Brian Manning in his book, The English People and the English Revolution, has developed the discussion of resistance theory and why men took up weapons against their king in 1642. Indeed, Manning proclaimed that the King's opponents saw the English as "a conquered people who had been deprived of their rights and liberties by the Norman Conquest."[20] Manning explored literature from the army commanded by Oliver Cromwell that reinforces this particular view of the Norman Yoke, which claimed that the lords and barons of England were comparable to the lieutenants and colonels of William the Conqueror's invasion force.[21] A similar interpretation is voiced by Andy Wood in his book Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England. Wood claims that Charles I's sergeants-at-arms, his Lord and Deputy Lieutenants, the sheriffs, judges and lawmen were seen as the "foot-soldiers of the Norman Conquest."[22] This thesis argues that the artillery preaching of lawful warfare and use of weapons against barbarous tyrants, within the circles of the Artillery Companies, contributed to this debate and even handled the more sensitive subject of resistance theory certainly in the later publications of the artillery clerics. In particular, the artillery preacher William Bridge, in 1643, publicly justified "the lawfulnesse of Parliamentary proceedings in taking up of arms," to the Deputy-Lieutenants of Norfolk.[23] Previously, Bridge had preached to the Martial Company of Great Yarmouth and also to the Artillery Yard of Norwich in 1642. William Bridge, in his later preaching and pamphlet of 1642 to Parliament, would become influential in promoting defensive warfare against the King's government.

Throughout this thesis, sixteen printed artillery sermons by sixteen different preachers will be used as the key primary sources, being preached from 1617 to 1642. The pitfalls of using the artillery sermons as primary sources are evident in the fact that "printed versions of sermons might differ from the original spoken text." The spoken words of the artillery cleric in a sermon may have been modified in print in order to appeal to a broader audience other than

---

[19] Louis G. Schwoerer, *"No Standing Armies!" The Anti*-Army Ideology in Seventeenth Century England (London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1974) p. 20
[20] Brian Manning, The English People and the English Revolution (London: Bookmarks Publishing, 1991) p. 360
[21] Ibid.
[22] Andy Wood, Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002) p. 163
[23] William Bridge, The Truth of the Times Vindicated Whereby the Lawfulnesse of Parliamentary Proceedings in Taking Up of Arms is Justified (1643) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing/B4467, in Thomason Collection, Reel Position: Wing/239:E.61[20])

soldiers or to tone down pointed political references. [24] Stephen Baskerville explains that puritan preachers, during the Great Rebellion, "formed the backbone of the parliamentary propaganda campaign, composing resistance tracts in defense of the war and on the constitutional issues around which it was fought." However, he explains that attempting to analyse within the pre-war sermons any "cryptic allusions" to Charles I's sheriffs, bishops, chief advisors and lieutenants as enemies of the state by historians, was largely futile possibly due to the reluctance by preachers to fuel any obvious warmongering and armed revolt against the King for fear of arrestment by his sergeants-at-arms. With this in mind, Baskerville claims that the audiences of the political sermons were encouraged by the preachers to decipher within their own "private thoughts" the identities of domestic state enemies.[25] It is important to consider that the printed political and artillery sermons may have been edited during the Civil War to justify the actions of the Parliament in the taking up of weapons against the King's rule.

Consequently, there are two audiences of the artillery sermons; the auditors, who were the Artillerymen receiving the brunt of the preaching, and the readers, who were analysists of the printed sermons with the luxury of interpreting differently any warmongering or politicised text within the artillery sermon and possibly attuned to the ideas of 'resistance theory'. Yet as Jacqueline Eales explains from 1640 to 1646, "pulpits [became] battlegrounds" as clergymen justified or damned armed rebellion against Charles' government in their sermons.[26] This thesis recognises the problem of using artillery sermons chiefly preached and printed in London. Eales explains that "the centralisation of the printing trade in the Capital meant that relatively few sermons preached outside London were published,"[27] although sermons preached to the King's troops were printed at York and Oxford. Despite this difficulty in obtaining evidence of artillery preaching from a wider spectrum, this thesis is able to draw on

[24] Jacqueline Eales, 'Preaching, The Clergy and Allegiance in the First English Civil War, 1640-1646' in Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Early Stuart Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) p. 187.
[25] Stephen Baskerville, The Political Theology of Puritan Preaching in the English Revolution 1640-1653 (London: London School of Economics, 1987)
[26] Jacqueline Eales, 'Preaching, The Clergy and Allegiance in the First English Civil War,' p.188.
[27] Ibid. p.186. – For the general political importance of sermons see; Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's* Cross Sermons, 1558-1642 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) , Arnold Hunt, The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590-1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), Peter E., McCullough, Sermons Preached at the Jacobean Courts, 1615-1619 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), David Appleby, 'Issues of Audience and Reception in Restoration Sermons', (edited by Geoff Baker and Ann McGruer) Readers, Audiences and Coteries in Early Modern England (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2006)

evidence of artillery preaching from the Military Yards of Great Yarmouth, Coventry and Bristol before and in the early stages of the Civil Wars.

The artillery sermons, being preached to congregations of armed men, were consequently constructed as the preachers emphasised in a "war-like dialect,"[28] and a "Warlike Language,"[29] which was structured in accordance with the, "language of a Souldier [to be] plaine and blunt"[30]. Indeed, when the artillery cleric William Gouge, a minister of Blackfriars, London,[31] addressed the Bishopsgate Artillerymen in 1626, he professed that, "Among Souldiers I endeavoured to speake souldier-like."[32] The "artillery-preachers"[33] of the sermons professed to be 'fellow-souldiers' with their auditors. Many of the preachers were educated at Oxford or Cambridge University and it is striking that many later saw military action alongside Parliamentarian troops as regimental chaplains during the Civil War. Amongst these men was the "fellow souldier," Thomas Palmer, a Leicestershire clergyman who had preached to the Military Yard of Bristol in 1635, and who later served as a sergeant-major to the Parliamentarian John Lambert's Cavalry Regiment. Lambert's troops fought at the Battle of Bradford in 1644 and later at the Battle of Marston Moor. It is quite possible Palmer may have borne witness to these battles whilst preaching to the Parliamentarian troops. Palmer later served as a regimental chaplain in Sergeant-Major-General Skippon's Regiment, an infantry unit which fought decisively at the Battle of Naseby in 1645[34]. Obadiah Sedgwick, the artillery cleric who preached to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen at their general muster in October 1638, where he covertly damned men, possibly the Earl of Strafford, as comparable to, "the Crocodile, which laments and sheds tears, intending also to kill and shed blood,"[35] enlisted as a regimental chaplain to Denzil Holles' Infantry Regiment which fought at the Battle of Edgehill in Warwickshire in 1642, but was later annihilated at

[28] Matthias Millward, The Souldiers Triumph and the Preachers Glory (1641), Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd edition) / M2186, Thomason/E.175(7), in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/31:E.175(7), p. 1
[29] Thomas Dekker, Warres, Warres, Warres (1628), (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition)/6531, in The Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, Reel Position: STC /831:04) p.
[30] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 3
[31] Brett Usher, 'Gouge, William (1575–1653)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11133, accessed 18 Oct 2016]
[32] William Gouge, The Dignitie of Chivalrie, set forth in a sermon before the Artillery Company of London (1626), (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition)/12112, in Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, Reel Position: STC/1380:08) Dedicatory
[33] William Hunt, Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War, p. 223
[34] Stuart B. Jennings, 'Palmer, Thomas (b. 1611/12, d. in or after 1667)', (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21219, Accessed 14 April 2016)
[35] Obadiah Sedgwicke, Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier (1638) Bibliographic name/Number: STC, in Union Theological Seminary (New York, N. Y.) Library) p. 23

the Battle of Brentford. Interestingly, Sedgwick's younger brother John Sedgwick, was also a regimental chaplain in the Parliamentarian forces, serving in the Earl of Stamford's Regiment.[36] Calybute Downing, was also another artillery preacher who served Parliament in the Civil War. Downing, was baptised in Northborough, Northamptonshire and educated at Oxford University. He became a curate in Buckinghamshire where he became involved in civil laws whilst maintaining an interest in politics, especially in foreign warfare and the military expansion of "Austrian power" in Germany. On the 1st September 1640, Downing preached to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen and was later accused of justifying military action against the King's government by proclaiming the taking up of weapons against the King's authority as a defence of liberty and conscience. The House of Commons published the sermon in 1641 after Downing had sought refuge at the house of the Earl of Warwick, a close ally. In the printed version of his sermon to the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard, Downing had discreetly quoted Grotius in Latin to state that the law of refraining from armed revolt against rulers was not always obligatory.[37] Downing served until 1643 as a regimental chaplain to Lord John Robartes' Regiment where he possibly saw combat at the Battle of Edgehill and the Battle of Brentford in 1642. He aligned with the Solemn League and Covenant, a military alliance between the Scottish Covenanting Army and the Parliamentary armies. [38]

Earlier sermons to the Artillery Companies in the 1620s had addressed fears of state disarmament and were preached in the context of an 'Arms Race' abroad, with the Imperial Spanish war machine seizing the lion's share of military success in Europe, and the invading Ottoman armies manning major strongholds in the Balkans. Spanish military occupation of the Rhineland Palatine, which was consolidated in 1621[39], along with the earlier establishment of a Spanish naval arsenal at Dunkirk in 1583[40], prompted Englishmen to fear a brutal invasion by 'barbarous' and 'brutal'[41] Spanish soldiers. Spanish armies had been

[36] Barbara Donagan, 'Sedgwick, Obadiah (1599/1600–1658)', (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; Online edition, January 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25016, Accessed 14 April 2016)
[37] Calybute Downing, A Sermon Preached to the Renowned Company of the Artillery (1641) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing / D2105, Copy From: The Thomason Collection) p. 37
[38] Barbara Donagan, 'Downing, Calybute (1606–1644)', (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; Online Edition, January 2010, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7980, Accessed 14 April 2016)
[39] Frank Tallett, War and Society in Early Modern Europe 1495-1715 (London: Routledge, 2001) p. 19
[40] Ibid.
[41] Geoffrey Parker, 'Why Did the Dutch Revolt Last Eighty years?' (Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Vol. 26, 1976, pp. 53-72, Cambridge University Press, JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3679072, Accessed: 15/11/2016) p. 55

besieging the embattled 'Dutch Bulwark'[42] since 1581. It was a vast territory on the low-lying delta of the Rhine with fortified frontiers guarding from the French Gravelines, Flanders and Dunkirk to the west and to Lower Saxony in the east with the North Sea being the only passage of retreat and supply of weaponry and ammunition with the Baltic States.[43] Squadrons of Dutch battleships sustained the survival of the Dutch Republic by patrolling trade routes to Denmark, Norway, and more importantly, Protestant England, docking at London and Newcastle.[44] England was a strategic military and political ally; English troops shared the brunt of military contracture alongside Saxon, Flemish and Walloon mercenaries in the battlefields of the "great bog of Europe."[45] However, whilst the Dutch were spearheading armed revolt against Spanish tyranny in Europe, in particular by supplying armaments to North African warlords who threatened the Spanish coastal strongholds in Algeria, such as the naval arsenal at Oran[46], the English Parliament was prevented from pursuing a warmongering foreign policy due to a national fatigue of war-weariness. Consequently, the artillery clerics in the years prior the English Civil War, sternly preached that England was becoming a decayed and archaic military power. The artillery clerics wanted to remilitarise the state to the point where Englishmen would not let their country, "beare three Lyons in vaine."[47] Michael Barthorp has argued that indeed since the ceasefire of the Hundred Years War in 1453, the English military system had become stagnant and the weapons and armaments of the militia had remained in use since the Battle of Agincourt, the Battle of Crecy and the Battle of Bosworth Field; the crossbow, halberd, falchion, bludgeon, longbow and the bill, "the latter deriving from the two-handed battle-axe of the old Saxon infantry."[48] John Gillingham reinforces this point in his publication Cromwell: Portrait of a Soldier, claiming that the military architecture of England was woefully designed for an earlier age of warfare. The archaic fortresses with their "high stone walls which had worked well in the age of the ballista and crossbow"[49] were now rendered obsolete by the colossal firepower of cast-iron artillery ordnances of gunpowder warfare. To the contrary, England's

[42] Marvin Arthur Breslow, English Puritan Views of Foreign Nations 1618-1640 (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970) p. 79
[43] Ibid. p. 56
[44] J. I. Israel, 'A Conflict of Empires: Spain and the Netherlands 1618-1648' (Past & Present, No. 76, August 1977, pp. 34-74, Oxford University Press, JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable/650409, Accessed: 15/11/2016) p. 44
[45] Geoffrey Parker, 'Why Did the Dutch Revolt Last Eighty Years?', p. 55
[46] Israel, 'A Conflict of Empires', p. 39
[47] Samuel Buggs, The Mid-land Souldier (1622), (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition)/4023, in The Bodlein Library) p. 23
[48] Michael Barthorp, The Armies of Britain 1485-1980, (London: The National Army Museum, 1980) p. 10
[49] John Gillingham, Cromwell: Portrait of a Soldier, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976) pp. 23-24

coastal fortifications, commissioned to be built by Henry VIII from 1539, were formidable battlements with horn-works and bastions. These masonry artillery fortresses, known as 'device forts' and 'block houses' defended the coast from East Anglia to the Welsh borders, whilst guarding anchorages at Gravesend, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Portland and Falmouth Harbour.[50] These coastal artillery batteries were " squat fortification[s] made out of rubble and brick which absorbed cannon shot, instead of fracturing on impact as stone did."[51] Munitions and weapons were efficiently re-supplied by earthen entrenchments between the forts.[52]

In order to promote the rearmament of England, the warrior credentials of a Protestant man were presented by the Artillery Company preachers alongside the image of God as a warlord, who had engineered all warfare fought throughout Man's brutal and savage histories. Indeed the chief source of "Protestant pro-war literature" was the Old Testament which, and as Frank Tallett argues, was considered the 'book of battles' by Protestant clergyman and soldiers.[53] The Israelite God was honoured as a 'Man-of-War'[54] whose chief concern was the bloody business of soldiering and warfare. Furthermore it was strongly maintained that "The Lord walks in the midst of [an] Army"[55] and through pious servitude "an Army is but a well-governed commonwealth in Armes."[56] God, as also depicted in the artillery sermons, was considered to be a destroyer of those civilisations which He damned as barbarous and corrupt. The artillery preachers explained this by arguing that, "God may be patient a long time; but patience too much wronged becomes rage…wrath will quickly afford weapons."[57] This God of Armies and Warfare had specifically favoured England as his chosen people to destroy the Spaniards and German Imperialists. According to the artillery sermon preached by Thomas Sutton of Westmorland, a minister of Culham in Oxfordshire[58], to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen in 1623, God "commends fighting; above all actions, he honours

[50] Andrew Saunders, Channel Defences (London: English Heritage, 1997) pp. 46-47
[51] John Gillingham, Cromwell: Portrait of a Soldier, pp. 23-24
[52] Peter Harrington, The Castles of Henry VIII (Oxford: Osprey Publishing Limited, 2007) p. 37
[53] Frank Tallett, War and Society in Early-Modern Europe (London: Routledge, 1997) p. 241
[54] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour (1617) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC 2nd Edition)/127, Source: Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, Reel Position: STC/818:02) p. 2
[55] Donald Lupton, A War-like Treatise of the Pike (1642) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing/L3496, in Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, Reel Position: Wing/606:14) p. 7
[56] Ibid. p. 11
[57] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 10
[58] Richard L. Greaves, 'Sutton, Thomas (1584/5–1623)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26807, accessed 13 Oct 2016]

warlike and martiall designes."[59] It was strongly maintained that only the, "most and best warriours were called the Sonnes of God."[60] Indeed, "the old worlds war-like souldiers,"[61] such as Sampson, Samuel, Abraham, Saul, David and Goliath were prominent in the sermons. The artillery preacher and 'fellow souldier' John Leech, who addressed the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard in 1618, explained that, "they were called [by God] to be Warriours & Souldiers."[62] These "warlike principles"[63] were stalwartly reinforced by the artillery preachers in order that England not be, "crushed and over-trodden by every barbarous Nation."[64]

As parallel evidence, the thesis will also examine manuals on military strategy, written by associates of the Artillery Yards, which addressed not just the practical usage of weapons and armaments, but also, like the artillery sermons, provided the lawful principles of warfare and soldiering to the Artillery Companies. These manuals on warfare strongly advocated "warlike sport"[65] to prepare men for combat in a "bloudie skirmish [and a] bloudie battle"[66] with "warlike weapons."[67] Typically, the manuals discussed the necessity of armament against savage enemies and barbarous men before enforcing "warlike discipline"[68] with weaponry such as the pike, halberd, buckler and musket. Before the bayonet was the stock infantry weapon for close quarter skirmishing, the pike was the most practical defensive weapon on the battlefield for foot soldiers. Most notably the Artillerymen of Bishopsgate, such as Lieutenant John Bingham and Lieutenant William Barriffe, provided written instruction on tactics concerning fighting on foot. Bingham, a freeman of the City of London and a member of the King's Council of War[69], was commander-in-chief of the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard in 1618. He was a former serviceman who had experienced the business of fighting overseas as a military contractor in the German War of 1618 to 1648, an armed conflict largely dominated by static trench fighting and siege warfare. Battles of this era would tend to be

[59] Thomas Sutton, The Good Fight of Faith (1623) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd ed.) / 23504 in The Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery) p. 408
[60] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, pp. 20-21
[61] Richard Niccolls, Londons Artillery (1616) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd ed) / 18522, in Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery) p. 21
[62] John Leech, The Trayne Souldier (1619) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd ed.) / 15364, in The British Library) p. 7
[63] Ralph Knevet, A Discourse of Militarie Discipline, Dedicatory
[64] William Barriffe, Mars, His Triumph (1639) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd ed.) / 1505, in Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery) Dedicatory
[65] Ralph Knevet, A Discourse of Militarie Discipline, p. 13
[66]John Leech, The Trayne Souldier, pp.6-9
[67] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 24
[68] Ralph Knevet, A Discourse of Militarie Discipline, Dedicatory
[69] Roger B. Manning, An Apprenticeship in Arms: The Origins of the British Army 1585-1702 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) p. 145

bloody but only end in a ceasefire and stalemate. Consequently, this led Bingham to despise sustained defensive strategy fighting from behind strong ramparts commenting that "there [is no] Conquest to be made without [open] Battailes."[70] Barriffe, an Artilleryman of both the London Artillery Yards of Bishopsgate and Cripplegate, who would later die fighting as a Lieutenant-Colonel within the Parliamentary Army in July 1643, addressed his manual on military discipline, *'The Young Artilleryman'*, to the Artillery Company of Bishopsgate in 1635. According to Roger Manning, William Barriffe's manual on weaponry and warfare was published in six editions throughout a 26 year period, such was the success of his writings.[71] Another artillery writer was Donald Lupton, a Protestant clergyman who had served as a regimental chaplain to English troops fighting in Germany to reconquer the Rhine Palatinate from the Spanish and Austrian Catholic armies. In 1632, Lupton, in his writings on the characters of Englishmen, praised the Artillerymen of Bishopsgate for their military professionalism[72]. His manual on weaponry called, *'A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike'*, published in 1642, explained that the lawful taking up of weapons to combat the "destruction of Justice and Civility" by barbarous oppressors was necessary to avoid the "vast slaughtering of men."[73] Consequently this source will be examined for its principles on just warfare. Evidence would suggest that Lupton never preached openly to a Martial Company or an Artillery Yard. However, what we do know is that he addressed his manual on warfare to men affiliated with both the Artillery Company of Bishopsgate and the London Militia, such as Captains Bond, Wilson, Buckstone, Langham, Davies and Forster, as did Lewes Roberts, a Bishopsgate Artilleryman in 1640. Roberts saw service with the East India Company from 1617 and made a career as a merchant shipman operating in Istanbul, possibly having dealings with the Ottoman Empire. In the Spring of 1639 he was commissioned as an officer to drill militiamen to be deployed in the First Bishops War in Scotland[74]. In his writings, Warrefare Epitomized in a Century of Military Observations (1640), Roberts explained that the "true scope of a Just Warre amongst all Nations, is held to be a firme Peace," which was

[70] Keith Roberts, *Cromwell's War Machine: The New Model Army 1645*-1660 (South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Limited, 2009) p. 35
[71] Roger Manning, An Apprenticeship in Arms, p. 145
[72] Donald Lupton, London and the Countrey Carbonadoed and Quartred into Severall Characters (London: 1632) p. 18
[73] Donald Lupton, A Warre-Like Treatise of the Pike, Introductory
[74] Sonia P. Anderson, 'Roberts, Lewes (1596–1641)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23766, accessed 13 Oct 2016]

well maintained with a weapon in hand.[75] John Roberts of Weston credited as "John Roberts of the Artillery Company of Great Yarmouth,"[76] was a provincial artillery writer and addressed the Artillery Yard of Great Yarmouth in 1638 with his own manual on warfare. He strongly endorsed "manlike actions" and a "warlike behaviour" where a man should act in a "Souldier-Like manner".[77] David Lawrence in his publication concerning military manuals written in England from 1603-1645 has observed that the manuals on weaponry and warfare were robust and compact tomes and could be efficiently concealed in a soldier's buff-coat, military fatigues made out of ox or bull hide, worn by professional soldiers of the period, and hence the manuals were extremely practical for use whilst handling weaponry and ammunition.[78]

There is a considerable literature on the political content of sermons, particularly the fast sermons delivered to the Houses of Parliament in the 1640s, but so far the sermons to the Artillery Yards and Martial Companies have not been extensively researched. Furthermore, the history of the Artillery and Martial Yards have also been somewhat neglected by military historians and scholars of the English Civil War. In 1954, Major George. G. Walker and G. R. Armstrong published the history of the Bishopsgate Artillery Company, tracing its origins from a 'Militia of Longbowmen, Crossbowmen and Gunmen' in 1537, to its function as a Territorial Infantry Battalion after the Battle of Normandy in 1944. However, their work is purely a documented history of the Bishopsgate Artillerymen and does not examine why they upheld principles of manful duty concerning weapons-drill and self-defence against enemies of the state prior to the English Civil War. In 1967 Lindsay Boynton, in his investigations into the Militia system of the 1500s, briefly described how the principles of military education were taught to young men. Lincoln Grammar School, for example, employed an ex-soldier, who had fought overseas as a mercenary, to educate the students in infantry drill and provided the school's armoury with an arsenal of weaponry for that purpose[79]. Ian Beckett in his investigations into Britain's auxiliary troops and militiamen from 1558 to 1945, identified the four Artillery Yards in London; the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard founded in 1610; the Military Company of St Martin's Fields, also founded in the same year; the

[75] Lewes Roberts, Warrefare Epitomized in a Century of Military Observations (1640) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition)/21095, in Harvard University Library, Reel Position: STC/935:09) Introductory
[76] Roger Manning, An Apprenticeship in Arms, p. 149
[77] John Roberts, Great Yarmouths Exercise (1638), Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd ed.) / 21093, in The British Library, Dedicatory
[78] David R. Lawrence, The Complete Soldier: Military Books and Military Culture in Early Stuart England, 1603-1645 (Boston: Brill, 2009) p. 165
[79] Lindsay Boynton, The Elizabethan Militia 1558-1638 (Devonshire: David & Charles1971) pp. 265-266

Military Yard of Westminster founded in 1635 and the Martial Yard of Southwark founded in 1639[80]. A historical pamphlet concerning the St John's Churchyard, distributed by Southwark Council, further explains that in 1639, the Old Artillery Hall of Southwark was built on the Martial Yard, which had previously been leased by the governors of the local grammar school for the liberty of the local militiamen to drill with weaponry.[81]

William Hunt has briefly investigated the other Military Companies in England, showing that Artillery and Martial Yards were established in Coventry in 1617; Colchester in 1621; Bury St. Edmunds in 1622; Bristol in 1625; Norwich in 1625; Chester in 1626; Gloucester in 1626; Great Yarmouth in 1626; Derbyshire in 1627; Ipswich in 1629 and Nottingham in 1629[82]. Hunt has arguably spearheaded the investigations into what he has described as the civic-militarism[83] which prospered mainly in such urban centres from the 1620s up to the outbreak of the English Civil War in 1642, explaining that the weapons-drill of the Artillery and Martial Yards supported the "remilitarisation of English society"[84] after the Anglo-Spanish War of 1604. However, while Hunt discusses the principles of chivalric duty within the City of London Artillery Yards and the Provincial Military Companies, he does not provide a detailed investigation into the warlike precepts of the artillery sermons themselves. In 1992 Charles Carlton published some interesting comparisons between the warmongering nationalism of the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard and that of the men who enlisted in the Pal's Battalions of Kitchener's Army, to be later butchered at the Battle of the Somme in 1916[85]. More recently in 2008 and 2009, Barbara Donagan and David R. Lawrence briefly provided research into the calibre of men who executed martial drill in the Artillery Yards. Their respective publications credited the development of the civic-militarism of the Bishopsgate Artillerymen to the ex-soldiers of the Protestant struggle abroad, who had returned to warn their fellow countrymen to prepare for war against Spain. However, none of these historians attempted an investigation into how the Provincial Military Companies and City of London Artillery Yards promoted the beliefs surrounding the execution of lawful warfare as a defensive action, and the political necessity to destroy barbarous, tyrannical men in an armed

[80] Ian F. W. Beckett, *Britain's Part*-Time Soldiers: The Amateur Military Tradition 1558-1945 (South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Books Limited, 2011) p. 35
[81] Southwark Council, St John's Churchyard Enhancement Project, Historical Overview
[81] William Hunt, 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War', in The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe (edited by Anthony Grafton and Anne Blair) (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) p. 218
[83] Ibid. p. 220
[84] Ibid. p. 218
[85] Charles Carlton, Going to the Wars: The Experience of the English Civil Wars, 1638-1651 (London: BCA, 1992) p. 71

struggle, through the militant language and Old Testament rhetoric of the sermons. The thesis will thus provide a crucial insight into the warmongering nationalism of the Martial Companies of East Anglia, Coventry and Bristol, and the Artillery Yards of London. The credentials of these 'Artillerymen', who promoted a war against tyrannical 'men of violence' prior to the Great Rebellion in 1642, will be argued to have established a platform for rhetoric concerning armed revolt.

To understand this context, we need to consider here a brief history of the London Artillery and Military Yards, as they are the chief sources of the artillery sermons. The Bishopsgate Militia was first established by King Henry VIII in 1537, and granted use of the Old Artillery Yard adjoining Moorfields[86], where local men could sharpen their knowledge in the, "Artyllary of Longbowes, Crossbowes and Handgonnes."[87] The Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate, or as credited by Michael Barthorp as the Honourable Corps of Gentlemen-at-Arms[88], consequently provided a military education to the sons of, "London's great men."[89] The Company's most recognisable title however was the Honourable Artillery Company, or the London Artillery Company, as proposed by Roger Manning.[90] Henry VIII granted this regiment of armed men certain legal rights, such as the right to hunt game in the King's hunting estates, and to be armed in public with a weapon for self-defence against outlaws[91]. Henry had his Council of War spearhead Militia reform during his reign; every man in the country was to be armed with a weapon and pressed into the Army if the nation was invaded[92]. Indeed, after his campaigns in Scotland and leading an Army-Royal[93] in an invasion of France in 1513, Henry had made many enemies abroad. Consequently he was a great advocator of the warlike drill of the Old Artillery Yard; essentially his soldiers were to be a "rod of iron,"[94] against invaders and rebels, and in this scenario, the 'London Artillery Company of Longbowmen, Crossbowmen and Gunmen' could muster 15,000 armed-men for

[86] Roger Manning, An Apprenticeship of Arms, p. 144
[87] The Precinct of St. Mary Spital: 'The Old Artillery Ground', in Survey of London: Volume 27, Spitalfields and Mile End New Town, ed. F.H.W Sheppard (London, 1957), pp. 24-38, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol27/pp24-38)
[88] Michael Barthorp, The Armies of Britain, p. 13
[89] William Hunt, Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War, p. 218
[90] Roger Manning, An Apprenticeship in Arms, p. 144
[91] Ibid. p. 214
[92] Boynton, The Elizabethan Militia, pp. 8-9
[93] Charles Cruickshank, Henry VIII and the Invasion of France (Gloucestershire: Alan Sutton Publishing Limited, 1990) p. 1
[94] Boynton, The Elizabethan Militia, pp.8-9.

deployment in a defensive war[95]. From 1598, the Old Artillery Yard witnessed the establishment of a weapon manufacture industry led by local "Cross-bow-makers" while the professional soldiers, artillerymen and gunners of the 'Ordnance Office' repaired and operated "brass peeces of great Artilleries against a Butt of earth, made for that purpose."[96] The Honorable Artillery Company of Longbowmen, Crossbowmen and Gunmen were allowed continued usage of the land for warlike drill. By 1612, however the lease of the land was bitterly contested by William Hammond, the Master Gunner of England, who after being granted the ownership of the land on the 30th September by James I, Hammond prohibited the free usage of the land, demanding a tax to be levied from the Artillery-troop of Longbowmen, Crossbowmen and Gunmen, now simply known as the 'Artillery Company'. As Master Gunner of England, Hammond was charged with compiling a well-documented register of all men drilled in weapon proficiencies concerning artillery warfare. His responsibilities also included listing all artillery-defences in the country and maintaining their combat-function as powerful weapons of war. His authority came from the Board of Ordnance – a government office originally established by Henry VIII which regulated all artillery-fortresses and ammunition depots. To combat William Hammond's defiant prohibition, the Bishopsgate Artillerymen appealed to the Privy Council, which forced Hammond to surrender his lease of the Old Artillery Yard, thus allowing its free usage by the Artillerymen. During this period, the Artillery Company requested of the Privy Council financial leverage to finance the construction of a new armoury. Roger Manning explains that the New Artillery Yard was established in Bishopsgate, hence the revised title of the Artillery Company of Bishopsgate, which had a "new armoury [built in 1641 according to Manning] which took the place of Armourer's Hall."[97] The "Armoury and Forte" were built out of substantial "bricke and stone" which cost £1,000[98].

During this period another Artillery Yard in London, known as the Martial Company of Westminster, was established in 1616. Its organisational structure was heavily based around the Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate with the Artillerymen electing their own sergeants,

[95] John Noorthouck, Book 2, Chapter 3: 'Summary of Military Government', in a New History of London Including Westminster and Southwark (London: 1773), pp. 541-543 http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/new-history-london/pp541-543 (accessed: 10th December 2015)
[96] 'The Old Artillery Ground' ed. F.H.W Sheppard
[97] Roger Manning, An Apprenticeship in Arms, p. 144
[98] The Old Artillery Ground' ed. F.H.W Sheppard

corporals and lieutenants[99]. It also had its own armoury house which stored military equipment such as halberds, 'Spanish Javelyns', suits of armour, primitive grenades, pioneering tools and "two brass pieces of ordinance called drakes"[100]. From the 1620s, with the Protestant armed struggle being hard fought in Germany, and in the Low Countries against the 'Spanish Oppressor', the Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate and the Military Company of Westminster began to promote a stern warmongering nationalism that staunchly endorsed warlike Protestantism. Consequently, the artillery sermons played an integral part in promoting a strongly entrenched military culture before the outbreak of Parliament's armed rebellion. Evidence for the Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate in particular reveals that many of its members seized weapons for Parliament during its armed rebellion in 1642.[101] Notorious amongst these men was Lieutenant Phillip Skippon, a professional soldier who had 'trailed the pike' in Germany and who would later become a Major-General in the New Model Army. Skippon led the London Militia in the defence of the City against the King's troops after the hard-fought stalemate at the Battle of Edgehill, which was primarily a foot-soldiers' battle, and after the King's army had defeated Parliamentarian insurgents at Brentford.[102] Lieutenants Manwaring and Wilson, also of the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard, likewise saw action in the Civil War serving Parliament as Lieutenant-Colonels fighting in the City of London Regiments[103]. During the Civil War, Lieutenant-Colonel William Manby of the Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate was entrusted with the Company's financial records and documents as the Company treasurer. Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell, authorised the continuation of weapons-drill at the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard in 1657 after the ceasefire of the Civil War.[104] When Cromwell died, the Bishopsgate Artillerymen provided the honour guard in the funeral escort.

Before the thesis discusses how the artillery sermons promoted the lawfulness of an armed struggle against barbarous and tyrannical men, it is crucial to understand how the artillery preachers promoted 'manfulnesse' as a warlike function that would engineer the rearmament

---

[99] 'Gerrard Street Area: *'The Military Ground, Introduction'*, in Survey of London: Volumes 33 and 34, St Anne Soho, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1966), PP. 380-384 http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vols33-4/pp380-384 (accessed 16th December 2015)

[100] Ibid.

[101] Lieutenant-Colonel George Alfred Raikes of the 3rd Battalion, The York & Lancaster Regiment and Honourable Artillery Company, The Ancient Vellum Book of the Honourable Artillery Company Being the Roll of Members from 1611 to 1682 (London: Richard Bentley & Son, 1890) p. 8

[102] G. E. Aylmer, Rebellion or Revolution? England from Civil War to Restoration 1640-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987) pp. 48-49

[103] Barbara Donagan, War in England 1642-1649 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) p. 59

[104] Lieutenant-Colonel George Alfred Raikes, The Ancient Vellum Book of the Honourable Artillery Company, p. 8

of the state and ultimately re-arm Englishmen with the mental fortitude to defend their country against the armies of ‘barbarous oppressors’ deployed from Spain and entrenched in Germany.

Chapter One: "Manfulnesse be a Warlike Virtue"

During his investigations into soldiering during the English Civil War, Charles Carlton argued that, "the links between being a warrior and being a man have always been strong."[105] He discussed the Falklands War to reinforce this point by referencing the memoirs of an officer in the Parachute Regiment who observed that "the only real test of a man is when the firing starts."[106] Indeed the artillery cleric Thomas Adams, a puritan clergyman who had ministered in Buckinghamshire and London[107], professed a similar argument that "manfulnesse be a warlike virtue"[108] whilst fellow artillery clerics such as Thomas Sutton and the Northamptonshire clergyman John Everard, sternly reinforced that "all degrees of men are warriours"[109] and that a man should be "enured to hardnesse [and] accustomed to the use of weapons both defensive and offensive."[110] The first chapter of the thesis will examine how the artillery clerics preached 'manfulnesse' as an essential practicality in warfare and how Protestant masculinity was promoted as a warrior ideology ,which was stalwartly entrenched within the Artillery and Military Yards through an armoury of warlike principles. Indeed the artillery cleric William Bridge proclaimed that "the heart of man is the Artillery-Yard"[111] meaning that a man is naturally inclined to weapons and warfare.

The principles of 'manfulnesse' stalwartly reinforced the honouring of God as a Man-of-War and a God-of-Battles. Old Testament warlike rhetoric and warmongering, including references to Hebrew warriors, such as Saul, David, and in particular Sampson, were strongly utilised to reinforce Protestant 'manfulnesse'. Conversely, warlike masculinity was not solely a construct applied to Protestant Englishmen during the 17th Century. The function of a man as a warrior, whether he be a Turk, Englishman or a Spaniard, was strengthened by the iconography and projection of a man's status which was implemented in particular by powerful men, such as kings and sultans, who patrolled their courts invariably accompanied

[105] Charles Carlton, Going to the Wars, p. 5
[106] Ibid.
[107] J. Sears McGee, 'Adams, Thomas (1583–1652)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2012 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/131, accessed 13 Oct 2016]
[108] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 21
[109] Thomas Sutton, The Good Fight of Faith, p. 408
[110] John Everard, The Arriereban, A Sermon Preached to the Company of the Military Yarde (1618) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd. Edition)/10598, in The British Library) p. 49
[111] William Bridge, A Sermon Preached unto the Voluntiers of the City of Norwich and also to the Voluntiers of Great Yarmouth (the East Anglian Artillery Companies) (1643) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing/B4466, in The British Library) p. 7

by their huntsmen, houndsmen and falconers, whilst being guarded by armed men and their sergeants-at-arms. This provided a robust image, which reinforced a ruler's 'manfulnesse' as a warrior and a hunter. Richard Bonney explains that the great Sultans of the Ottoman Empire were dedicated to war, because military success enhanced their prestige and reinforced their control over the army and state bureaucracy.[112] Fred Dallmayr, in his paper on, A War Against the Turks?, an investigation into early modern enemy constructs of the Ottoman Turk and principles of just war, proclaims that militarism promotes a 'cult of violence' where warmongers and men of realpolitik blamed their warlike urges on a 'design of a savage [primitivism]'. Dallmayr observes that "for man, no wild beast is more dangerous then man [whereas leopards and hyenas, eagles and hawks only engineer violence] when hunger drives them mad", or when they are being hunted. These beasts "fight with their own weapons, like teeth and claws" out of survival, while man kills man with tools of iron, steel and lead, forged for the sole function of being a weapon to maim and destroy.[113]

Hunting was a dangerous and violent sport[114] which prepared men for the bloodshed of battle. Roger Manning in his work on the history of unlawful hunting in England 1485-1640, Hunters and Poachers, maintains that hunting and warfare were symbolically interchangeable.[115] As this thesis discusses masculinity and warfare, it is just to explain how hunting a buck or a wild boar was comparable to killing a man in war. Hunting allowed a man to pursue his lust for aggression and violence, which without the savagery and bloodshed of the hunt, may have found expression in warfare and armed rebellion.[116] Manning promotes that when a boy finally entered the brutal world of men, he did so by confronting death.[117] Hunting reinforced the symbolism of warfare. The 'violent feuds' and 'bloody poaching wars' between enemy hunters led to ambushes with crossbows and bludgeons, eventually leading to the killing of one man by another.[118] Manning thus explains that "hunters went armed and armoured for combat."[119] Indeed, huntsmen were armed with "weapons invasive and defensive."[120] Falconry also reinforced manful principles in

[112] Richard Bonney, The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) p. 288
[113] Fred R. Dallmayr, 'A War Against the Turks? Erasmus on War and Peace' (Asian Journal of Social Science, Vol. 34, No. 1 (2006), pp. 67-85, JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable/23654400, Accessed: 2/4/16) pp. 74-77
[114] David Harris Willson, James VI & I (London: Jonathan Cape, 1966) pp. 180-182
[115] Brian Manning, Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of England, 1485-1640 (Oxford: Clarendon Press Limited, 1993) p. 36
[116] Ibid. p. 38
[117] Ibid. p. 36
[118] Ibid. pp. 36-47
[119] Ibid. 39
[120] Ibid. p. 45

connection with power and prestige. It provided a masculinity that was political rather than warmongering; as Richard Grassby explains, the exchange of hawks and falcons was a diplomatic convention between men, but that hawking and falconry "could not be justified as a means of preparing fighting men for warfare." [121] The imagery of masculinity, through hunting and falconry, in the Stuart Court is further explored by Arthur Macgregor who reveals that James I had '24 falconers' and '30 hawks' in his employment to sustain his will for hunting whilst Charles I was honoured with a gift of 'Barbary Falcons' from the English ambassador in North Africa.[122] James had even written a treatise on hunting with falcons.[123]

Arthur Macgregor, in his article on Hunting and Hawking at the Court of James I and Charles I, explains that James employed a 'Sergeant of the Buckhounds' who was paid £100 per annum to maintain the King's packs of hunting hounds.[124] He was also "reputed to watch cock-fighting twice a week" whilst regularly entertaining his court with bull and bear-baiting.[125] Billett provides an account of how James enjoyed pitting lions and bull-mastiffs against each other, the former beasts being kept under guard at the Tower of London[126] along with crocodiles[127]. To engineer such accounts of 'gladiatorial combats' between the likes of leopards and bears portrayed the Stuart Kings as overlords of both man and beast, thus enhancing the potency of their rule.

This chapter will be divided into four lines of enquiry to reinforce how the artillery sermons implemented the shaping of military culture in England before the Civil War. The first line of enquiry being how the imagery of weaponry was implemented to denote a man as a defender of his lands and property. Armaments were also considered fundamental to a man's survival in the brutal times of combustions that had plagued Germany and potentially threatened England. The second line of enquiry will examine how a man's physical strength was considered a major concern of the Protestant 'manfulnesse' preached within the Artillery and Martial Yards. The artillery clerics staunchly professed that soldiers were to be physically hardy to strongly wield weapons in battle, and to be industrious and bold in the defence of one's countrymen. The third line of enquiry will be investigation into how the artillery clerics

[121] Richard Grassby, 'The Decline of Falconry in Early Modern England', (Past & Present, No. 157, November 1997, pp. 37-62, Oxford University Press, JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable/651080, Accessed: 14/9/15) pp 42-48.
[122] Arthur Macgregor, 'Hunting and Hawking at the Court of James I and Charles I' (Archives of Natural History (1989) 16 (3): pp. 305-318) p. 312
[123] Michael Billett, A History of English Country Sports (London: Robert Hale, 1994) p. 74
[124] Ibid. p. 309
[125] Michael Billett, A History of English Country Sports, pp. 36-47
[126] Ibid. p. 27
[127] David Harris Willson, James VI & I, p. 182

condemned the vices of cowardice in battle. The fourth line of enquiry will examine how the principles of 'State Watch' and a man, being a 'Bulwark of Conscience', was enforced within the Martial and Artillery Yards. A man, it was argued, should be stout and strong, but also be mentally hardy, capable of manful action to take up weapons against enemies of the state in a stern conviction to defend the laws and liberties of his countrymen. This will include an investigation into how the artillery clerics reinforced the principle that a man be a guardsman against sin.

Weaponry and tools of war were glorified as manful devices in the sermon preached by John Everard to the Martial Yard of Westminster in 1618. The sermon was later printed at the London shop at the sign of the Eagle and Childe. Everard promoted the idea of, "peace among the mighty men, among the valiant men which are fallen [in battle], which have gone downe to the grave with their weapons of warre, and have layed their swords under their heads."[128] William Gouge, when addressing the Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate in 1626, further justified the function of a man being a warrior. According to Gouge, Abraham of the Old Testament maintained an 'Artillery Yard' to reinforce the Hebrews against the violence of enemy invaders. Gouge lamented that for a city or a state to be without an Artillery Yard, is as dangerous as for a wandering man in barbarous lands to be without a weapon. Consequently he professed a similar principle that "the Artillery profession is an honourable function…to manage weapons of Warre [is honourable]"[129]. In 1617 Thomas Adams, addressing the Artillerymen of Bishopsgate, explained that a man's house should not be furnished with gold and silver but "with Weapons and Armour, to defend the Commonwealth, [otherwise] the Turke enters [his house] and conquers. Therefore Adams proclaimed that "we need not make our selves enemies by our riches."[130]

These sermons staunchly upheld that a man was to be a warrior who was obliged to maintain an arsenal of weaponry and ammunition for the self-defence of his person and his countrymen against 'savage' enemies. Thomas Adams further reinforced this principle claiming that "Munition and Armes should at all times be in readinesse…if Warre doe come, it is a labour well spent."[131] This reasoning was also particularly prevalent in the artillery sermon by John Leech, who asked, "what is Munition without Men? Or what are Weapons

[128] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 10
[129] William Gouge, The Dignitie of Chivalrie, pp.10-11
[130] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, pp. 24-25
[131] Ibid., p. 24

without Warriours? As good no weapons at all, as no dexteritie to use them."[132] Leech stalwartly advocated the, "martiall and warlike exercises,"[133] of weapons-drill within the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard. The latter strongly maintained that a Protestant man, as 'a Man of Warre' should "feare not Tyrants"[134] and enforce a stout knowledge of weaponry and warfare amongst his fellow-soldiers. John Everard, strongly argued that weapons served a defensive function to, "subdue rebels [and] to defend our owne land"[135] against the violence of 'barbarous' enemies. Thomas Palmer, describing himself as the 'fellow-souldier' of the Military Yard of Bristol, discussed the use of weaponry in archaic warfare by explaining that, "Hands, nayles, and teeth, were the old Primitive Armes. These were seconded with stones, and clubs for offensive weapons; and the skinnes of Beasts for defensive harnesse. But as the times, and designes grew more cruell, so the weapons more dangerous."[136] Everard strengthened the moral justification for stockpiling weaponry and ammunition by claiming that "Him that makes himself a sheepe, the wolfe devoures."[137] Indeed, the focus on the importance of armaments and military professionalism in warfare was fuelled by concerns in the decline of the knowledge of weaponry and warfare amongst men eligible for military service. Contemporary critics of the early Stuarts believed that Englishmen had become largely ignorant of the brutality and bloodshed of battle, the barbarity of "bloody hand to hand fighting" and the savagery the "push of pike"[138]. The artillery preachers thus strongly criticised the decline of military professionalism in England, claiming that moral cowardice and the influence of strong drink and whoredom had infiltrated a once warlike nation. The artillery preacher Thomas Adams voiced his concerns over the lack of knowledge of weaponry and warfare amongst the local men of the counties by explaining that "Wee shall fight strangely, if we have no weapons; and use our weapons for strangely if we have no skill."[139] Indeed this artillery sermon in particular damned the, "madness of us Englishmen!…[to be]…exposed to the furie of warre without weapons."[140] A man's military service to the state had become an outdated principle. According to Boynton, militiamen during this era favoured "hunting and hawking" over weaponry and warfare.[141] Lois

[132] John Leech, The Trayne Souldier, p. 58
[133] Ibid. p. 59
[134] Ibid. p. 44
[135] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 17
[136] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 24
[137] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 10
[138] Frank Tallett, War and Society in Early-Modern Europe, pp. 44-45
[139] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, pp. 23-24
[140] Ibid. p. 26
[141] Boynton, The Elizabethan Militia, p. 216

Schwoerer in her publication, No Standing Armies: The Anti-Army Ideology in Seventeenth Century England, explains that due to the decayed military system of England's land forces, a war against the Spanish could be fought only at sea by armed buccaneers and their warships and would not involve the mobilisation "of an army of foot-soldiers that Parliament wanted" in the 1620s in order to restore England's military power abroad.[142]

Whilst a weapon was a crucial tool of a Protestant man, the physical strength to wield weaponry was a major aspect of Protestant masculinity promoted by the artillery clerics. The image of the strong man within the sermons was clearly articulated by the artillery cleric John Leech of Northamptonshire[143]. Leech, in 1619, cited Judges 14.6 and 16.3 of the Old Testament to urge the Bishopsgate Artillerymen to be physically strong and hardy like the Old Testament warrior Sampson, who could, "rent a Lyon as one would rent a [goat]."[144] Leech also proclaimed that Sampson "could slay [an army of] a thousand Philistines,"[145] such was his strength. The principles of Protestant manliness sternly reinforced amongst the Artillery and Martial Yards that a man "must have both one hand to fight, another to worke. If there be no use of the sword, he must make use of the trowel: He must get his living as by blood, so by sweat."[146] Consequently, the artillery sermons maintained that a Protestant soldier was prohibited to shirk hard labour such as the digging of trenches and the hauling of weaponry, artillery and ammunition to the field of battle. To do so was considered a grave insult to God, who as previously discussed, was judged a Man-of-War. John Leech strengthened this principle proclaiming that all men be staunchly warlike and should, "learne to suffer hardnesse."[147] Protestant masculinity was also conveyed in the Martial and Artillery Yards through the infantry-drill manuals produced by their 'fellow souldiers'. From his manual A Warlike Treatise of the Pike Lupton reinforced the principle that a man should be "inured to carry iron, to make ditches [and] to beare [the hardships of war]."[148]

Protestant masculinity, presented within the artillery sermons, strongly enforced the scorn of cowardly men who shirked the perils of combat and further implemented the shaping of military culture in England. For a man to surrender his lands, and the liberties of his countrymen, without bloodshed and battle, was damned as unmanful and unwarlike. Indeed

---

[142] Lois Schwoerer, No Standing Armies, p. 20
[143] A Cambridge University Alumni Database, John Leech (1543-1641), Cambridge University
[144] John Leech, *The Trayne Souldier*, p. 28
[145] Ibid.
[146] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 5
[147] John Leech, The Trayne Souldier, p. 26
[148] Donald Lupton, A War-like Treatise of the Pike, p. 30

the artillery cleric and self-professed 'fellow souldier' Mathias Millward promoted that "it is not the manner of the English to yield without blows"[149] whilst dismissing "cowards [as] the scorne of men"[150] in his sermon preached to the Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate in 1641. Equally the artillery preacher William Gouge also damned cowards who fled from a skirmish proclaiming that "such men are more fit to stoope downe to a sythe then take up a sword, to lift a pitchforke than to tosse a picke, to handle a mattock then to hold a musket, and to carrie a bush-bill rather then a battle-axe."[151] Gouge lamented that cowards "have often beene the ruine of a great strong Army,"[152] whilst claiming that "a few courageous men to great armies of cowards are as so many Lyons to whole heards of deere."[153] In comparison, Donald Lupton writing in his manual on warfare, the War-like Treatise of the Pike, equally argued that "a few Lions [are] better than a great company of Stagges."[154] Calybute Downing also damned cowards in an army, proclaiming that it is a better bargain to be eaten by a Lion, then be a traitorous coward and a shirker of military duty.[155] Roger Manning establishes that the artillery preachers in their sermons covertly criticized James I's foreign and military policies of peace with the Spanish and German Imperialists[156]. When preaching to the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard in 1617, Thomas Adams reinforced his contempt for state demilitarisation and military cowardice within the Stuart Court claiming that "Manie of our English Lyons have brought forth Sheepe. Among birds you shall never see a Pigeon hatched in an Eagles neast."[157]

Furthermore, Jason White in his article on Militant Protestants: British Identity in the Jacobean Period, cited writings from a Scotsman, John Gordon, who strongly pressed that James I should reinforce his nation against the 'barbarous tyranny' of Rome.[158] White also referenced a statement by Richard Bernard, a puritan clergyman from North Lincolnshire, who claimed that the King should pursue warfare abroad and "wash his feete in the blood of his enemies."[159] However instead of being feared as a staunch militarist and a warlord, James

[149] Mathias Millward, The Souldiers Triumph and the Preachers Glory, p. 16
[150] Ibid. p. 15
[151] William Gouge, The Dignitie of Chivalrie, pp. 24-25
[152] Ibid. p. 24
[153] Ibid. p. 25
[154] Donald Lupton, A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike, p. 29
[155] Calybute Downing, A Sermon Preached to the Renowned Company of the Artillery, p. 27
[156] Roger Manning, An Apprenticeship in Arms, p. 146
[157] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 30
[158] Jason C. White, 'Militant Protestants: British Identity in the Jacobean Period, 1603-1625' (History, Volume 94, Number 2 (314) (April 2009), pp. 154-175, Wiley, JSTOR: jttp://www.jstor.org/stable/24428585, Accessed: 16/06/2016) p. 160
[159] Ibid. p. 161

I favored the title of 'Rex pacificus' [the Royal peace-maker][160] due to his diplomacy with foreign enemies and the engineering of a ceasefire of the Anglo-Spanish War at the Treaty of London in 1604. Mathias Millward, preaching to the Artillery Yard of the City of London in 1641, explained in hindsight that "better is wisdom then weapons of war" and better still a military alliance with Imperial Spain and "march out against the common enemy the Turk."[161] The Bishop of Lincoln, John Williams, deemed James worthy of the name 'Solomon', the son of the warrior David of the Old Testament. King Solomon was the Chief of the Israelites and credited to have united the warring tribes of Israel into a centralised state whilst avoiding foreign wars.[162] However, David Harris Willson explains that James' diplomacy lacked the military power to enforce the peace of 1604[163].

William Gouge referenced the Old Testament warrior principles in his sermon to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen in 1626, claiming that "Saul's warriors were "men of might; men of Warre; fit for the battell…whose faces were [indeed] like the faces of Lyons."[164] The artillery cleric Thomas Taylor, preaching to the Martial Yard of Westminster in 1629, also referenced the corps d'elite of Saul's troops by explaining that Saul's soldiers were "valiant and strong men…not of strong bodies onely, but of brave minds and resolutions [and] of stout and ready action."[165] Consequently, Taylor used a similar warlike rhetoric as Gouge to promote the bravery of Saul's men explaining that as "the Lyon is strong among beasts…for their courage, [Saul's warriors] had faces of Lyons."[166] Samuel Buggs of Coventry, another artillery cleric associated with Oxford University[167], also utilised the warmongering rhetoric of the Old Testament in his sermon, *'The Mid*-land Souldier, preached to the Martial Yard of Coventry in 1622. Buggs referenced 1 Samuel 17:33 and proclaimed that "Goliath was more terrible in the opinion of Saul, because he was a Man of Warre from his youth."[168]

To reinforce the condemnation of cowardice in battle, Thomas Adams in his sermon to the Bishopsgate Artillery Yard in 1617, professed that William the Conqueror, after landing with his troops at Pevensey, commanded that their warships be set ablaze and destroyed in order that his soldiers rather die in battle than surrender the invasion and retreat across the Channel

[160] Derek Hirst, Authority and Conflict: England 1603-1658 (London: Edward Arnold, 1992) p. 98
[161] Mathias Millward, The Souldiers Triumph and the Preachers Glory, pp. 5-6
[162] B. S. J. Isserlin, The Israelites (London: Thames & Hudson Limited, 1998) p. 81
[163] David Harris Willson, King James VI & I,p. 273
[164] William Gouge, The Dignitie of Chivalrie, p. 24-25
[165] Thomas Taylor, The Probation and Approbation of a Right Military Man, p. 2
[166] Ibid. p. 9
[167] A Cambridge University Alumni Database, Samuel Buggs (1589-1687) Cambridge University
[168] Samuel Buggs, The Mid-land Souldier, p. 26

back to Normandy[169]. The artillery preacher, Obadiah Sedgwick, also provided stern teachings to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen on the vices of cowardice in warfare. He explained that fear in battle, "makes our owne weapons uselesse, and…our enemies weapons…victorious." He explained that in war, a man "must either conquer or be conquered" and advised "Feare [not] the combate, nor Quit the field [of battle]…the Warre may be long, the assaults fierce, the blowes thick, the encounter sharpe, yet bee strong [and never surrender]."[170]

These arguments, which reinforced the militant principles of the execution of violence and weaponry within Protestant masculinity, played on the idea of England being defensively entrenched within a brutish and cruel 'Wilderness,' where savage beasts of prey hunted men, and where wayfarers were ambushed by barbarous outlaws. In this shaping of military culture within the Artillery Companies, Englishmen were compared by the artillery preachers to the embattled Hebrews, surviving the "brutal and violent times"[171] of the Exodus and enduring an armed struggle to carve out the Promised Land. The state enemies of Protestant England, such as the Roman Church and Imperial Spain; the Irish 'barbarians,' the Catholic Germans, Bavarians, Hungarians and Ottoman Turks, were all symbolically represented as the Philistine, Babylonian, Assyrian and Scythian foes who had fought bloody wars of conquest against Judah and Israel. The artillery sermons described the Protestant Church as a strong bulwark against the savagery and barbarism of the 'Wilderness'. To reinforce this point, John Everard preaching to the Artillerymen of Westminster, professed that the "Church [is] a squadron of armed men"[172] against the lawlessness of barbarous violent enemies. Everard explained that God intended this to be the way of the world where "the strong might [battle] against the strong, and the armed man [go to war] against him that was armed."[173]

The motif of the 'Wilderness' was discussed further in the artillery sermons and continued to reinforce the idea of Protestant masculinity, in particular, by the artillery preacher Thomas Adams. He cited Chapter 1, Verse 7 of the Book of Job in the Hebrew Scriptures that "Job calls mans life a Warfare"[174] whilst his fellow artillery-preachers, John Everard and Thomas Sutton, equally professed that "the life of a man upon earth is a warfare"[175] and "the life of

[169] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 32
[170] Ibid. p. 7
[171] Mark Healy, Warriors of the Old Testament (London: Brockhampton Press, 1998) p. 99
[172] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 18
[173] Ibid. p. 23
[174] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. Dedicatory
[175] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 19

every man is a continuall warre…is a continuall Battalion, and [a] bloody Skirmish"[176]. Derek Hirst commenting on the nature of English society during this era explained that "the popularity of bloody sports such as bear- and bull-baiting, and public hangings," convey a brutal way of life that modern observers would discredit as barbarous and primitive.[177] This view is strongly argued by Michael Billet who explains that "the people thought little of the cruelty [of blood sports and public execution] for they themselves lived in harsh and bloody times."[178] Therefore the notion of the 'savage Wilderness' was likely to gain momentum within the warlike context of the sermons. Consequently the artillery sermons reinforced to the congregations of armed men that throughout Man's "warlike histories,"[179] only strong, hardy martial-like men[180] forged their own survival in the 'brutal' 'Wilderness' where a man should hunt or be hunted, kill or be killed. It was acknowledged that if Man was not warlike, "the wolfe might dwell with the lamb, and the leopard lie with the kid, and the calfe, and the young lyon…the lyon might eat straw like the oxe."[181]

Protestant masculinity was further based in the artillery sermons on the idea of God being a Man-of-War who engineered armed struggles to destroy barbarous and hawkish peoples, such as the Philistines and the "mercilesse Syrians."[182] Protestant troops were therefore considered the weapons of God's wrath and judgement against brutal enemies. According to Thomas Palmer, "Warre is a scourge…the sword of the Warriour is Gods rod of iron.[183]" The artillery sermons further built upon the construct of this God-of-Battles, within the warlike principles of Protestant masculinity, by asserting that Englishmen were the "bulwarks of the Protestant Religion"[184] and that He made "one as bold as a lyon"[185] in a war fought in a just cause. God was considered a pillar of strength for the Protestant man in such barbarous times of warfare abroad. To reinforce this point, the artillery preacher Abraham Gibson, a clergyman from Rutland[186], addressed the Bishopsgate Artillerymen in 1618, and cited 2 Samuel 22:35, "Hee teacheth my hands to warre [and reinforces my] strength unto the battell, and subdueth mine

[176] Thomas Sutton, The Good Fight of Faith, p. 409
[177] Derek Hirst, Authority and Conflict: England 1603-1658, p. 95
[178] Michael Billett, A History of English Country Sports, pp. 30-31
[179] Donald Lupton, A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike, p. 9
[180] John Roberts, Great Yarmouths Exercise (1638), (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition) / 21093, in The British Library) Dedicatory
[181] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 10
[182] George Hughes, The Saints Losse and Lamentation: A Sermon Preached at the Funerall of thye Worshipfull Captaine Henry Waller (1632) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition)/13913, in The Bodleian Library, Reel Position: STC/1522:03) p. 15
[183] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 4
[184] William Bridge, A Sermon to [the East Anglian Artillery Companies], p. 15
[185] John Leech, The Trayne Souldier, p. 31
[186] A Cambridge University Alumni Database, Abraham Gibson, University of Cambridge

enemies under me,"[187] to support the motif of the Old Testament God as a Man of War. John Leech similarly argued that God-given strength in war was the "best weapon a man can carry into the field with him."[188] It was equally argued by Thomas Sutton that, with regards to the enemy, who is without God's reinforcement, "his weapons [are] like the weapons of Goliath,"[189] which were constructed and forged out of iron and were consequently liable to break.

The fourth line of enquiry investigating how the clerics promoted Protestant 'manfulnesse' within the Martial and Artillery Yards will be the examination of the principles of 'State Watch' and a man being a 'Bulwark of Conscience'. The 'fellow souldier' Obadiah Sedgwick, who preached to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen in October 1638 whilst under the patronage of the Earl of Essex, coined the term 'State Watch', enforcing that a Protestant man must be a guardsman with a trenchant vigilance against corrupt and barbarous men and armed with "the eye of an Eagle"[190] to hunt down enemies of state. Earlier, Samuel Buggs, who preached to the Martial Yard of Coventry in 1622, implemented a similar rhetoric promoting that manful action has a duty to "hunt out danger."[191] Sedgwick built upon the principle of State Watch by gravely warning that even strong defences of stone bulwarks and ramparts, the stockpiling of weaponry and ammunition and the fighting strength of an army are "useless weapons unto you, if you watch not; swords in scabbards and no more; even the Lyon if he be couchant, and the Serpent if he be dormant,"[192] can be ambushed and ensnared by enemies. At a time when Charles I was contemplating using force against the Scots, Sedgwick was enforcing a stalwart principle that every Protestant Englishman must guard his country with "Temperance and Vigilancie"[193] whilst gravely warning against enemies of the state that could infiltrate society and wreak destruction and bloodshed in an internal war. To this, Sedgwick explained that a Protestant man, as a guardsman against state infiltrators should be "Like the Eagle that causeth the young in her nest to looke with open eyes on the Sun, if they can doe so, shee [will defend them to the death against all enemies]…if not, she [will destroy them] as if they were an adulterous brood."[194] Sedgwick further sternly

[187] Abraham Gibson, A Preparative to War Shewing the Lawfull Use Thereof (1618) (Bibliographic Name / Number: STC (2nd edition) / 11828, in The British Library, Reel Position: STC / 1067:04) p. 11
[188] John Leech, The Trayne Souldier, p. 30
[189] Thomas Sutton, The Good Fight of Faith, p. 410
[190] Obadiah Sedgwicke, Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier, p. 19
[191] Samuel Buggs, The Mid-land Souldier, p. 30
[192] Obadiah Sedgwicke, Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier, p. 60
[193] Ibid
[194] Ibid. pp. 24-25

enforced to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen that "steadfastnesse…is a sharpe weapon"[195] in armed conflict. "Military Security…[according to the artillery cleric]…is a stone for strength,"[196] against invaders and raiders. Sedgwick, like his fellow artillery preachers warned of the vices of demilitarisation, claiming that it "sheathes up weapons amongst ourselves"[197] and extends a hand to the enemy. William Gouge also contributes to this argument on State Watch proclaiming that a state infiltrator is like "A Wolfe…if he be stoutly resisted with weapons in hand, [he] will retreat."[198] In 1623 Thomas Sutton had concentrated his artillery preaching on the allegiance between barbarous enemies, who plot the destruction of civil society, and the Devil. He maintains that a God-fearing man must stand guard against the vices of the Beast who he discredits as "that insulting and braving enemy…that old and malicious enemy [who] "thinkes of nought but death [and] shakes the pillars of society, [causing] the strongest castles to totter [and plots to] drive the Lord from among you, & strengthen the hands of the destroyer against you."[199] Thus it was sternly enforced by the artillery preachers that a Protestant man, as a vigilant guardsman against tyrannical, barbarous men, must be armed, stand-fast and await "the signall for Battell," against both the Devil and foreign savage enemies.[200] Sedgwick also staunchly reinforced the necessity for a Protestant man to be a guardsman against moral corruption, his own failings and that of his enemies.

Justifying the Artilleryman's profession as a lawful military career was a chief objective of the artillery preachers. During the 1620s, professional soldiering had been disgraced by the ill-disciplined pressed men, enforced into the Army during the1620s. The Duke of Buckingham, a man considered incompetent in warfare[201], led a press-ganged mob of armed men, rather than a professional army, into a futile beach assault on the Spanish naval stronghold of Cadiz in 1625, ending in bloodshed and annihilation for the English troops. In 1624, Duke Mansfeld, a German mercenary and an heir to the 16th century landsknecht military contractors[202], and "as liable to plunder his own employer as he was the enemy,"[203]

---

[195] Ibid. p. 66
[196] Ibid. p. 4
[197] Ibid. p. 8
[198] William Gouge, The Dignitie of Chivalrie, p. 31
[199] Thomas Sutton, The Good Fight of Faith, pp. 403-412
[200] Obadiah Sedgwicke, Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier, p. 5
[201] James Holstun, *"God Bless Thee, Little David!"*, p. 518
[202] V. G. Kiernan, 'Foreign Mercenaries and Absolute Monarchy' (Past & Present, No. 11 (Apr., 1957), pp. 66-86, Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of The Past and Present Society Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/649741) p. 77

led an expeditionary-force, "the bulk of the men [being] impressed,"[204] into the Rhineland to reconquer the Rhine Palatinate. However Mansfeld's 12,000 troops[205] were surrounded and butchered by the enemy. 400 of Mansfeld's soldiers were killed by local armed men in the Rhine.[206] Furthermore, many of the English troops fell prey to hunger, dysentery and trench-foot. Indeed, "disease was as dangerous as battle".[207] Richard Bonney explains that dysentery and trench-foot wrought more devastation to an army than enemy muskets and was a more frequent cause of death than action in battle.[208] Mercenary troops in particular were damned by the artillery preachers as the chief enforcers of barbarity and savagery against unarmed men and, "indifferent to the justice of war.[209]" Mercenaries were depicted as essentially armed men, who killed in battle for financial gain, rather than killing in battle for a just cause, such as the defence of liberty. Consequently, the artillery preacher and 'fellow souldier' Thomas Palmer maintained that, "The Lord will scatter those that delight in warre…what profession more scattered, then the Mercenary souldier?"[210] Parliament in the 1620s was flooded with grievances concerning the violent and unlawful conduct of the pressed foot-soldier billeted upon unarmed communities.[211] Furthermore, the deputy-lieutenants and sergeants-at-arms failed to regulate and update the armouries of weaponry and ammunition maintained by the local defence forces. Stephen Stearns in his publication concerning Conscription and English Society in the 1620s has unearthed evidence that the Lord-Lieutenancy had allowed the military system to become outdated and corrupt, engineering an unlawful monopoly on the distribution of men, weapons and armaments of the militia. As an example, Sir John Browne, Mr. Henry Hastings and Sir Symon Weston, the deputy-lieutenants assigned to regulate the militia in Dorset and Staffordshire, were guilty of extorting money from pressed men. One allegation reinforces this point; "Sir John Browne and Mr. Henry Hastinges [,] deputie lieutenants…did release a miller [,] an exstraordinarie stout man [,] and in his stead a boy of fifteene years of age," was enforced into the militia.[212] Roger Manning provides further example of the weaknesses of the military system,

---

[203] Charles Carlton, Going to the Wars, p. 14
[204] Michael Barthorp, The Armies of Britain, p. 16
[205] Charles Carlton, Going to the Wars, p. 16
[206] Frank Tallett, War and Society in Early-Modern Europe 1495-1715, p. 157
[207] Barbara Donagan, War in England 1642-1649, pp. 50-51
[208] Richard Bonney, The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660, p. 348
[209] William Hunt, Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War, p. 224
[210] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 5
[211] Stephen J. Stearns, 'Conscription and English Society in the 1620s', (Journal of British Studies, Vol. 11, No. 2, May 1972, pp. 1-23, Cambridge University Press on Behalf of the North American Conference on British Studies, JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable/175073, Accessed: 27/05/2016) p. 7
[212] Ibid. p. 10

explaining that the militiamen of the Cinque Ports, the frontline of England's coastal bulwarks, entrenchments and bastions against invasion by a foreign enemy, would refuse any orders by deputy-lieutenants of Kent to mobilise on the basis that their only loyalties were to the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports himself.[213] Later, the prestige of the local militia officers, and law-enforcers such as the sheriffs and deputy-lieutenants, was damaged by the Crown's unpopular Ship Money taxation of the 1630s, causing many county men to shirk militia duties. [214] It was feared that only decayed servicemen and militiamen, armed with outdated weapons, would man the nation's bulwarks and ramparts if a brutal invader landed in England. Boynton explains that such was the shortage of manpower in the militia, the pensions for ex-soldiers were supplemented by county deputy-lieutenants to pay them to drill 'squadrons' of local men and to develop a military professionalism.[215] Roger Manning argues that the enforced impressment of men, and the steady assembling of militiamen, considered to be unlawfully billeted in the Capital, along with fear of foreign invasion by the Spanish, or even the Turks, led many men to drill with weaponry in the Artillery Yards to prepare for civil violence.[216] Consequently the fears of a brutal invasion by savage and tyrannical enemies promoted the discussion of warfare in the Provincial cities, which ultimately led to "the founding of new Artillery Companies in the early Stuart period."[217]

Accordingly, in warfare, when armed savagery engineers barbarity and lawlessness amongst men, a Protestant soldier must be a "Bulwark of Conscience."[218] Protestant troops, according to Sedgwick, must be "men above men"[219] and execute battle in a lawful and honourable manner, refraining from the butchering of unarmed men and the raping of women. The barbarous actions executed by Spanish and Imperial German troops during the early stages of the Thirty Years War may have prompted both Thomas Adams and Sedgwick to reinforce the principle of lawfulness in warfare to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen. Adams in his sermon explained that "Hee [God] directs them to be good men, not forbids them to bee warlike men."[220] Sedgwick similarly argued that "a good Souldier ought to be a good man."[221] However the artillery cleric warned that even the "strongest Sampson"[222] may fall prey to sin.

[213] Roger Manning, An Apprenticeship in Arms, p. 143
[214] Ibid.
[215] Boynton, The Elizabethan Militia, pp. 265-266.
[216] Roger Manning, An Apprenticeship in Arms, p. 143
[217] Ibid.p. 144
[218] Ibid. p. 27
[219] Ibid. p. 6
[220] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 18
[221] Obadiah Sedgwick, Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier, p. 94
[222] Ibid. p. 60

Accordingly, "David's idle wandering eye occasioned two horrid sinnes, one of adulterie, the other of murder."[223] Conclusively, Sedgwick maintained that even honourable men can inflict "cruel combats" and lawlessness.[224] John Everard reinforces this point in his preaching of manful integrity to the Martial Yard of Westminster in 1618, by denoting the "intruders and usurpers"[225] of manful honour. A dishonourable man would be a man who lusted after his neighbour's wife, or drunkards who staked a false claim to 'manfulnesse' by asserting to be "men of strength [devouring] strong drinke."[226] Furthermore men who "thinke by great words to bragge themselves into an opinion of valour,"[227] would be "fitter for a Mattock, or a Spade, then a Pike or Musket"[228] The artillery preacher continued to denounce such men as cowards who be "as Lions in their roaring" on the proclamation of war but will eventually shirk their military duties on the day enemies come with weapons and armaments of war to destroy their nation.[229] Men of violence were also considered dishonourable by Everard who "cursed their wrath, for it is fierce, and their anger for it is cruell."[230] Manful integrity thus promoted a stern conscience over the uses of violence to defend the unarmed and to combat the vices of barbarity and savagery in warfare.

The artillery cleric George Hughes, a puritan clergyman from London who held curacies in Oxfordshire prior to the civil war and who was killed during the siege of Exeter preaching to Parliamentarian troops[231], addressed the Artillery Yard of Bishopsgate in 1632. He discussed the principles of duty to God to promote manful integrity and the principle of a man being a bulwark against sin. He referenced the Amalekite Wars of Saul where God ordered the total destruction and annihilation of the Amalekite army. However, Saul spared the prime cattle that fed the enemy troops and kept them for his own warriors. He also spared the enemy commander who had surrendered whilst seizing the enemy's arsenal of weapons for his own armouries. This accordingly enraged God who instead favoured David as his chosen soldier. Indeed David is depicted as the greater warrior than Saul, as "after a great conquest of the Philistines…Saul hath slaine his thousand, and David his ten thousand."[232] Hughes

[223] Ibid. p. 50
[224] Ibid.
[225] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 38
[226] Ibid.
[227] Ibid.
[228] Samuel Buggs, The Mid-Land Souldier, p. 25
[229] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 39
[230] Ibid.
[231] Mary Wolffe, *'Hughes, George (1603/4–1667)'*, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14069, accessed 13 Oct 2016]
[232] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 3

proclaimed that Saul's rebellion against God "branded him for an enemy" whilst discussing the "violence and ravenous desire for bloud Saul hunted David,"[233] in his rage of jealousy. However, it was maintained that David was a loyal and steadfast man and consequently kept the faith that God would defend him from the weapons and violence of the enemies that hunted him. William Bridge also reinforces this point explaining that when David was besieged and surrounded by his enemies [who] had seized his wives, and then plundered all he had, "his own Souldiers began to mutiny, and thought of stoning him"[234]. However he was stalwart in his faith in God to destroy the barbarous foes that were bent on his destruction.[235] William Bridge thus reinforced that the "righteous are as bold as a Lyon."[236] Both Bridge and Hughes thus illustrate within their sermons to the congregations of Artillerymen that 'manfulnesse' is stalwartly entrenched as a principle concerning a man being a 'Bulwark of Conscience' by being loyal to one's commander, even when savage enemies seek to undermine that principle. Loyalty to God, as a Man of War, was also paramount in the artillery sermons. Thomas Sutton damns men who honour "a monument of Brasse" and enforce upon other men that "a corruptible piece of gold to bee [their] god." [237] Sutton explained that the warriors of the Old Testament such as Abraham, Isaac, Barach, Sampson and Samuel, in their wars with foreign enemies, fought "against the violence of fire, the fury of Lions, the terrours and exquisite torments of racking, mocking, scourging, stoning, imprisonment, poverty, banishment"; [and] that in their skirmishes and conflicts with their foes, they honoured and were loyal to God.[238]

In conclusion to this chapter, the shaping of military culture in England prior the Great Rebellion was largely established through the ideals of warlike Protestant masculinity, which were conveyed principally through reference to Old Testament warrior traditions within the artillery sermons. As discussed, the artillery preachers promoted the motifs of weaponry and warfare to denote a man as a warrior within the sermons. The construct of manful honour was discussed by analysing the principles of 'State Watch' which enforced that a man should be a 'Bulwark of Conscience' and a 'Bulwark of Defiance' and to execute an armed struggle against tyrannical, barbarous men at every opportunity, whilst being a stalwart and loyal man to one's commander. With regard to soldiering, Protestant 'manfulnesse' strongly endorsed

[233] George Hughes, The Saints Losse and Lamentation, p. 4
[234] William Bridge, A Sermon Preached to the (East Anglian Artillery Companies), p. 20
[235] Ibid. p. 20
[236] Ibid. p. 21
[237] Thomas Sutton, The Good Fight of Faith, pp. 403-413
[238] Ibid. pp. 419-420

military action as Godly and honourable. Consequently, the vices of cowardice in battle, and the shirking of military duties, were damned as gravely dishonourable to God, who was staunchly honoured as a ‘Man of War.’ Warlike Protestant ‘manfulnesse’ condemned mercenary soldiering and barbaric warfare, such as the killing of unarmed men and prisoners of war. A mercenary soldier was damned as a barbarous man who delighted in the savagery of warfare such as the rapine of women whilst financially profiting from the butchering of his fellow man. The distinction drawn in the artillery sermons between honourable military service and mercenary service hinged on principles of just and lawful warfare, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter Two: “the First Ground of a Lawfull War is in a way of Just Defence”

This chapter will focus on how the artillery preachers understood the necessity of warfare as a just principle. The sermons preached to the Military and Artillery Yards strongly argued that an armed struggle against barbarous and tyrannical men was the chief objective of a Protestant man’s duty to God and to his State. This was conveyed mainly by a stalwart entrenchment of principles concerning lawful soldiering and just warfare within the sermons. The artillery preachers decried the execution of unlawful violence and savagery against unarmed men in warfare whilst promoting a staunch principle that soldiers should be merciful to a defeated enemy. This chapter will consider three lines of enquiry. The first being how the artillery preachers promoted their own interpretations of just war to their congregations of armed men. This will involve discussing how some artillery clerics justified executing warfare as an action of revenge for an enemies' seizing of cattle, the plundering of armouries or the rapine of women. However, some artillery sermons sternly prohibited all unnecessary bloodshed such as the execution of unarmed prisoners of war out of revenge for an enemy ambush. The second line of enquiry will endeavour to deal with the problem of mercenary soldiering for the artillery clerics. Mercenary troops, who engineered war crimes, were judged little more than armed rogues and cut-throats, who profited from armed thuggery, rapine and plunder. Consequently, it was dictated that men should only take up weapons as a part of a just cause in a defensive action against a brutal invader or to reinforce an oppressed allied state against the barbarity of a common enemy. The final line of enquiry will explain how the preachers increasingly discussed the political and military situation in England to convey justification for defensive warfare. It will be argued that the sermons voiced the strongly entrenched suspicions within political and military circles that Charles I would execute military force to undermine parliamentary liberty. Calybute Downing covertly justified a civil war in England as an armed struggle of national defence against men who endeavoured to barbarise and enslave the nation. However, once the war had begun, artillery preachers such as William Bridge, openly justified armed rebellion against the King in 1642 as a just war fought with a staunch conscience concerning the defence of the liberty of parliamentary debate.

The Thirty Years War of 1618-48, was an armed quarrel fought chiefly within the German empire. It was initially fought between the troops of the rebel alliance entrenched in Saxony,

the Upper Rhineland, and Prussia, and the Protestant Baltic Powers of Sweden and Denmark-Norway against the imperial armies of Austria, Hungary, the Lower Rhineland and Bavaria who were loyal to the old Roman faith. Consequently, the artillery preachers championed the Protestant cause as they saw the victory of the latter as beneficial to England, a factor that strongly politicized the artillery sermons. As a war scarred by "lawlessness and barbarity"[239], it provided the artillery preachers with examples of unlawful and 'barbarous' warfare and in particular they condemned the vices of military contracture. The German War generated stories of savage brigands and mercenary troops butchering unarmed men and driving away their cattle and oxen, and local warlords plundering the lands as law and order was annihilated. In response, for a man to take up weapons and armaments against a barbarous and tyrannical enemy was considered a lawful and just cause by the preachers to the Artillery Companies. The artillery cleric, John Everard, preaching to the Martial Yard of Westminster at the start of the war in 1618, strongly argued that God had, "permitted unto man and implanted in his heart, to oppose violence with violence." Similarly, the artillery sermon preached to the Artillery Company of Bristol in 1635 by Thomas Palmer, staunchly maintained that the, "onely necessary and lawful action wherein to imploy weapons, is the action of (defensive) warre."[240]

Consequently, the artillery sermons justified warfare as a defensive action against barbarous foreign enemies, in particular, the Spanish, who had been seen as the key enemy to England since the closing decades of Elizabeth's reign. The artillery cleric Thomas Adams preached in 1617 to the Artillerymen of Bishopsgate that, "[the Spaniards] have often threatened [war]…they come like Lyons rampant [and] intend nothing but our ruine and desolation."[241] To the English, the Spanish were a warring and savage peoples, ethnically linked with the "Berber warlords [and] Berber warriors of North Africa." According to John Parry's The Spanish Seaborne Empire, the Spanish were believed to have inherited a violent legacy of barbarity and armed savagery from the "Arab and Berber armies" that had invaded the Iberian Peninsula in 711AD. [242] The Spanish Conquistadors' execution of warfare and bloodshed in the Americas against native peoples further reinforced the 'Black Legend' of the Spaniard as a cruel oppressor. The Spanish imperialists, according to Parry, were hard edged, desperate men, "willing to kill and be killed…willing to grind men into utter poverty

[239] Ibid.
[240] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 9
[241] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 26
[242] John Horace Parry, The Spanish Seaborne Empire, pp. 2-5

so that they might fulfil their lust for power and riches."[243] The 'Jaguar Warriors' of the Americas were "armed only with weapons of wood and stone"[244] and thus were butchered by the Spanish invaders armed with hackbuts and cannons. The artillery preachers thus strongly maintained a stock enemy construct of the, "brutal Spanish conquerors,"[245] as England's primal foe. Arguably, the Spanish Empire was feared by its English enemies and respected by its German allies as a "[military] colossus, the conqueror of peoples, [and] the [victor] of battles."[246] English political thought already implemented a "rhetoric of barbarity,"[247] used to depict foreign enemies as barbarous, tyrannical men. Indeed, as Barbara Donagan notes, warnings against "Foreign-ness…was a useful weapon in the propaganda arsenal,"[248] to fuel English warmongering. Richard Bonney explains that during this era the popular press could mould public opinion though the "violent language of [politicised] pamphlets" whilst the "the printed word was wielded as a weapon in [a] political struggle and [was] a tool of warfare in its own right."[249] The same could be said of the printed artillery sermons when considering what audience was analysing the text. The passages concerning the taking up of weapons against tyrants may have been interpreted as justification for civil war depending on how soon the text was read to the King's retreat from London to Nottingham in 1642, and how well attuned the reader was in the growing rhetoric concerning armed rebellion.

In 1641, the artillery cleric and "fellow souldier," Mathias Millward, preaching to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen, their Lieutenant William Manby, and several London Militiamen including Captains Bond, Langham, Manwaring, Davies and Wilson, and Captain Phillip Skippon, explained that "when revenge lies in a man's hand"[250] he is capable of barbarous and savage actions. To this, Millward concluded "doe violence to no man" unless it is in a defensive war against a barbarous transgressor. Millward was not the only artillery cleric to discuss the vices of revenge in war. Thomas Taylor, a puritan from the North Riding of Yorkshire,[251] also condemned brutal reparations against enemies in warfare. He condemned vengeful men as barbaric and ruthless, comparable to the "rough Ishmael…[his] hand is

[243] Ibid. Introduction, p. xvii.
[244] Ibid. p. 63
[245] Christopher Hill, The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution (London: Penguin Books Limited, 1993) p. 135
[246] Henry Kamen, Empire: How Spain Became a World Power 1492-1763 (New York: Perennial, 2004) p. xxii
[247] Barbara Donagan, War in England, p. 52
[248] Ibid. p. 198
[249] Richard Bonney, The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660, p. 501
[250] Mathias Millward, The Souldiers Triumph and the Preachers Glory, p. 16
[251] Charlotte Fell Smith, 'Taylor, Thomas (1576-1633)', Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900, Volume 55

against every man, and every man's against [him]."[252] Ishmael was an illegitimate son of Abraham of the Old Testament. Though God regarded Ishmael as a warrior, He maintained that the man would live out his life at war with all his brothers. Taylor further discussed revenge in warfare and explained that if a man is armed against the life of another man without lawful prohibition for his use of weapons and violence, he shall perish by the weapon of a man, or else be destroyed by God's terrible wrath.[253] Taylor concluded that warfare may not be authorised by a private individual. According to Taylor "neither is it in their power to denounce a publicke enemy; and none is to bee reputed a publicke enemy, till hee bee publickely denounced by publicke authority."[254] To hunt down and kill a man 'without publicke warrant…is theft and murder," except when times of brutal combustions 'maketh a man a Magistrate in his owne case."[255]

However, artillery preachers such as Thomas Palmer promoted in 1635 that "an offensive warre may bee a lawful course of revenge." Palmer explains this by referencing 2 Samuel 10 of the Old Testament, explaining how David sought to avenge the honour of his military envoys who had their beards shorn off by the soldiers of the King of the Ammonites. [256] The Ammonite enemy then employed Syrian warriors to engineer war upon the Israelites. David in turn executed a war of conquest against these foes. Indeed, the King James Bible explains that David commanded his troops to wreak a barbaric destruction and annihilation of the Ammonites, executing them in brutal ways, killing them under "axes of iron, and [forcing] them through the brick-kiln."[257] Palmer also cited Genesis 14, Chapters 1 to 4 of the Old Testament telling when Abraham implemented offensive war against warriors from ancient Iran who had seized his nephew Lot in the wilderness.[258] The artillery preachers were generally stalwart in their conviction that war only be fought as a defensive action against barbarous enemies. While their views on offensive warfare conflicted, they were in agreement on the condemnation of mercenary soldiering.

Although Henry VIII, the founding father of the Artillery Companies of the City of London, had hired "foreign soldiers from all nations under the sun [including] Spaniards, Germans and

[252] Thomas Taylor, The Probation and Approbation of a Right Military Man, p. 4
[253]Ibid. p. 14
[254] Ibid.
[255] Ibid.
[256] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 16
[257] 2 Samuel 12, The Holy Bible (Authorized King James Version) Containing the Old and New Testaments, Translated out of the original tongues and with the former translations diligently compared and revised, By His *Majesty's Special Command*, (London: Scripture Gift Mission, 1957) pp. 329-330
[258] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 16

Turks" in his wars in France and Scotland[259], by the early 17th century the artillery preachers were wary of condoning military contracture. As previously discussed, mercenary soldiering conveyed imagery of outlandish barbarous troops plundering and massacring unarmed peoples whilst being loyal only to their master's coin. The brutal war in Germany (1618-1648) was particularly condemned by the artillery clerics as an unlawful war due to the fact that "mercenaries [were employed] as weapons against rebellion,"[260] to brutalise the Protestant rebels into compliance with the Imperial Government. Indeed, Gary Martin Best, writing in 1985, when the 'iron curtain' of the Soviet Bloc maintained a stranglehold on Eastern Germany, credited the brutal fighting [of the Thirty Years War] with the "destruction of towns on a major scale, resulting in the disintegration of the established pattern of agriculture, industry and commerce [and] thus decimating the population, which consequently barbarised the German people so that they could never become a united nation."[261] J. V. Polisensky in his publication on the Thirty Years War, originally published in 1971 at the height of the Cold War, has explained that the violence and destruction wrought by mercenary troops, particularly on the Ottoman-Hungarian Frontier, "still provides a source of argument among Czech, Slovak, Austrian and Hungarian historians."[262] However Victor Kiernan takes a more sympathetic view on mercenary soldiering explaining that it provided employment for "men for whom war was the alternative to poverty and starvation."[263]

It was strongly reinforced by the artillery clerics that God-fearing troops should be merciful to a defeated enemy soldier. A mercenary was considered a dishonourable man who was brutal and ruthless without a just cause. To unlawfully execute an unarmed man or prisoner of war was condemned as a grave dishonouring to the business of soldiering. The war reports of the alleged barbarism of Spanish and German Catholic troops, many of them mercenaries, fighting abroad against Protestant insurgents, reinforced the vices of brute savagery associated with unlawful soldiering to Englishmen. Preaching to the Martial Yard of Bristol in 1635, Thomas Palmer professed that "it is neither Honour to kill our enemies dis-armed, nor Justice to kill our prisoners in cold blood, unlesse our owne safety doe inforce it."[264] Thomas Adams stated a similar argument, maintaining that a weapon "should not be

[259] Richard Bonney, The European Dynastic States: 1494-1660, p. 349
[260] V.G.Kiernan, 'Foreign Mercenaries and Absolute Monarchy', p. 77
[261] Gary Martin Best, Seventeenth Century Europe (London: Macmillan Publishers Limited, 1985) p. 18
[262] J. V. Polisensky, The Thirty Years War (London: New English Library, 1974) p. 22
[263] V.G. Kiernan, 'Foreign Mercenaries and Absolute Monarchy', p. 77
[264] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 17

bloodied, but in the heat of battell" and not in the aftermath of a skirmish in a bloody massacre of prisoners of war.[265] Donald Lupton, reinforced this judgement in his infantry-drill manual in 1642 that "the Transgressors of warlike Orders are punished with death….the Sword-law rather inclines to justice than mercy."[266] Indeed English Martial Law decreed that if a man plundered or raped a woman on campaign, he was liable to be executed by firing squad or hanged till death in front of his fellow soldiers. The artillery cleric William Bridge, preaching to the Martial and Artillery Yards of Norwich and Great Yarmouth in 1642, explained that a merciful man in warfare was indeed a "stout man...[and] bold as a Lyon: the Lyon himselfe is mercifull, not revengefull, if a [prey] lyes down before Him, he will spare it."[267] Consequently the warlike actions promoted within the Martial and Artillery Yards decried military contracture, but stalwartly promoted restraint in use of weapons against a defeated enemy because it was considered just.

Warfare as a defensive action was lawful according to the artillery clerics. On the 25th July 1629, Thomas Taylor, a clergyman from the North Riding of Yorkshire, preached to the Military Yard of Westminster claiming that foreign enemies such as Imperial Spain and Germany were like, "whole Army of Philistines."[268] Taylor also lectured in Hebrew Scripture at Oxford University which perhaps explains his reliance on Old Testament military rhetoric. In this context the armed struggle between David and Goliath was a stock motif to justify the 'lawfulness' of defensive warfare within the preaching. Thomas Palmer promoted the 'lawfulness' of David's actions in using a weapon against his brutal enemy Goliath. Professing to be a "fellow souldier" whilst preaching to the Bristol Artillerymen in 1635, Palmer claimed that "David was armed with a more lawful quarrel,"[269] which was the defence of his country against the invading Philistine barbarians. Consequently, "David [had] the warlike precedent,"[270] in the battle with Goliath. Hence, Palmer concluded that, "the lawfulness of the defence of one's country and liberty warranted, "the lawfulnesse of the warre"[271]. Furthermore, the artillery sermons explained that if God judged a war lawful then it was legal to arm oneself with a weapon to execute the war. Christopher Hill considered God's authorising of just warfare explaining that this "doctrine that might is right is as at least

[265] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 21
[266] Donald Lupton, A War-like Treatise of the Pike, p.5
[267] William Bridge, A Sermon Preached unto the (East Anglian Artillery Companies) p. 6
[268] Thomas Taylor, The Probation and Approbation of a Right Military Man (1629), (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd edition)/23857, in The Cambridge University Library, Reel Position: STC/1587:07) p. 20
[269] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, pp.1-4
[270] Ibid.
[271] Ibid.

as old as ordeal by battle, and corresponds to a very primitive view of society."[272] Thus it was a lawful defensive action to maintain, "Readiness of Weapons fit for the use of Warre."[273] Thomas Adams explained in his sermon to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen that "Warre at times is just and necessarie"[274] when a brutal enemy is bent on the destruction of the laws and liberties of the land. To this end Thomas Adams sternly warned that "some must [be] dangered, that all may not be destroyed."[275] He justified warfare stating that we take up weapons "against an unjust warre; but wee desire a just warre, that we settle a true peace."[276] Indeed, Adams proclaimed that a soldier "is the hand of Justice against the hands of Unrighteousnesse"[277] whilst Obadiah Sedgwick proclaimed that a soldier should be a "Rampart [of] Justice."[278]

Thomas Taylor in 1629 stated a similar judgement explaining that a soldier's duty is "the taking of the prey out of the Lyons mouth, and the rescuing of the oppressed from the [barbarous and tyrannical] man."[279] Thomas Palmer when preaching to the Artillery Yard of Bristol explained that "Defensive warre is that which is made in defence of our country, lives, and of our liberty."[280] He referenced archaic warfare to reinforce his argument claiming that "this was the justice of the Romans upon the Gaules, with other Barbarous intrenching [enemies]. The same justice had the antient Brittanes against the Romanes, Saxons, Danes and Normanes, though not with the same successe."[281] Palmer maintained that "obedience unto God binde all men to guard themselves either with the offensive or defensive meanes of safety."[282] Consequently, the sermons stalwartly supported the principle that a man was authorised by God to take up his weapons and execute battle with an enemy that endeavoured to oppress and enslave him.

Samuel Buggs earlier in 1622 also discussed the ugly possibility of a savage invasion of England by one of its 'barbarous' enemies. In this scenario, the artillery preacher reinforced the necessity of executing and engineering violence in a defensive war. To kill an enemy

---

[272] Christopher Hill, *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London: Penguin Books Limited, 1990) p. 237
[273] Samuel Buggs, The Midland Souldier, p. 26
[274] Thomas Adams, The Souldiers Honour, p. 17
[275] Ibid. p. 19
[276] Ibid.
[277] Ibid. p. 3
[278] Obadiah Sedgwick, Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier, p. 57
[279] Thomas Taylor, The Probation and Approbation of a Right Military Man, Introductory
[280] Thomas Palmer, Bristolls Military Garden, p. 13
[281] Ibid.
[282] Ibid. p. 9

soldier was to prevent "the bowing of old men at the feete of the enemie"[283] whilst preventing the "destruction of civil societie"[284] cruelly wrought by the "jawes of the mercillesse enemie."[285] Indeed, Calybute Downing also proclaimed that that the "first ground of a lawfull war is in a way of just defence."[286] The necessity of executing defensive armed struggle against a barbarous and tyrannical oppressor was conveyed as a "law of Defiance"[287] by Downing whilst John Davenport reinforced a similar argument in his sermon claiming that the use of weapons in self defence against violent and brutal transgressors was a "Law of David"[288] and a principle as ancient as war itself. Thus necessary violence in a defensive war was staunchly justified by the artillery clerics.

Samuel Buggs proclaimed that "Our warre is likely to be defensive in all probable conjecture."[289] To this he strongly endorsed that a man be "readie to die for the defence of his Country,"[290] and sternly addressed his congregation of armed men stating that "upon your lives [,] suffer not a Conquest by a forreine Enemy."[291] Buggs warned that when the enemy invades, "on that day iron will be of more worth than gold,"[292] as it is fundamental in the manufacture of weapons, armaments and ammunition. Buggs also described domestic foes, such as the gunpowder plotters, as barbarous assassins plotting to supplant the ruler.[293] He continued proclaiming that "He that laies the Axe to the root of the tree, never meanes to have the [trunk] or branches prosper; He that smites the shepheard, intends that the flocke shall be scattered; He that undermines the foundation, never desires to have the building stand; He that strikes at the head, intends the ruine of the bodie."[294] Buggs' interpretation of defensive warfare was thus the need to "snatch…weapons out of madde mens hands"[295] He declared that men who were barbarous and tyrannical to their fellow countrymen were guilty of "armed impiettie" and that "Almighte God…never gave any man wisdom to defraud, or [the] strength to oppress his brother."[296] However, Buggs was firm in his conviction that

[283] Samuel Buggs, The Mid-Land Souldier, p. 8
[284] Calybute Downing, A Sermon Preached to the Renowned Company of the Artillery, p. 18
[285] Samuel Buggs, The Mid-Land Souldier, p. 11
[286] Calybute Downing, A Sermon Preached to the Renowned Company of the Artillery, p. 12
[287] Ibid. p. 7
[288] John Davenport, A Royall Edict for Military Exercises, p. 2
[289] Samuel Buggs, The Mid-land Souldier, p. 4
[290] Ibid. p. 26
[291] Ibid. p. 32
[292] Ibid. p. 8
[293] Ibid. p. 31
[294] Ibid. p. 33
[295] Ibid. p. 27
[296] Ibid. p. 37

"Warre without warrant is but Rebellion."[297] Authorisation for the taking up of weapons against men of violence charged with treason was a disputed right. The command of the militia and the military system would later be fiercely contested by both the King and Parliament in the 1640s, when many men were wary of being accused of unlawful armed revolt against either party.

Artillery clerics such as Thomas Sutton drew heavily on the construct of battling against sin as a necessity to prevent God unleashing His divine wrath in the form of earthly warfare. Sutton explained that "the managing of this warre [against enemies of the state], is the preventing of the other: the proclaiming of warre against our sins, would tie the hands of God from making war against our persons."[298] Sutton explained that danger was very near, but that it "may bee, not from any forain Nation. What then? Yet [war comes] from our alone sinne, the most secret plots, and treasonable conspiracies."[299] The idea of plots and treason being engineered by men's 'sinne' allowed Sutton to advocate a purifying process and a return to Godly principles. By the early 1640s the artillery preachers were focussing on the threats to the parliamentary programme of reform. For Mathias Milward in 1641 it was not just the Roman Catholics, or 'Jesuits' as he termed them, who threatened the Church, but also 'Separatists' who "spie out our liberty [and] betray our peace."[300] He was for a middle path between extremes, asking "is there no way to prevent drunkenesse, but by digging up the Vines?"[301] Milward exhorted his congregation of the captains and soldiers of the London Artillery Yards to fight only in a just cause so that "Justice may be preserved [against the] violence and oppression" and argued that "the Conquerors sword ought to be swayed with the arme of Justice."[302]

Calybute Downing reinforces the justification for a defensive war against state infiltrators stating that "wee have to deale with men, whose counsels and practices are like their ends, dareing and driving in destructive waies."[303] As Downing's sermon was preached in September 1640, it is highly possible that the cleric was damning the Earl of Strafford, Charles I's chief military advisor and, according to Derek Hirst, was likened by his political

[297] Ibid. p. 6
[298] Thomas Sutton, The Good Fight of Faith, p. 416
[299] Ibid. p. 417
[300] Ibid. p. 5
[301] Mathias Milward, The Souldiers Triumph and the Preachers Glory, p. 8
[302] Ibid. pp. 13-14
[303] Calybute Downing, A Sermon Preached to the Renowned Company of the Artillery, pp. 1-2

enemies to a 'Beast of Prey'[304]. In his address to the Bishopsgate Artillerymen, Downing explains that his sermon was composed to identify the "Enemies of the Peace [and] State."[305] During the Scottish Rebellions of 1638-1640, Strafford would spearhead the war against the Covenanters after anti-Covenanter men such as George Gordon, the 2nd Earl of Huntly, Charles' Lord-Lieutenant of the Scottish Highlands, and Lord Edward Conway, a Warwickshire MP and later a commander of troops stationed in Ireland, had failed to force the Covenanter soldiers into a surrender. However, after the bloody defeat of the English Army at the Battle of Newburn in Northumberland, August 1640, there was a major fear that Strafford, as commander-in-chief of government troops billeted in Ireland, would be authorised to deploy Irish Catholic soldiers, ruthless militiamen called 'Buannachan', to crush the Covenanter insurgency in Scotland. This mercenary army would in turn be implemented to annihilate Parliamentary revolt concerning the taxation of the Forced Loan, the unlawful billeting of troops on unarmed citizens and the dismissal of a regular Parliament. Consequently, Strafford was damned by Parliament as a traitor and condemned to be executed. Thus, it is plausible that Downing's sermon was politically charged and indeed angled against Strafford as an enemy of the state. A defensive war in England was warrantable if fought against men that were bent on the destruction of the liberty of the people.

William Bridge in his sermon to the Artillerymen of the East Anglian Artillery Companies also provides incendiary explanations in the crucial necessity for an offensive war in England where a man would take up weapons against his kinsmen. The sermon was printed on the 30th January 1643 by order of the House of Commons, Bridge justifies the actions of the Parliament in their conscience to take up weapons in a supposed defence of liberty. Implementing the warlike rhetoric of the Old Testament by damning the King's militiamen as Israel's barbarous enemies, Bridge explains that "the Ammonites and Syrians are now about us, if you do not behave yourselves valiantly, your people are pillaged, captive, murthered."[306] He referenced Samuel 10:12 of the Old Testament, "Be of good courage and let us play the men" to reinforce his point. Indeed, the principles of manful action were again reinforced within the sermons but in the context of taking up weapons and armaments against

[304] Derek Hirst, Authority and Conflict: England 1603-1658, p. 195
[305] Calybute Downing, A Sermon Preached to the Renowned Company of the Artillery. Title Page.
[306] William Bridge, A Sermon Preached unto the (East Anglian Artillery Companies), p. 3

the King's government in the defence of the "liberty of the Law [and the] security of the Parliament."[307]

Bridge justified armed rebellion against the King by referencing how David took up weapons against Saul after he had put a bounty on his head. Accordingly, David "tooke up Arms to defend himselfe."[308] Ruthlessly hunted by Sauls' men, David entrenched himself in a succession of strongholds wary of being ambushed and ensnared by the troops of his enemy. His cause however was strengthened by men who had their own grievances against Saul. The times in which "[David] lived were harsh and savage and he was playing for very high stakes."[309] Consequently he allied himself with the Philistines as a mercenary foot-soldier. Interestingly, the artillery sermons fail to acknowledge this 'failing' of David's military career when they consider him as God's chosen warrior. As this thesis discusses, military contracture was seen as little more than armed thuggery and brigandage.

Just as David was playing for high stakes, so were the artillery preachers from 1640 onwards. Their conscience of a just war in England, fought against both foreign enemies and traitorous enemies of the state, meant that their preaching was both incendiary and disloyal to Charles' government. Artillery clerics such as William Bridge continued to engineer a warmongering mentality within the Military Companies. Bridge explained that "there is much difference between taking up of Armes against the King's Person, and taking up of Armes for the defence of the Kingdom." Bridge promoted how "David's example is our practice…if the Parliament should not have a power to send for those by force of Arms which are accused before them for just tryall, they should no longer be a Parliament; every Court of Justice have a power to send for by force, men accused to be tried before them…according to the known priviledge of Parliament, they do send [a] Serjeant at Arms for those that are accused, to be tried before them, and if they have power to send out one Sergeant at Arms, then they have power also to send forth a hundred, and so a thousand, and so ten thousand if need require; and if the accused persons gather into an Army, how can the Parliament send for them but by an Army? So that when you consider the Law of the Land, or the Law of God, or the Law of nature, which is for a community to defend it selfe, your way and course is very warrantable."[310] When considering the auditors of the spoken sermon and the analysists of the printed equivalent, both audiences were being challenged with divisive warmongering

[307] Ibid. pp. 12-13
[308] Ibid. p. 17
[309] Mark Healy, King David: Warlord of Israel (Dorset: Firebird Books, 1989) p. 18
[310] William Bridge, A Sermon Preached unto the (East Anglian Artillery Companies), p. 18

concerning the legitimacy of deploying sergeants-at-arms against possibly the King's own councillors. The rhetoric concerning the execution of the 'Law' as a political weapon would have been a persuasive tactic employed by Bridge to portray his own brand of resistance theory to his audience.

In conclusion to this chapter, the artillery preachers sternly maintained that warfare was just as it involved the defence of the people against barbarous and ruthless men that sought to enslave the nation. A just war that was lawful unto the eyes of that Man of War, God, was a conflict that was fought with strong regard for principles of mercy. Whilst a man was regarded as a soldier by the artillery preachers, he must be a good man who did not fall foul of the moral corruption associated with mercenary soldiers and savage brigands. His weapons, as firmly enforced by the clerics, were only to be bloodied in the gore of a ruthless and barbaric enemy, armed with his own armaments of war, and bent on the destruction of the former's lands and liberty. Consequently, when analysing the political and military context surrounding the artillery preaching, this thesis argues that the Artillerymen of the Military Companies and Artillery Yards were exhorted by the clergy in justification of armed resistance to unjust force. William Bridge's sermon preached in 1642, after the civil war had started, is the most overt call for war against Charles I and his forces loyal to the King's government entrenched in Oxford. Consequently, the following chapter will assess the later warmongering of the artillery clerics, which was addressed to both the Parliamentarian Army and the House of Commons, in order to demonstrate the development of their views on warfare and military culture during the Civil War period.

Chapter Three: "this Warlike Humour is an Incentive to Rebellion"

John Everard, preaching to the Military Yard of Saint Martin's-in-the-fields in 1618, condemned the critics of the Martial Companies and Artillery Yards for implying that "[their] warlike humour is an incentive to Rebellion."[311] However, these charges held an element of truth. Indeed, the interest of the artillery sermons as sources concerning the promotion of resistance theory is witnessed in the later influence of preaching by the artillery clerics after their initial sermons to the Artillerymen. Both the House of Commons and the Army commanded by Parliament were addressed by clerics who had preached to the Artillery Companies. The same warlike principles and Old Testament warmongering were raised within their later preaching; God was still promoted as a Man of War whilst Rome and the Austro-Spanish Empire were condemned as England's national enemies, comparable in barbarity and corruption to Egypt, Sodom and Babylon of the Old World. It was argued that God would destroy the enemies of Parliament whilst England would become the battlefield on which the Protestant Reformation would be furthered. Indeed, Luther himself claimed that war was a necessary evil.[312] William Bridge, in a thanksgiving sermon honouring the conquest of Wales by Oliver Cromwell and the New Model Army, which was addressed to the House of Commons in 1648, proclaimed that before the salvation of Man, "there shall be warres and rumours of warres…there shall be great divisions…men shall be smiting their fellow [man], eating and drinking with the drunken."[313] Indeed, the Parliament's rebellion was justified by claims that it would annihilate corrupt and barbarous men who were guilty of false piety. However more importantly, the justification for the taking up of arms against the King's government was strongly argued, but with stern caution not to incite violence against the King's person.

Barbara Donagan considered Calybute Downing's sermon, published by order of the House of Commons in 1641, as a decisive stage in the legitimisation of resistance to the King's

[311] John Everard, The Arriereban, p. 54
[312] M. S. Anderson, War and Society in Europe of the Old Regime 1618-1789 (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1998) p. 13
[313] William Bridge, Christs Coming (1648), Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (CD-ROM, 1996)/B4451, in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/75:E.471[3]) pp. 19-20

authority.[314] After preaching to the Bishopgate Artillerymen on the lawfulness of taking up armaments against the King on the 1st September 1640, Downing feared arrest and imprisonment by the King's sergeants-at-arms and so sought refuge at the Earl of Warwick's household of Leez in Essex. From this stronghold in 1641 he wrote two political pamphlets, intended to be read aloud in the House of Commons, on the necessity for English military intervention in Germany. In his publication, A Discoverie of the False Grounds the Bavarian Party have Layd, Downing identified the "Spaniards, Imperialists and Bavarians…as the common Enemies of the peace, liberties, and lawes of Nations…[315] who pretend piety [and] justice." Similarly, in his writings concerning the Present Troubles of Great Britaine and the parallel with Lower Germanie, Downing criticises the "Austrian Tyrannie"[316] of "driving the interests of a false and forraine [ally] (Spain) knowing that seditions make Conquests easie."[317] With regard to the political grievances in England, Downing argued that Charles I was surrounded by the "executioners of ill advice…blood-thirsty, & deceitful men, who should not live out halfe their daies."[318] This attack on the King's advisors was presented in order that Charles have the opportunity to prevent a civil war in England, an armed struggle that Downing clearly feared.

Obadiah Sedgwick also predicted an armed revolt against the King's government. Like Downing, Sedgwick was a close ally to the Earl of Warwick also taking refuge at his household in 1637. According to Barbara Donagan, Sedgwick corresponded with his fellow artillery preacher John Davenport over clerical matters.[319] On the 25th May 1642, Sedgwick delivered a sermon to the House of Commons called *England's Preservation: A Sermon* Discovering the Onely way to Prevent Destroying Judgements. In this sermon, Sedgwick predicted civil warfare in England claiming that God would have "a bitter intestine Warre amongst our selves, where every mans sword bee against his brother."[320] The sermon condemned enemies of the state who had wrought "divisions and dissentions…twixt the King

---

[314] Barbara Donagan, 'Calybute Downing (1606-1644)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
[315] Calybute Downing, A Discoverie of the False Grounds the Bavarian Party have Layd (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd. Ed.)/D2102/4, Thomason/E.160 [8]/[9], in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/28:E.160[8]) pp. 3-31
[316] Calbute Downing, A Discoursive Conjecture upon the Reasons that Produce a Desired Event of the Present Troubles of Great Britaine (1641) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (CD-ROM, 1996) / D2103A, in Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, Reel Position: Wing/2353;01) p. 16
[317] Ibid. p. 25
[318] Ibid. pp. 32-35
[319] Barbara Donagan, 'Obadiah Sedgwick (1599/1600-1658)' Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
[320] Obadiah Sedgwick, *England's Preservation, or, a Sermon Discovering the Onely way to Prevent Destroying* Judgements (1642) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd ed.)/S2372, in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/27:E.150[22]) p. 21

and the Parliament."[321] Sedgwick predicted that salvation through warfare would not be achieved if men were not humbled by piety and consequently would "prove like Sauls discretion with the Amalekites, who spared the [wealthiest] and destroyed the poorest."[322] He explained that "marriners in a storme are very pious, but then in a Calme turne wicked as before."[323] Sedgwick continued that "we would set to this work but that we are afraid of warlike opposition."[324] The sermon can be interpreted as inciting men to hunt down and annihilate corrupt advisors. However, it is not concrete proof of a direct call to arms. Later on the 22nd October 1644, Sedgwick preached another sermon to the Houses of Commons named An Arke Against a Deluge, or, Safety in Dangerous Times. This preaching explained his previous warmongering in 1642 when Sedgwick claimed that only "an Intestine War"[325] would be the salvation of Englishmen. Accordingly, "we stand out against a threatning God, and against a destroying God…Prayings will not do it…Covenantings will not do it, Councels, Armies, Assemblies, nothing will do it, God will never be pacified, till we become a humbled and reformed People."[326] Sedgwick explained that England was in the stranglehold of a brutal civil war with "Divisions in Counsells, divisions in Armies,"[327] that threatened to destroy the rule of law. The security of the "House of Parliament" rested on a knife-edge according to the artillery cleric; "the fall of a Parliament, will be the greatest fall that ever Englishmen heard of." [328] Sedgwick however on the 9th April 1644, offered courage to the Parliament in a thanksgiving sermon commemorating victories obtained by Parliamentarian troops commanded by Sir William Waller. Barbara Donagan explains that due to his success in the besieging of Portsmouth, an important arsenal, in 1642, his reinforcement of Bristol in 1643 and his victory at Worcester later that year, Waller was likened to William the Conqueror.[329] Using the same rhetoric concerning God as a Man of War witnessed in the artillery preaching, Sedgwick in 1644 to the House of Commons preached that "God hath been [the] salvation of the Parliament, and in the Parliament; and for

[321] Ibid. p. 34
[322] Ibid. p. 36
[323] Ibid. p. 37
[324] Ibid. p. 45
[325] Obadiah Sedgwick, An Arke Against a Deluge: or, Safety in Dangerous Times (1644) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd.)/S2364, in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/3:E.17[18]) p. 10
[326] Ibid. p. 11
[327] Ibid. p. 28
[328] Ibid. pp. 24-25
[329] Barbara Donagan, 'Sir William Waller' (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnd.com/view/article/28561, accessed: 18/09/16)

the Parliament [and] Salvation at [the Battle of] Edgehill."[330] Accordingly, God engineered the "Humbling of our Army which fought this battell"[331] and thus wrought the victory for the Parliament. Like his fellow artillery preachers, Sedgwick referenced the wars of the Old Testament to convey how God's providence in warfare destroys the enemies of his people. Sedgwick conveyed this by asking "Did not God appoint Saul, to save his people out of the hand of the Philistines [?]"[332], a reference to 1 Samuel 9:16 in the Old Testament. Equally, the sermon states that God "who did deliver David from the Bear and from the Lyon, could and did also deliver him from that uncircumcised Philistine."[333]

The artillery cleric Thomas Palmer used very similar rhetoric in his sermon delivered at Tiverton in 1644 to the Parliamentarian Army commanded by the Earl of Essex. Palmer quoted 1 Samuel 17:37 and claimed that David had said "the Lord that delivered me out of the paw of the Lyon, and out of the paw of the Beare…will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine."[334] Indeed, Palmer acclaimed the Parliamentarian troops as "the Davids of our time…who are now combating with the Goliath of Rome."[335] Palmer's continuity of artillery preaching is witnessed in his reliance on Old Testament accounts of warfare, in particular Exodus 14; "what became of proud Pharaoh and his Army, were they not drowned in the Sea?"[336] The sermon asks "Doe not you see what shall be the end, the doom of all their plottings and powers, counsels, and armies[?]"[337] Palmer then incites destruction of the King's warriors claiming that "God doth not onely infatuate their Counsels and bring to nothing their plots, but God usually beats them with their owne weapon."[338] The artillery cleric claimed that the King's soldiers were deluded by the Devil into thinking that they "do God great service in killing these Round-heads." Indeed, Palmer attacked Charles claiming "the King had better to have a whole Army of men against him, then the blood of one [Round-head] …it were better for [Charles] that a milstone were hanged about his necke, and that he were drowned in the depth of the Sea" than be accused of war against his own

[330] Obadiah Sedgwick, A Thanksgiving Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at Westminster, April 9th, 1644 (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd ed.)/S2381, in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/8:E.46[10]), p. 21
[331] Ibid. p. 23
[332] Ibid. p. 7
[333] Ibid. p. 28
[334] Thomas Palmer, The Saints Support in these Sad Times (1644) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing/P255, in Thomason Collection, Reel Position: Wing/230:E.13[2]) p. 29
[335] Ibid.
[336] Ibid. p. 10
[337] Ibid. p. 9
[338] Ibid. p. 40

peoples. [339] In particular, the perceived ruthlessness of the King's troops insulted Palmer, who claimed that the Cavaliers "grow hardy and expert in murder, they are lesse mercifull, and more cruell every battell" whilst comparing them to the "King of Babylons Army."[340]

When considering the legacy of Obadiah Sedgwick's artillery preaching, it can be weighed by the fact that on the 6th October 1643, he was one of four revolutionary speakers at the Guild-Hall in London, who debated the necessity of financing the invasion of Northern England by a Scottish Covenanter army to conquer the King's strongholds in Yorkshire, Durham, Northumberland and Cumberland. With regard to how artillery preaching may contribute to resistance theory, Sedgwick had become part of the wider political war in England during 1643 when he allied himself with Jeremiah Burroughs, who argued that it was "lawful to take up armes [against the] tyranny and slavery"[341] of Charles' government. Burroughs justified his call to arms in the Foure Speeches asking "why should we fear those uncircumcised Philistines?"[342] meaning the King's army billeted at Oxford. The opening speaker was Mr. Solicitor who began the debate discussing the "Skirmishes [and] Battailes" fought at Edgehill, Portsmouth, Exeter and Bristol.[343] He discussed how the King's soldiers were heavily entrenched in Newcastle, Nottingham, Yorkshire, Durham and Northumberland which would require a substantial military action to force the surrender of those garrisons, with the use of a "Scotch Army" being the only great weapon available to Parliament[344]. The only other option the speaker claimed Parliament had was to "kill and destroy all Cattle…to starve out the Enemy."[345] The second speaker at the Guild-Hall was Edmund Calamy, a London clergyman who later condemned the dissolution of the Rump Parliament by Oliver Cromwell as unlawful.[346] Calamy argued that "if the plundering [Royal] Army should prevail"[347] England would be enslaved by tyrants. "The plundering Army at Oxford"[348]

---

[339] Ibid. pp. 11-12
[340] Ibid. p. 10
[341] Thomas Gardiner, *Foure Speeches, Jeremiah Burroughs' Speech in Guild*-hall on Friday 6th October 1643 (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd.)/F1671, in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/55:E.338[1]) pp. 33-35
[342] Ibid. p. 36
[343] Thomas Gardiner, *Foure Speeches, Mr Solicitor's Speech in Guild*-Hall on Friday 6th October 1643 (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd.)/F1671, in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/55:E.338[1]) p. 3
[344] Ibid. p. 9
[345] Ibid. p. 8
[346] Sharon Achinstein, 'Edmund Calamy', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnd.com/view/article/4355, accessed: 18/09/16)
[347] Thomas Gardiner, *Foure Speeches, Edmond Calamy's Speech at Guild*-Hall on Friday, 6th October 1643, (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd.)/F1671, in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/55:E.338[1]) p. 17
[348] Ibid. p. 25

would according to Calamy only be defeated by a "warlike manner."[349] Sedgwick was the last speaker beginning his speech claiming that the "grave Senate" of the King has intended with "armed power to have compelled and plundered your estates."[350] Indeed there can be no doubt of how influential the artillery preacher Obadiah Sedgwick was in the presence of the congregation assembled at the Guild Hall in the City of London in October 1643. He had politicised and emboldened his speaking on a greater public level than the Artillery Yard.

William Bridge's preaching can be credited as exemplifying the evidence for the developing bond between artillery preaching and resistance theory. Bridge is the most incendiary in his preaching concerning the use of weapons against the perceived tyrannical government of Charles I to the House of Commons from 1640 and his artillery sermon in 1642 needs to be contextualised with his other publications. In 1640 he wrote a sermon titled The True Souldiers Convoy which was published for the "good successe in going forth to warre"[351] of the Lutheran troops fighting in Germany. In the same rhetoric as his fellow artillery preachers he acclaimed God as Man of War. He claimed that God engineered war to destroy barbarous and cruel men. However, Bridge added that God tolerated transgressions of sinful men whom he judged unworthy of his wrath; "the Eagle doth not hunt after flies, and a lyon doth not [prepare] himselfe to battaile against a poore worme."[352] Bridge was conscious of the wars in Germany and was possibly justifying the lack of God's favour in the military campaigns fought by the Lutheran armies against the seemingly unconquerable Austrian-Spanish war machine. Bridge, with the wider political scope of his fellow artillery preacher Calybute Downing, in his sermon asked "consider the afflictions of Germany"[353] and claimed that Rome "is called Sodome, it is called Egypt, and it is called Babilon; you know the [savagery] of Egypt, the cruelty of Babilon, and the [corruption] of Sodome."[354] Like his fellow artillery clerics, Bridge is depicting the larger battle against tyrannical and barbarous enemies abroad. Bridge contemplated the words of God; "behold I judge betweene cattell and cattell."[355] God as the destroyer of barbarous enemies is also a judge of Man's sin. Those he judges as an unlawful and corrupt tyrant God claims "that man is an enemy, and in due time the Lord will

[349] Ibid. p. 18
[350] Thomas Gardiner, Foure *Speeches, Obadiah Sedgwick's Speech at Guild*-Hall on Friday 6th October 1643 (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (2nd.)/F1671, in The British Library, Reel Position: Thomason/55:E.338[1]) p. 38
[351] William Bridge, The True Souldiers Convoy (1640) (Bibliographic Name/Number: STC (2nd.)/3732, in Harvard University Library, Reel Position: STC/1129:08) Title Dedicatory
[352] Ibid. p. 15
[353] Ibid. p. 68
[354] Ibid. p. 92
[355] Ibid. p. 33

wounde the hairy scalpe of such a ruffian, for he is an enemy."[356] Bridge contemplates this further proclaiming that "when men in their times, shall maliciously labour to cause the works of God to cease, and hinder the great proceedings, which God hath [established] in the world, these are enemies and none but enemies."[357] Undoubtedly these 'great works' are the designs of the Protestant Reformation. Rome, Spain and Austria are considered the destroyers of these works and therefore will face annihilation as did the Sodom, Egypt and Babylon of the Old Testament. These enemies faced by England, Bridge preaches "are compared to the waves of the Sea, that roare whilest they are in the Sea, yet when they come to the shore, they break."[358] Accordingly, "God is and hath been working on many great works in the world; if any mans heart tell him that he hath thus taken up armes against God, let him lay down his weapons, and humble himselfe, for God will be above him, God is greater and will break him."[359] This warmongering against Rome and the Spanish in particular was emphasised by the artillery cleric, who claimed that "It is not an easy thing for a lion to teare the caull of a mans heart. What is more strong then a lion, what more thin then the caull of a mans heart [?] And God hath said it; I will rend the cawle of their heart and there will I devoure them like a lion."[360]

Throughout The True Souldiers Convoy, Bridge justified the necessity of the preachers proclaiming that "our prayers are to lead Armies into the field."[361] He continued "great was the army of preachers; an army of Preachers is a great matter, nay it is a great matter to have seven or eight good preachers in a great army."[362] In the same approach as other artillery clerics had towards masculinity and soldiering, Bridge discussed how "usually there is much disorder in Armies; the Souldiers have much evil and sin among them, though the Souldiers be outwardly strong yet many of them are inwardly weak."[363] The artillery preaching that conveyed the bond between piety and soldiering was evident in Bridge's words; "an army…may be scattered two waies, The Souldiers when they come from their trenches, every one goeth to his [barracks], and the whole army is in some measure scattered and devided, but in order, this is an orderly scattering: but when they are routed, that is another scattering,

[356] Ibid. p. 38
[357] Ibid. p. 40
[358] Ibid. p. 42
[359] Ibid. p. 41
[360] Ibid. p. 49
[361] Ibid. p. 81
[362] Ibid. p. 22
[363] Ibid. pp. 87-88

wherein there is no order."[364] As a "Lieutenant unto prayer"[365] Bridge preaches to "first smite with your prayers, and then wee will smite with our weapons."[366] Interestingly, Bridge uses military language to describe himself as leader of the prayer which is very similar to how his fellow artillery preachers described themselves as 'fellow souldiers.'

In another of Bridge's politically charged sermons called Babylons Downfall, which was preached prior to the 6th April 1641 to the House of Commons, the artillery cleric directs an assault on Rome claiming it is the "fiery furnace, and [a] denne of Lyons."[367] He drew a parallel between Babylon and Rome stating that "Rome is Sodome, Egypt and truly Babylon,"[368] a very similar comparison to the one he made in the former sermon. Equally he preaches similar rhetoric discussing how "the destruction of ancient Babylon was great, [God] shalt binde a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of Euphrates."[369] In the latter part of the sermon, Bridge turned his attention to England, claiming that "God used this great Parliamentary ordinance for the slaying of many Philistines."[370] It is quite possible that Bridge was referencing the arrest of the Earl of Strafford and the discovering of the Army-Plot. In a sermon Bridge preached to the House of Commons in 1642, he discussed how Parliament "delivered [England] from that bloody War with Scotland" and the "hellish conspiracie"[371] which followed, an obvious reference to the failed military coup by the King's army billeted in York. Bridge's turning point in discussing resistance theory came in his treatise The Wounded Conscience Cured, which openly justified and defended the use of weapons against the King's government. In the traditional discourse of artillery preaching, the warfare of the Old Testament was employed to establish the lawful grounds for an armed rebellion. Bridge criticised the opinions that Parliament made "many weapons sharp[end] for this resistance at the Philistine's forge,"[372] claiming instead that "Parliament may take up a guard to secure their persons against the cut-throats that are about [the] King...[as did David

[364] Ibid. p. 34
[365] Ibid. p. 90
[366] Ibid.
[367] William Bridge, Babylons Downfall, A Sermon Lately Preached at Westminster before sundry of the House of Commons (1641) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing/B4448, in Thomason Collection, Reel Position: Wing/254:E.163[3]) p. 4
[368] Ibid. p. 8
[369] Ibid. p. 5
[370] Ibid. p. 22
[371] William Bridge, *The Diseases that make a Stoppage to England's Mercies Discovered and Attended with* their Remedies (1642) (Bibliographic Name/Number: McAlpin Collection/II 104, in Thomason Collection, Reel Position: Wing/243:E.91, no. 37) p. 21
[372] William Bridge, The Wounded Conscience Cured (1642) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing (CD, 1996)/B4476A, in Folger Shakespeare Library, Reel Position: Wing/2440:02) p. 45

who was justified] to secure his person against the cut-throats of Saul."[373] Furthermore, Bridge proclaimed that "a Parliament is the highest Court of Justice; 'Tis out of doubt agreed on by all that the Parliament hath a power to send a Sergeant at Armes to bring up such an one as is accused before them; and if they have a power to send one Sergeant at Armes, then 20, if 20, be accused, then a 100. If there be a 100 accused, then a thousand, if there be a thousand accused, then tenne thousand if there be tenne thousand accused…To take away this power from the Parliament, and 'tis no longer a Parliament, but the King and his forefathers have by law settled these liberties of Parliament, and therefore according to Lawes, they have a power to send for by force those that are accused to be tried before them, which they cannot do unlesse they raise an army, when the accused are kept from them by an army."[374] Bridge reinforced this point again later in the work claiming that if the Parliament no longer has the authority to hunt down unlawful men, "they are no Parliament…The King have often protested to maintaine the liberties and priviledges of Parliament; Now suppose a man be complained of to the Parliament for some notorious crime, it is granted by all that the Parliament hath a power to send a Serjeant of Armes for him, and if he refuses to come, that Serjeant at Armes hath a power to call for [reinforcements]. Bridge explained that if the outlaw is armed and allies with "twenty or thirty, or a hundred men to rescue himselfe, then the Parliament hath power to send downe more [lawmen]…if the King shall protect these [outlaws]" he then offers violence to the Parliament. "This Army…under the command of the Earle of Essex" is sent to arrest the enemies of the state, "and to deny them such a power as this, is to deny them the very being of a Parliament. For the same reason that they may send one Serjeant at Armes for one, they may send one thousand for one thousand."[375] If one considers the artillery sermon preached by William Bridge to the Artillery Companies of East Anglia on the 30th January 1642, it is uses the exact same rhetoric to justify use of weapons against the King.

In 1643, William Bridge published another tract in which he addressed the Deputy-Lieutenants loyal to Parliament in Norfolk, where he considered the lawfulnesse of Parliamentary Proceedings in taking up of Armes is Justified. Again the warriors and warlords of the Old Testament are referenced to justify not just defensive warfare but also the legitimacy of Parliamentary sovereignty. Accordingly, "Judah carried a Lyon in his Standard,

[373] Ibid. pp. 10-11
[374] Ibid. p. 4
[375] Ibid. p. 15

Ephraim an Ox [whilst the enemies of God] had the Beare, the Leopard,"[376] to symbolise barbarism and savagery. As recurring subjects in the artillery preaching, it is interesting to see Bridge continue to quote from the Scriptures as in the manner of the artillery clerics. Accordingly, "Saul, David and Solomon…came to their government by the consent and choice of the people."[377] Undoubtedly, Bridge is questioning the authority of the King as the chief law-giver. Indeed, it is plausible to suggest that William Bridge staunchly questioned the issue of Divine Right, claiming instead the sovereignty of an elected leader by the people. Bridge explained that "the Warres of David were Godly,"[378] as they were fought in self-defence against both Saul and the Philistines. Indeed, "David had many armed men about him that hee might repell violence offered unto him."[379] David's guerrilla war against Saul was glorified as it justified that "if the chiefe magistrate degenerate into a Tyrant, may the Subjects resist by force of Armes."[380] Consequently, Bridge applied this logic to the use of armaments against Charles' authority; "Parliament hath raised this Army by an act of judgement and jurisdiction…which is the known priviledge of every Parliament man according to Law."[381] As in his previous sermons, Bridge reinforces that "the Parliament may send one Sergeant at Armes, then 100, then 1000."[382] Regarding the Deputy-Lieutenants Bridge was addressing he explained that "your work is to bring men to justice then to execute it." [383]

From the later sermons and address to both the Army and the House of Commons, the artillery preachers Calybute Downing, Obadiah Sedgwick, Thomas Palmer and William Bridge were major figures in the discussion of offensive warfare against Charles I. They openly justified taking up weapons against the Monarchy as a lawful action that God would condone. Thus when considering resistance theory, it is crucial the legacy of the artillery preachers is properly considered alongside earlier discussions on the armed revolt by Parliament. In particular, Bridge's printed sermons to Parliament and tracts mirror his preaching to the Artillerymen of Great Yarmouth in 1642. He advocates Parliament builds an army of their own sergeants-at-arms to destroy the King's troops. The use of a 'sergeant-at-

[376] William Bridge, The Truth of the Times Vindicated whereby the Lawfulnesse of Parliamentary Proceedings in Taking up of Armes is Justified (1643) (Bibliographic Name/Number: Wing/B4467, in Thomason Collection, Reel Position: Wing/239:E.61[20]) Introductory
[377] Ibid. p. 24
[378] Ibid. p. 30
[379] Ibid.
[380] Ibid.
[381] Ibid. pp. 18-19
[382] Ibid. p. 27
[383] Ibid. Introductory

arms' in his terminology to describe a soldier points to a legal position where Parliament can lawfully arrest Charles as they would an outlaw or criminal. Consequently, this rhetoric envisages Parliament as the sole authority over the legal system in a nation ravaged by armed revolt and civil warfare. Thus it renders the King's position as 'father of the people' as obsolete.

Conclusion

The chief objective of this thesis is to place the preaching of the artillery sermons within a context where England was seen as a decayed and conquerable nation when compared to the war-machines of the Spanish Empire and the German and Ottoman fiscal-military states. Some Englishmen believed they were facing a crisis of disarmament marked by a corrupt and archaic militia system and bloody failure on the battlefield. The artillery clerics were fundamental in attempting to spearhead and reinforce the call for state re-armament which had its foundations in their God-fearing militarism and warmongering sermons. The artillery sermons surviving in print were entrenched with the justification of the use of weapons against barbarous enemies and the lawfulness of defensive wars against savage invaders. Examples of honourable manhood were found in the Old Testament warrior cultures surrounding David and Goliath, Saul, Sampson, Joshua and Gideon. The sermons preached to the Artillery Yards and Martial Companies of London, Bristol, East Anglia and Coventry were fundamental in providing a validation for taking up arms against those who were suspected of engineering barbarity and violence against the English. This argument provided the basis for the transition to providing similar reasoning for armed revolt against Charles I's government from 1641.

Research into the provincial artillery sermons was restricted mainly to the Artillery Yards of Bristol, Coventry and East Anglia. Sermons from artillery companies founded in Nottingham, Ipswich, Colchester, Bury St. Edmunds, Chester, Gloucester and Derby could not be identified. Consequently, it must be assumed that either no printed sermons survive from these artillery yards or, and much less likely, that none were preached there. This factor poses questions concerning whether armed revolt against domestic tyrants was encouraged or even if the loyalties of the Artillery Companies were to either Parliament or the King? While not in regard to the actual sermons, much has been written of the Bishopsgate and Cripplesgate Artillery Companies due to their legacy within the British Army as the Honourable Artillery Company. Consequently, regimental records contain a rich history of its origins as the 'London Artillery Company of Longbowmen, Crossbowmen and Gunmen' founded in 1537 by King Henry VIII. However, research into the provincial military companies was severely limited; William Hunt's list of the artillery companies outside of London was one of the only secondary sources which had even identified them.

With regard to further research there were several lines of investigation this thesis could have concentrated on. Whilst the thesis focused on defensive warfare against tyrannical statesmen, and the Spanish and German tyrannies, the impact of the 'Ottoman Tyranny' upon the shaping of military culture in England before the Civil War lacked further study. The military expansion of the Ottoman Empire severely threatened the west after the conquest of Istanbul in 1453 by Mehmed the Conqueror. Ottoman raids across the Hungarian frontiers and Austria's *'Long Turkish War'* of 1593-1606 reinforced the status of the Ottoman war machine as a military dreadnought. In England, the image of the 'savage' Turk was indeed presented within the culture of the Artillery Yard. In October 1638, William Barriffe of the Bishopsgate Artillerymen conducted a 'battle' in front of Captain John Venn, vice-president of the Artillery Company and William Manby the Company treasurer. This involved a display of martial expertise where eighty artillerymen of the company were either clad as Saracen warriors or English soldiers. The mock skirmish was recorded by Barriffe in his manual on warfare, Mars, his Triumph. The Saracens were represented as barbarous and cruel, and armed with primitive weaponry. Barbara Donagan has examined this source and has highlighted that the 'Saracens' made hideous war-cries from blowing into a "Buffolas horn" and beating a "Turky Drumme."[384] The source depicts the Saracen warriors armed with "barbary guns and Cymitars" and the "chiefest" of the Saracen Turks had "broad Turky daggers at their [baldrics],"[385] whilst the lieutenants of the Saracen horde wielded "large-pole axes and were hung around with scimitars, battle axes and daggers."[386] This image does indeed present the Turks as a barbarous and warlike peoples who posed a threat to the West. Donagan explains that Captain John Venn's 'English' soldiers conquered the 'Turks' in a display of military supremacy, which reinforced "the superiority of the west"[387] to the spectators within the Artillery Yard. Further research into how the Provincial and London artillery companies viewed the Ottoman Turks would provide a broader scope of investigation into tyrannical constructs within the Artillery Yards.

This study has opened up the potential for a comparative exercise between the artillery sermons and the Buckingham assassination literature. John Felton's actions at Portsmouth Harbour on the 23rd August 1628 can be argued to have summarised the principles of the artillery sermons in regard to destroying tyrants and enemies of the people. Due to the

[384] Barbara Donagan, War in England, p. 58
[385] William Barriffe, Mars, His Triumph, pp.2-3
[386] Barbara Donagan, War in England, p. 58
[387] Ibid.

restrictions of the word limitation of this thesis, further study of the comparison between the Buckingham assassination literature and the artillery sermons was unable to be completed.

This thesis ultimately provides an investigation into a largely neglected field of academic research regarding the origins of the English Civil War. By examining the artillery preachers and how they justified armed revolt against tyranny, this work has opened up new lines of enquiry concerning resistance theory. Furthermore, the thesis provides an alternative viewpoint on the development of military culture prior the English Civil War by analysing the ideas on armed rebellion maintained by the ranks of citizen soldiers, whose concepts on God the Warrior and warring against barbarous tyrants, perhaps predated the principles of the New Model Army concerning pious and sombre soldiering. In this light, this thesis contributes to the discussion of God-fearing and warmongering Englishness prior the Great Rebellion.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- Adams, Thomas, The Souldiers Honour (1617)
- Barriffe, William
  - Military Discipline or the Young Artillery Man (1635)
  - Mars, His Triumph (1638)
- Bingham, John
  - The Historie of Xenophon (1623)
  - The Art of Embattling an Army (1631)
- Bridge, William
  - The True Souldiers Convoy (1640)
  - Babylons Downfall (1641)
  - A Sermon Preached unto the Voluntiers of the City of Norwich (1642)
  - The Diseases that make *a Stoppage to England's Mercies Discovered and* Attended with their Remedies (1642)
  - A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at their Publique Fast (1643)
  - A True Relation of a Great Victory Obtained by the Parliament Forces in Lincolnshire (1643)
  - The Wounded Conscience Cured (1643)
  - The Truth of the Times Vindicated whereby the Lawfulnesse of Parliamentary Proceedings in Taking up of Arms is Justified (1643)
  - The Loyall Convert (1644)
  - England Saved with a Notwithstanding (1648)
  - Christs Coming (1648)
- Buggs, Samuel, The Mid-land Souldier (1622)
- Davenport, John, A Royall Edict for Military Exercises (1629)
- Dekker, Thomas, Warres, Warres, Warres (1628)
- Downing, Calybute,
  - A Sermon Preached to the Renowned Company of the Artillery (1640)
  - A Discoursive Conjecture (1641)

  - A Discoverie of the False Grounds the Bavarian Party have Layd (1641)
- Eglisham, George, The Forerunner of Revenge upon the Duke of Buckingham (1626)
- Everard, John, The Arriereban (1618)
- Gardiner, Sir Thomas (editor) Foure Speeches Delivered in Guild Hall (by) Mr. Solicitor, Mr. Edmund Calamy, Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs and Mr. Obadiah Sedgwick (1646)
- Gibson, Abraham, A Preparative to Warre Shewing the Lawfull Use Thereof (1619)
- Gouge, William, The Dignitie of Chivalrie (1626)
- Hughes, George, The Saints Losse and Lamentation (1632)
- Knever, Ralph, A Discourse of Militarie Discipline (1628)
- Leech, John, The Trayne Souldier (1619)
- Lupton, Donald, A Warre-Like Treatise of the Pike (1642)
- Milward, Matthias, The Souldiers Triumph and the Preachers Glory (1641)
- Nicolls, Richard, Londons Artillery (1616)
- Palmer, Thomas
  - Bristolls Military Garden (1635)
  - The Saints Support in these Sad Times (1644)
- Roberts, John, Great Yarmouths Exercise (1638)
- Roberts, Lewes, Warrefare Epitomized in a Century of Military Observations (1640)
- Sedgwick, Obadiah
  - Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier (1638)
  - *England's Preservation* (1642)
  - An Arke Against a Deluge, or, Safety in Dangerous Times (1644)
  - A Thanksgiving Sermon (1644)
- Sutton, Thomas, The Good Fight of Faith (1623)
- Taylor, Thomas, The Probation and Approbation of a Right Military Man (1629)

Secondary Literature:

- Alamein, Field-Marshall Viscount Montgomery of, A History of Warfare (London: Collins, 1968)
- Anderson, M. S, War and Society in Europe of the Old Regime 1618-1789 (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1998)
- Armstrong, G. R, and George G. Walker, The Honourable Artillery Company, 1537-1947 (London: Gale & Polden,1954)
- Ashley, Maurice, Oliver Cromwell and the Puritan Revolution (London: The English Universities Press, 1972)
- Aylmer, G. E, Rebellion or Revolution? England from Civil War to Restoration 1640-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987)
- Barthorp, Michael, The Armies of Britain 1485-1980 (London: The National Army Museum, 1980)
- Baskerville, Stephen, The Political Theology of Puritan Preaching in the English Revolution 1640-1653 (London: London School of Economics, 1987)
- Beaver, Daniel C., Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Beckett, Ian, *Britain's Part*-Time Soldiers: The Amateur Military Tradition 1558-1945 (South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Books Limited, 2011)
- Bennett, Martyn, The Civil Wars 1637-1653 (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 2002)
- Best, Gary Martin, Seventeenth-Century Europe (Hampshire: Macmillan Publishers Limited, 1985)
- Billett, Michael, A History of English Country Sports (London: Robert Hale, 1994)
- Boadt, Lawrence, Reading the Old Testament: An Introduction (New York: Paulist Press, 1984)
- Bonney, Richard, The European Dynastic States 1494-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- Boynton, Lindsay, The Elizabethan Militia 1558-1638 (Devonshire: David & Charles Publishers Limited, 1971)
- Breslov, Marvin Arthur, English Puritan Views of Foreign Nations, 1618-1640 (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970)

- Carlton, Charles, Going to the Wars: The Experience of the English Civil Wars 1638-1651 (London: BCA, 1992)
- Cornish, Paul, Henry VII*I's Army* (London: Osprey Publishing Limited, 1996)
- Coward, Barry, The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714 (London: Longman Limited, 1997)
- Craigie, Peter C., The Problem of War in the Old Testament (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983)
- Cruickshank, Charles, Henry VIII and the Invasion of France (Gloucestershire: Alan Sutton Publishing Limited, 1991)
- Donagan, Barbara, War in England 1642-1649 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- Duke, Alastair, Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries (London: Hambledon and London, 2003)
- Dunthorne, Hugh Britain and the Dutch Revolt 1560-1700 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)
- Durston, Christopher, James I (London: Lancaster Pamphlets, 2001)
- Elton, G. R, Reformation Europe 1517-1559 (London: Collins, 1969)
- Fernandez-Santamaria, J. A., The State, War and Peace: Spanish Political Thought in the Renaissance 1516-1559 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)
- Firth, C. H., *Cromwell's Army: A History of the English Soldier during the Civil* Wars, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate (London: Methuen & Co Limited, 1967)
- Fissel, Mark Charles
  - *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns against Scotland 1638*-1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
  - War and Government in Britain 1598-1650 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991)
- Fraser, Antonia, Cromwell: Our Chief of Men (London: Phoenix, 2004)
- Friedeburg, Robert von, *Luther's Legacy: The Thirty Years War and the Modern Notion of 'State' in the Empire, 1530s*-1790s (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016)
- Gentles, Ian, The New Model Army in England, Ireland and Scotland 1645-1653 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994)

- Gillingham, John, Cromwell: Portrait of a Soldier (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976)
- Goodwin, Godfrey, The Janissaries (London: Saqi Books, 2006)
- Harrington, Peter, The Castles of Henry VIII (Oxford: Osprey Publishing Limited, 2007)
- Healy, Mark,
  - Warriors of the Old Testament (London: Brockhampton Press, 1998)
  - King David: Warlord of Israel (Dorset: Firebird Books, 1989)
- Helfferich, Tryntje (editor) The Essential Thirty Years War: A Documentary History (Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2015)
- Herzog, Chaim and Mordechai Gichon, Battles of the Bible (London: Greenhill Books, 2002)
- Hirst, Derek, Authority and Conflict: England 1603-1658 (London: Edward Arnold, 1992)
- Hill, Christopher
  - The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution (London: Penguin Books, 1975)
  - *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Rev*olution (London: Penguin Books, 1990)
  - The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution (London: The Penguin Press, 1993)
- Hunt, William, 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War', (editors) Anthony Grafton and Anne Blair, The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990)
- Hunt, Arnold, The Art of Hearing : English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
- Isserlin, B.S.J., The Israelites (London: Thames & Hudson, 1998)
- Kamen, Henry, Empire: How Spain became a World Power 1492-1763 (London: Perennial, 2004)
- Keller, Werner, The Bible as History: Archaeology confirms the Book of Books (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1959)
- Kenyon, J, P.
  - Stuart England (London: Book Club Associates, 1978)

- (editor) The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland and Ireland 1638-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- The Stuarts: A Study in English Kingship (London: Fontana Press, 1972)

- Kishlansky, Mark, The Rise of the New Model Army (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)
- Kitson, Frank, Old Ironsides: The Military Biography of Oliver Cromwell (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 2004)
- Lawrence, David. R, The Complete Soldier: Military Books and Military Culture in Early Stuart England 1603-1645 (Leiden: BRILL, 2009)
- Lenman, Bruce, *England's Colonial Wars 1550*-1688: Conflicts, Empire and National Identity (London: Routledge, 2013)
- Longman, Tremper, and Daniel G. Reid, God is a Warrior (Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1995)
- Manning, Brian, The English People and the English Revolution (London: Bookmarks, 1991)
- Manning, Roger
  - Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)
  - Swordsmen: The Martial Ethos in the Three Kingdoms (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Marshall, Alan, Oliver Cromwell: Soldier – The Military Life of a Revolutionary at War (London: Brassey's, 2004)
- McCullough, Peter E, Sermons Preached at the Jacobean Courts, 1615-1619 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)
- Metzger, Bruce and Michael Coogan (Editors) The Oxford Companion to the Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)
- Morrissey, Mary, Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558-1642 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Nicolle, David, Armies of the Ottoman Turks 1300-1774 (Oxford: Osprey Publishing Limited, 2003)
- Niditch, Susan, War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

- Orr, Dr. Alan, Treason and the State: Law, Politics, and Ideology in the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Parker, Geoffrey
  - The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West 1500-1800 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)
  - The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road 1567-1659: The Logistics of Spanish *Victory and Defeat in the Low Countries' Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Parrot, David, The Business of War: Military Enterprise and the Military Revolution in Early Modern Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Parry, J. H, The Spanish Seaborne Empire (Middlesex: Penguin Books Limited, 1973)
- Polisensky, J. V., The Thirty Years War (London: The New English Library Limited, 1974)
- Raikes, Lieutenant-Colonel George Alfred, of the 3rd Battalion, The York & Lancaster Regiment and Honourable Artillery Company, The Ancient Vellum Book of the Honourable Artillery Company Being the Roll of Members from 1611 to 1682 (London: Richard Bentley & Son, 1890)
- Roberts, Keith, *Cromwell's War Machine: The New Model Army 1645*-1660 (South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Books Limited, 2009)
- Roots, Ivan, The Great Rebellion 1642-1660 (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1998)
- Russell, Conrad,
  - Parliaments and English Politics 1621-1629 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)
  - (Editor) The Origins of the English Civil War (London: The Macmillan Press Limited, 1973)
- Sandberg, Brian, War and Conflict in the Early Modern World 1500-1700 (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016)
- Saunders, Andrew, Channel Defences (London: English Heritage, 1997)
- Scannell, Paul, *Conflict and Soldiers' Literature in Early Modern Europe: The Reality* of War (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016)
- Sharp, David, England in Crisis 1640-1660 (Oxford: Heinemann Educational Publishers, 2000)
- Schwoerer, Lois G.

  - No Standing Armies: The Anti-Army Ideology in Seventeenth Century England (London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1974)
  - Gun Culture in Early Modern England (Virginia: Virginia University Press, 2016)
- Smith, David L., Oliver Cromwell: Politics and Religion in the English Revolution 1640-1658 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Solt, Leo F., Saints *in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell's Army* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959)
- Southern, Antonia, Forlorn Hope: Soldier Radicals of the Seventeenth Century (Sussex: The Book Guild Limited, 2001)
- Spurr, John, English Puritanism 1603-1689 (Hampshire: Macmillan Press Limited, 1998)
- Tallett, Frank, War and Society in Early Modern Europe 1495-1715 (London: Routledge, 2001)
- Urban, William, Matchlocks to Flintlocks: Warfare in Europe and Beyond 1500-1700 (London: Frontline Books, 2011)
- Walker, G. Goold., The Honourable Artillery Company 1537-1947 (Aldershot: Gale and Polden Limited, 1954)
- Wedgwood, C.V., Thomas Wentworth: First Earl of Strafford 1593-1641, A Revaluation (London: Phoenix Press, 2000)
- Willson, David Harris, King James VI & I (London: Jonathan Cape, 1966)
- Wheeler, James Scott, The Making of a World Power: War and the Military Revolution in Seventeenth Century England (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1999)
- Wood, Andy, Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002)
- Woolrych, Austin
  - Oliver Cromwell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968)
  - Soldiers and Statesmen: The General Council of the Army and its Debates 1647-1648 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987)
- Wright, Rev. C. H., The *Bible Reader's Encyclopaedia and Concordance* (London: Collins' Clear-Type Press, 1962)
- Zagorin, Perez, The Court and the Country: The Beginning of the English Revolution (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969)

- The Holy Bible (King James Version) Containing the Old and New Testaments: Translated Out of the Original Tongues and with Former Translations Diligently Compared and Revised by His Majesty's Special Command (London: Scripture Gift Mission, 1957)

Secondary Literature – Academic Papers

- Appleby, David Jarvis, 'Issues of Audience and Reception in Restoration Sermons', (edited by Geoff Baker and Ann McGruer) Readers, Audiences and Coteries in Early Modern England (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2006)
- Boynton, Lindsay, 'Martial Law and the Petition of Right', The English Historical Review 79, no. 311 (1964): pp. 255-84
- Capua, J. V., 'The Early History of Martial Law in England from the Fourteenth Century to the Petition of Right', The Cambridge Law Journal 36, no. 1 (1977): pp. 152-73
- Christianson, Paul, 'Arguments on Billeting and Martial Law in the Parliament of 1628', The Historical Journal 37, no. 3 (1994): pp. 539-67.
- Collins, John J, 'The Zeal of Phinehas: The Bible and the Legitimation of Violence', Journal of Biblical Literature 122, no. 1 (2003): pp. 3-21
- Crawford, Patricia., 'Charles Stuart, That Man of Blood', Journal of British Studies 16, no. 2 (1977): pp. 41-61
- Cressy, David., 'Conflict, Consensus, and the Willingness to Wink: The Erosion of Community in Charles I's England', Huntington Library Quarterly 61, no. 2 (1998): pp. 131-49
- Dallmayr, Fred R, 'A War Against the Turks? Erasmus on War and Peace', Asian Journal of Social Science 34, no. 1 (2006): pp. 67-85.
- Davies, Godfrey, 'English Political Sermons, 1603-1640', Huntington Library Quarterly 3, no. 1 (1939): pp. 1-22.
- Davis, J. C, 'Religion and the Struggle for Freedom in the English Revolution', The Historical Journal 35, no. 3 (1992): pp. 507-30
- Drake, George, 'The Ideology of Oliver Cromwell', Church History 35, no. 3 (1966): pp. 259-72

- Forell, George W, ‘Luther and the War against the Turks’, Church History 14, no. 4 (1945): pp. 256-71
- Foyster, Elizabeth, ‘Male Honour, Social Control and Wife Beating in Late Stuart England’, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 6 (1996): pp. 215-24
- George, Timothy, ‘War and Peace in the Puritan Tradition’, Church History 53, no. 4 (1984): pp. 492-503
- Goldstone, Jack A, ‘East and West in the Seventeenth Century: Political Crises in Stuart England, Ottoman Turkey, and Ming China’, Comparative Studies in Society and History 30, no. 1 (1988): pp. 103-42
- Gordon, M. D. ‘The Collection of Ship-Money in the Reign of Charles I.’, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 4 (1910): pp. 141-62.
- Grassby, Richard, ‘The Decline of Falconry in Early Modern England’, Past & Present, no. 157 (1997): pp. 37-62
- Greenberg, Janelle, ‘The Confessor's Laws and the Radical Face of the Ancient Constitution’, The English Historical Review 104, no. 412 (1989): pp. 611-37
- Haefeli, Evan, ‘Words and Power in Stuart England’, Huntington Library Quarterly 69, no. 3 (2006): pp. 469-76
- Herrup, Cynthia B, ‘Law and Morality in Seventeenth-Century England’, Past & Present, no. 106 (1985): pp. 102-23
- Hexter, J. H, ‘Power Struggle, Parliament, and Liberty in Early Stuart England’, The Journal of Modern History 50, no. 1 (1978): pp. 2-50.
- Hill, Christopher
  - ‘God and the English Revolution’, History Workshop, no. 17 (1984): pp. 19-31
  - ‘The English Revolution and the Brotherhood of Man’, Science & Society 18, no. 4 (1954): pp. 289-309
- Hindle, Steve, ‘Imagining Insurrection in Seventeenth-Century England: Representations of the Midland Rising of 1607’, History Workshop Journal, no. 66 (2008): pp. 21-61
- Hinton, R. W. K., ‘Was Charles I a Tyrant?’ The Review of Politics 18, no. 1 (1956): pp. 69-87
- Holstun, James, ‘Ehud's Dagger: Patronage, Tyrannicide, and "Killing No Murder", Cultural Critique, no. 22 (1992): pp. 99-142

- Jefferson, Charles E, 'The Shadow of Old World Militarism', The Advocate of Peace (1894-1920) 62, no. 9 (1900): pp. 194-96
- Killeen, Kevin
  - 'Chastising with Scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in Early Modern England', Huntington Library Quarterly 73, no. 3 (2010): pp. 491-506
  - 'Hanging up Kings: The Political Bible in Early Modern England', Journal of the History of Ideas 72, no. 4 (2011): pp. 549-70
- Kiernan, V, G, 'Foreign Mercenaries and Absolute Monarchy', Past & Present, No. 11 (Apr., 1957)
- Kirby, Chester, and Ethyn Kirby, 'The Stuart Game Prerogative', The English Historical Review 46, no. 182 (1931): pp. 239-54
- Kishlansky, Mark
  - 'Tyranny Denied: Charles I, Attorney General Heath, and the Five Knights' Case', The Historical Journal 42, no. 1 (1999): pp. 53-83
  - 'The Army and the Levellers: The Roads to Putney', The Historical Journal 22, no. 4 (1979): 795-824
- Kohn, Hans, 'The Genesis and Character of English Nationalism', Journal of the History of Ideas 1, no. 1 (1940): pp. 69-94
- Lambert, Sheila, 'Committees, Religion, and Parliamentary Encroachment on Royal Authority in Early Stuart England', The English Historical Review 105, no. 414 (1990): pp. 60-95
- Langelüddecke, Henrik, 'Law and Order in Seventeenth-Century England: The Organization of Local Administration during the Personal Rule of Charles I', Law and History Review 15, no. 1 (1997): pp. 49-76
- Little, David, 'Some Justifications for Violence in the Puritan Revolution', The Harvard Theological Review 65, no. 4 (1972): pp. 577-89
- Macgregor, Arthur, 'Hunting and Hawking at the Court of James I and Charles I', Archives of Natural History (1989) 16 (3): pp. 305-318
- Manning, Roger B, 'Unlawful Hunting in England, 1500-1640', Forest & Conservation History 38, no. 1 (1994): pp. 16-23
- McMullan, John L, 'Crime, Law and Order in Early Modern England', The British Journal of Criminology 27, no. 3 (1987): pp. 252-74

- Peck, Linda Levy, ‘Beyond the Pale: John Cusacke and the Language of Absolutism in Early Stuart Britain’, The Historical Journal 41, no. 1 (1998): pp. 121-49
- Russell, Conrad, ‘The First Army Plot of 1641’, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 38 (1988): pp. 85-106
- Sharif, Regina, ‘Christians for Zion, 1600-1919’, Journal of Palestine Studies 5, no. 3/4 (1976): pp. 123-41
- Schwoerer, Lois G, “The Fittest Subject for a King's Quarrel": An Essay on the Militia Controversy 1641-1642’, Journal of British Studies 11, no. 1 (1971): pp. 45-76
- Semenza, Gregory M. Colón, ‘Sport, War, and Contest in Shakespeare's Henry VI, Renaissance’ Quarterly 54, no. 4 (2001): pp. 1251-272.
- Sharpe, Kevin, ‘Crown, Parliament and Locality: Government and Communication in Early Stuart England’, The English Historical Review 101, no. 399 (1986): pp. 321-50
- Simpson, Alan, ‘Saints in Arms: English Puritanism as Political Utopianism’, Church History 23, no. 2 (1954): pp. 119-25
- Solt, Leo F, ‘Army of Saints, the Religious and Political Ideas of the Chaplains of the New Model Army 1645-1648’, Church History 24, no. 4 (1955): pp. 368-69
- Southwark Council, St John’s Churchyard Enhancement Project, Historical Overview
- Stearns, Stephen J, ‘Conscription and English Society in the 1620s’, Journal of British Studies 11, no. 2 (1972): pp. 1-23
- Tuck, Richard, ‘Power and Authority in Seventeenth-Century England’, The Historical Journal 17, no. 1 (1974): pp. 43-61
- White, Jason C, ‘Militant Protestants: British Identity in the Jacobean Period, 1603–1625’, History 94, no. 2 (314) (2009): pp. 154-75
- Wood, Andy, Fear, ‘Hatred and the Hidden Injuries of Class in Early Modern England’, Journal of Social History 39, no. 3 (2006): pp. 803-26
- Wright, Louis B, ‘Propaganda against James I's "Appeasement" of Spain," Huntington Library Quarterly 6, no. 2 (1943): pp. 149-72
- Young, Michael B, ‘Charles I and the Erosion of Trust, 1625-1628’, Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies 22, no. 2 (1990): pp. 217-35
- Zaller, Robert, ‘The Concept of Opposition in Early Stuart England’, Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies 12, no. 3 (1980): pp. 211-34

British History Online:

- Francis, E.J., 'Artillery Company', in Analytical Index to the Series of Records Known as the Remembrancia 1579-1664 (London, 1878)
- Noorthouck, John, Book 2, Chapter 3: 'Summary of Military Government', in A New History of London and Southwark (London: 1773)
- Sheppard, F.H.W (editor), 'The Military Ground', in a Survey of London: Volumes 33 and 34 London 1966)
- Sheppard, F.H.W (editor), 'The Old Artillery Ground', in a Survey of London: Volume 27, Spitalfields and Mile End New Town, (London: 1957)

Biographies:

- Achinstein, Sharon, 'Edmund Calamy', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Anderson, Sonia P., 'Roberts, Lewes (1596–1641)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Bremer, Francis J., 'Davenport, John (bap. 1597, d. 1670)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Donagan, Barbara, Sedgwick, Obadiah (1599/1600–1658), (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Donagan, Barbara, 'Downing, Calybute (1606–1644)', (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Donagan, Barbara, 'Sir William Waller' (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Fowler, Alastair, 'Knevet, Ralph (bap. 1602, d. 1672)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Greaves, Richard L., 'Sutton, Thomas (1584/5–1623)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Jennings, Stuart B., 'Palmer, Thomas (b. 1611/12, d. in or after 1667)', (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004

- McGee, J. Sears, ‘Adams, Thomas (1583–1652)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Smith, Charlotte Fell, ‘Taylor, Thomas (1576-1633)’, Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900, Volume 55
- Thrush, Andrew, and John P. Ferris, The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604-1629 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) Henry Waller [c.1587-1631] of Watling Street, London and Enfield, Middlesex
- Wolffe, Mary, ‘Hughes, George (1603/4–1667)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Usher, Brett, ‘Gouge, William (1575–1653)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004
- A Cambridge University Alumni Database, *‘John Leech (1543-1641)’*, Cambridge University
- A Cambridge University Alumni Database, *‘Samuel Buggs (1589-1687)’* Cambridge University
- A Cambridge University Alumni Database, *‘Abraham Gibson’*, University of Cambridge