

**IDEAS OF WARFARE IN ROYALIST POETRY 1632-1649**

**NEIL ANTHONY WALLINGTON**

**UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON**

**PhD ENGLISH**

UMI Number: U602679

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U602679

Published by ProQuest LLC 2014. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

## CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abbreviations	iv
Introduction: ‘Dulce bellum expertis’: sources of warfare imagery	1
1. ‘To War and Armes I flie’: Changing Attitudes To War, 1632-1642	49
2. ‘Rage of Swords’ and ‘Bitternesse of Pens’: Poetry, Newsbooks and History in the English Civil War, 1642-1643	111
3. ‘Risen Stars’: Soldiers in the Poetry of the English Civil War, 1642-1648	187
Epilogue: England Turned Germany?	259
List of works cited	272

## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

This thesis addresses the issue of the changing experience of warfare in the 1630s and 1640s, and how these changes are reflected in the Royalist poetry of the period. It is a central argument that English responses to war in this period must be understood within the context of central Europe's experience of the Thirty Years' War. The introduction examines the most influential sources of ideas about warfare in the early seventeenth century, and considers the importance of translation of classical epic, the proliferation of books of military theory, and the rise of the newsbook in creating an understanding of warfare. The thesis adopts a chronological approach in order to explain how attitudes changed as Britain moved from being a nation at peace to civil war. The first chapter begins with an examination of English responses to the death of the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus, and contrasts the pacific stance of these responses with the more bellicose writings produced later in the same decade in response to the Bishops' Wars and armed risings on behalf of the king. The second chapter constructs a chronology of the opening year of the English Civil War, based on Cowley's The Civill Warre, and through comparison with the longer prose histories by Clarendon and Thomas May, demonstrates how the attitudes towards the war changed with the flow of events. The third chapter considers how poets wrote about soldiers, and in particular examines the changes in the genre of elegy from the beginning of the First Civil War to the conclusion of the Second Civil War. The study concludes by suggesting how some of the issues raised may inform a reading of canonical text, Andrew Marvell's 'An Horatian Ode Upon Cromwel's Return From Ireland'.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe the greatest intellectual debt to my supervisors, Paul Davis and Tim Langley. During the four years in which I have been working on this project, they have both been encouraging, patient, and sympathetic, and have offered excellent suggestions of new avenues to explore whenever I reached a critical cul-de-sac. I have also profited from conversations with David Trotter, Henry Woudhuysen, Danny Karlin, Helen Hackett, Sarah Wintle and Rosemary Ashton, and have benefited immeasurably from the opportunity to present a section from this thesis at a graduate seminar in the Department of English at University College London. I am also grateful to the ever cheerful and helpful staff of the British Library, the University of London Library and University College London Library, where the bulk of my research was carried out. The companionship and conversation of Martin Steward, Kiera Chapman and Alex Naylor helped to make the long hours in the Rare Books Room of the British Library less monastic; Martin, in particular, deserves special thanks for his willingness to discuss some of the finer points of seventeenth-century church politics when asked. Any errors that remain are, of course, my own.

I would like to extend my special thanks to my family, who have provided financial, and, more importantly, emotional support through what has been a difficult time. Throughout my educational career, I have been fortunate enough to have studied with so many excellent teachers, and would like to mention Roger Aldrich, John Barnett, John Shorter, Sheila Mather and Mark Godowski, who have all contributed to my being able to complete this thesis. I must thank Peter Dixon for his generous gift of an eighth edition of Cowley's Works. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance and support of Sarah Shoraka, Barry Keane, Emma Fenton, my students during the two years that I taught at UCL, and my colleagues at the Imperial War Museum. If this thesis warrants a dedication, I would like to dedicate it to the sadly anonymous members of the London Fire Brigade who rescued me from a burning building on the morning of 19 February, 2002.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Carew	Thomas Carew, <u>Poems And Masques</u> , ed. Rhodes Dunlap (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949).
Clarendon	Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon, <u>History of the Rebellion</u> , ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888, repr. 1958) (all references are in the form book; paragraph).
Cowley	Abraham Cowley, <u>English Writings</u> , ed. A. R. Waller, 2 vols., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905).
<u>CW</u>	Abraham Cowley, <u>The Civill Warre</u> , in Thomas O. Calhoun, Laurence Heyworth and Allan Pritchard, eds., <u>The Collected Works of Abraham Cowley</u> , 2 vols., (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989 - ).
King	Bishop Henry King, <u>Poems</u> , ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).
Lovelace	Richard Lovelace, <u>Poems</u> , ed. C. H. Wilkinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930).
Loxley, <u>RP</u>	James Loxley, <u>Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars</u> (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997).
Norbrook, <u>WR</u>	David Norbrook, <u>Writing the English Republic</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
NS	Carolyn Nelson and Matthew Seccombe, <u>British Newspapers and Periodicals 1641-1700: A Short-Title Catalogue of Serials Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, and British America</u> (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1987).
<u>PR</u>	Peter Davidson, ed., <u>Poetry and Revolution: An Anthology of British and Irish Verse 1625-1660</u> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
Smith, <u>LR</u>	Nigel Smith, <u>Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660</u> (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).
<u>STC</u>	A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, <u>Short-Title catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, And of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640</u> , 3 vols. (2 <sup>nd</sup> ed., New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1976-1991).
Wilcher, <u>WR</u>	Robert Wilcher, <u>The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
Wing	Donald Wing, <u>Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books printed in Other Countries 1641-1700</u> , 3 vols. (2 <sup>nd</sup> ed., New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1972-1994).

## **INTRODUCTION**

**‘DULCE BELLUM EXPERTIS’:**

**SOURCES OF WARFARE IMAGERY**

In recent decades there has been a resurgence of interest in the poetry of the 1640s. The rich and varied poetry of the decade is no longer seen as a valley situated between the peaks of Jonson, Donne and Herbert on one side, and Milton on the other. In particular, a number of recent critical works have sought to reaffirm the importance of writing from the 1640s by placing it in its historical context. The work of Michael Wilding, who pointed towards the overlooked political resonances of works by writers as different as Sir Thomas Browne, Andrew Marvell, Samuel Butler and John Milton, seemed to presage this revival of interest in works previously considered of marginal or, at best, purely historical concern. Thomas Corns gave equal weight to the Royalists Lovelace, Herrick and Cowley, alongside Milton, Marvell, and the Levellers. Recent collections of essays have considered the political engagement of writers such as Henry Vaughan and Sir Richard Fanshawe, as well as of rediscovered writers such as Mildmay Fane and Lucy Hutchinson. Nigel Smith has suggested how the crisis of the 1640s gave rise to radical voices who created new literary forms to express themselves; David Norbrook has excavated a submerged republican tradition in the English literature of the same period.<sup>1</sup>

The literature and culture of the Caroline court during the period of the Personal Rule has been examined in detail by Malcolm Smuts and Kevin Sharpe.<sup>2</sup> More recently, other critics have built upon this work in order to give a clearer view of a subject that has for a long time been obscured: the Royalist literature of the English Civil War. James Loxley has

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael Wilding, Dragon's Teeth: Literature in the English Revolution (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987); Thomas N. Corns, Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature 1640-1660 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday, eds., Literature and the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999); Nigel Smith, LR; David Norbrook, WR.

<sup>2</sup>R. Malcolm Smuts, Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987); Kevin Sharpe, Criticism And Compliment: The politics of literature in the England of Charles I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

examined the ideas of loyalty and engagement to give a fuller picture of the ideology behind the much-maligned term ‘Cavalier poetry’, while Robert Wilcher, taking a longer view, has considered the role played by literature in the evolution of Royalism as a political force before and during the English Civil War. This literary history has for a long time seemed hidden because many of its key texts were literally hidden; the full text of Abraham Cowley’s The Civill Warre was only published for the first time in 1973. It has since become a canonical text of Civil War literature.

Writing after the Napoleonic wars, the great Prussian military theorist Carl von Clausewitz observed that ‘war is not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse, carried on with other means’.<sup>3</sup> If there is a limitation to the recent studies, it is that they see the Civil War solely as a continuation of political intercourse. Smith comments that ‘the 1640s were about war, and its literature, from the simplest to the most complex forms, was all to do with that’,<sup>4</sup> yet he has little to say about how the experience of warfare informs the work that he discusses. Critics have been so eager to trace the ‘paper bullets’ of ideological conflict that they ignore the flight of the lead bullets that killed and maimed thousands of soldiers and civilians during the English Civil War.<sup>5</sup> The purpose of the present study is to examine how the changing experience of warfare during this period informed the poetry of the 1640s. I shall aim to give consideration to the three aspects of Clausewitz’s ‘paradoxical trinity’ of war:

---

<sup>3</sup>Carl von Clausewitz, On War, transl. and eds. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (1976; repr. London: Everyman, 1993), p. 99.

<sup>4</sup>Smith, LR, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup>A notable exception is to be found in Diane Purkiss, ‘Dismembering and Remembering: The English Civil War and Male Identity’, in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 220-241.

of primordial violence, hatred and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone.<sup>6</sup>

I shall aim to give due attention, therefore, to the passions of the people that create the atmosphere for war, the actions of officers and soldiers on the battlefield, and the wider political context in which warfare takes place.

As well as the political revolution of the 1640s, Britain began to undergo a military revolution in the same period. The thesis of a military revolution has been most cogently argued by Geoffrey Parker, who contends that the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw a number of significant changes in the way that wars were fought in Europe. Developments in artillery meant that strongholds were less able to withstand sieges, and so both new fortifications were developed, and greater importance was attached to offensive field armies, above defensive garrisons. Similarly, the developments of muskets and pistols meant that infantry began to take precedence over cavalry. Both of these developments led to an increase in army size, and armies were now to be raised, financed and controlled by the state, rather than by wealthy noblemen.<sup>7</sup> It has been argued that the Royalist war effort finally collapsed because it was unable to adapt to these developments, and still relied too heavily on the control of the landed gentry, in contrast with the bureaucratised system of logistics and supply that evolved within the Parliamentary army.<sup>8</sup> It is a central argument that English responses to war in this period must be understood within the context of central Europe's experience of the Thirty Years' War.

---

<sup>6</sup>Clausewitz, p. 101.

<sup>7</sup>See Geoffrey Parker, The Military Revolution: Military innovation and the rise of the West, 1500-1800 (rev. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 6- 44.

<sup>8</sup>See Ronald Hutton, 'The Royalist War Effort', in John Morrill, ed., Reactions To the English Civil War 1642-1649, Problems In Focus (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1982), 51-66.

This thesis, then, will consider the responses of Royalist poets and writers to the changing experience of the English Civil War. By 'Royalist' is meant writers who saw themselves as furthering the cause of the King in his armed struggle with his opponents during the 1630s and the 1640s. Some of these writers went as far as to take up arms themselves; others did not. Some were engaged in an official capacity by the King and his war party; others were not. Some gave unqualified support to the King and his policies; others were more cautious. 'Royalist' is not the only problematic term to require definition. How are we to refer to the conflict itself? Annabel Patterson, for one, objects to the phrase 'English Civil War' because it excludes other possible interpretations, 'specifically those of definitive social change or ideological confrontation'.<sup>9</sup> In this study, the neutral 'English Civil War' is preferred for two pragmatic reasons. It is preferred over the 'War of the Three Kingdoms', because, while I appreciate that the conflict saw fighting in Scotland and Ireland, all of the writers examined in this survey are English, or fought in England. I prefer to use the term 'English Civil War' over 'English Revolution', because the former keeps in mind that this was an armed struggle between fellow countrymen, and should aid us in seeing beyond more narrowly political concerns.

I will take a roughly chronological approach to the material examined in this thesis. The introduction examines the most influential sources of ideas about warfare in the early seventeenth century, and considers the importance of translation of classical epic, the proliferation of books of military theory, and the rise of the newsbook. The first chapter traces the change in English attitudes towards war in the decade preceding the Civil War. Beginning with an examination of English responses to the death of the Swedish king Gustavus

---

<sup>9</sup>Annabel Patterson, 'The very name of the game: theories of order and disorder', in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday, eds., Literature and the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 21-37; p. 22.

Adolphus, I try to explain how a nation that had prided itself on its avoidance of war was ready to take up arms in 1642. The second chapter looks in detail at Cowley's The Civill Warre, and compares its narrative strategies with other Royalist polemical writing, as well as with the longer prose histories by Clarendon and Thomas May. The third chapter considers how poets wrote about soldiers, and in particular examines the changes in the genre of elegy from the beginning of the First Civil War to the conclusion of the Second Civil War. I conclude the study by suggesting how some of the issues that I raise may inform a reading of a canonical text, Andrew Marvell's 'An Horatian Ode Upon Cromwel's Return From Ireland'.



## ‘STERNE ANGER AND THE AFFRIGHTS OF WARRE’: WARFARE IN CLASSICAL EPIC

War poetry is as old as poetry itself. Homer’s *Iliad*, the first creation of the Western literary tradition, is a war poem. While this epic takes its title from Ilion, another name for Troy, the subject announced in the first line is ‘the wrath of Achilles’. The poem narrates an episode in the last year of the Greeks’ decade-long siege of the city, yet, through retrospective and prospective digressions, the epic effectively embraces the action of the entire Trojan War. The death of the Trojan hero Hector, with which Homer concludes his epic, prefigures, and essentially embodies the subsequent fall of Troy. Given that ‘warfare, subtly varied but relentless and massive in effect, is a dominant theme of the poem’,<sup>10</sup> it is unsurprising that descriptions of fighting occupy much of the *Iliad*.

There are several aspects of Homeric warfare that strike the reader as being idiosyncratic. Richard Rutherford observes that ‘this is aristocratic combat: the common man is almost invisible’.<sup>11</sup> Thersites is the only common soldier among the Greek ‘rabble’ to be named. Odysseus silences an unnamed ‘common soldier’ with the judgment that he counts ‘for nothing, neither in war nor council’.<sup>12</sup> The fighting that Homer presents to us is thus between heroes, who are essentially battle-hardened veterans of noble status, and the poet introduces many lesser characters who are simply to die in battle. For example, the relation of the background of Simoeisios, killed by Ajax in Book Four, means that he acquires a ‘temporarily heroic’ status, yet the fact remains that ‘youngsters like Simoeisios make easy victims for great professionals like Achilles, Hector or Ajax’.<sup>13</sup> Rutherford detects that ‘the

---

<sup>10</sup>G. S. Kirk, ‘Homer’, in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, edd., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, I: Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 66.

<sup>11</sup>R. B. Rutherford, *Homer*, *Greece And Rome New Surveys in the Classics* 26 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Classical Association, 1996), p. 37.

<sup>12</sup>Homer, *The Iliad*, trans. Robert Fagles (New York: Viking, 1990), II. 229, 233, translating II. 202.

<sup>13</sup>Kirk, p. 59.

poem excludes almost entirely any kind of fighting that would involve deception or devices other than hand-to-hand combat', with the exception of the *Doloneia* in Book 10, which is now thought to be a later interpolation.<sup>14</sup> The poem centres upon a series of single combats, such as that between Paris and Menelaus in Book Three, Glaucus and Diomedes in Book Six, Hector and Ajax in Book Seven, and climactically between Hector and Achilles in Book Twenty-Two. The fight between Hector and Ajax is typical of these combats in that it begins when Hector launches his 'spear' (VII. 285). While Hector does not miss, Ajax's uniquely strong shield thwarts his weapon. They engage at close range, but neither can inflict a fatal blow. They are reduced to slinging stones at each other before Zeus intervenes to stop the combat. The weapons that the heroes use imply an aristocratic ethos, with most of the killing done at close range by the javelin, lance or sword. Archery lacks honour, as is clear when Diomedes dismisses Paris' 'spattering shafts' with the judgment that the 'shaft of a good-for-nothing coward's got no point' (XI. 456, 459). The conventions of Homeric warfare, Rutherford concludes, 'serve to create a highly artificial yet curiously convincing world, in which warfare is straightforward and noble'.<sup>15</sup>

The appeal to martial honour finds its most eloquent expression in the poem in the speech of Sarpedon to Glaucus in Book Twelve:

So that now the duty's ours -  
we are the ones to head our Lycian front,  
brace and fling ourselves in the blaze of war, ...  
Ah my friend, if you and I could escape this fray  
and live forever, never a trace of age, immortal,  
I would never fight on the front lines again  
or command you to the field where men win fame.  
But now, as it is, the fates of death await us,  
thousands poised to strike, and not a man alive

---

<sup>14</sup>Rutherford, pp. 38-9.

<sup>15</sup>Rutherford, p. 39.

can flee them or escape - so in we go for attack!  
Give our enemy glory or win it for ourselves! (XII. 365-8, 374-81, translating XII.  
310-28)

Against this ideal vision of the glory possible in warfare Homer places gruesome depictions of the horrors of the battlefield. In the following book, Idomeneus throws a spear at Alcathous, and 'the point stuck in his heart - / and the heart in its last throes jerked and shook the lance' (XIII. 512-3, translating XIII. 441-4). The spear that Ajax throws at Hippothous 'speared him at close range through the bronze-cheeked helmet ... His brains burst from the wound in sprays of blood' (XVII. 338, 341, translating XVII. 297). Robin Sowerby perceives a 'darkening moral tone' as the epic continues, 'apparent in the many images of corpses exposed to dogs and carrion birds'.<sup>16</sup> Hector promises the dying Patroclus that 'the vultures will eat your body raw!' (XVI. 976), Pallas warns Menelaus of dire consequences 'if under the walls of Troy the dogs in all their frenzy / drag and maul the proud Achilles' steadfast friend' (XVII. 634-5), and Priam expresses a wish that 'dogs and vultures would eat [Achilles'] fallen corpse at once!' (XXII. 49). The pattern of imagery comes full circle when Achilles' promises the memory of Patroclus that 'I've dragged Hector here for the dogs to rip him raw' (XXIII. 24). The grisly details suggest a direct experience of warfare, one finds a similar level of realism in the accounts of battles of the Civil War written by soldiers; in his account of the first battle of Newbury, Henry Foster describes how 'mens bowels and brains' flew in his face.<sup>17</sup>

Sarpedon's speech to Glaucus explaining his idea of martial honour leaves unstated the potential conflict that it implies between the striving for individual honour and the

---

<sup>16</sup>Robin Sowerby, *The Classical Legacy In Renaissance Poetry* (Harlow: Longman, 1994), p. 19.

<sup>17</sup>Henry Foster, *A True Relation of the Marchings of the ... Red & blew Regiments* (London, 1643; Wing F1625A), sig. B3r.

common good. It is Homer's exploration of this conflict that increased the interest in his epic during the seventeenth century. Achilles' wrath towards Agamemnon dramatises the conflicting demands of individual ambition and civic responsibility, for Agamemnon is a 'Jove-kept' king, deriving his authority as supreme *basileus* or king directly from Zeus. G. S. Kirk suggests that 'the existence of a kind of divine right of kings' is implicit in the description of Agamemnon's sceptre:<sup>18</sup>

the scepter  
Hephaestus made with all his strength and skill.  
Hephaestus gave it to Cronus' son, Father Zeus,  
and Zeus gave it to Hermes, the giant-killing Guide  
and Hermes gave it to Pelops, that fine charioteer,  
Pelops gave it to Atreus, marshal of fighting men,  
who died and passed it on to Thyestes rich in flocks  
And he in turn bestowed it on Agamemnon, to bear on high  
as he ruled his many islands and lorded mainland Argos. (II. 118-126, translating  
II. 100-8)

The result of dissent against such authority is akin to civil war, which Nestor's speech in Book Nine makes explicit:

Lost to the clan,  
lost to the hearth, lost to the old ways, that one  
who lusts for all the horrors of war with his own people. (IX. 73-5)

More recently, doubt has been cast on Agamemnon's assumed superiority, suggesting that he is not the supreme king but simply 'one of the chiefs'. According to this view, the rulers over the society in which Homer writes did not possess an unquestioned authority, and the relation between Agamemnon and Achilles is one between equals rather than between king and subject.<sup>19</sup> The poem's uncertainty about the limits of royal authority was to increase the appeal

---

<sup>18</sup>Kirk, p. 53.

<sup>19</sup>See the discussion in Oliver Taplin, *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of The Iliad* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 47-50, 56-66.

of the Iliad in the seventeenth century, as the following discussion of George Chapman's translation will illustrate.

Furthermore, while the Iliad describes international warfare fought between two empires, it is possible to understand certain aspects of the conflict as resembling a civil war. For example, Homer continually emphasises that the Greeks and Trojans worship the same pantheon of gods, who in turn favour equally heroes of both sides. It is true that when Menelaus considers Adrestus' pleadings for mercy, Agamemnon dismisses them, asking 'Why such concern for enemies? I suppose you got / such tender loving care at home from the Trojans' (VI. 64-5); knowing that the answer is negative, Agamemnon implies the lack of bonds between Mycenae and Troy. Yet at the conclusion of his *aristeia*, Diomedes discovers his intended victim, Glaucus, to be the grandson of Bellerophon, and announces that 'The men must know our claim: / we are sworn friends from our fathers' days till now!' (VI. 276-7). It is episodes such as this that create the impression that the struggle between Greece and Troy is in part a fraternal conflict. The variety of references to the Iliad in the literature of the English Civil War reflects the confusion concerning the exact relation between Greek and Trojan. In 1644, John Cleveland describes the authors of London newsbooks offering 'the English *Iliads* in a nut-shell',<sup>20</sup> perhaps perceiving a similarity between the Parliamentary stronghold of London and the besieged city of Troy. The author of A Letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus perceives an analogy with the Greek camp's in-fighting, comparing the London mob to Achilles' 'Mermidons'.<sup>21</sup> Royalist poets look to both sides in the Trojan War for models of valour and prowess; an elegy on Sir Bevill Grenville compares

---

<sup>20</sup>[John Cleveland], The Character of a London-Diurnall With Severall Select Poems (London, 1646; Wing C4662), p. 1.

<sup>21</sup>A Letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus ([London], 1643; Wing L1489B), p. 9.

its subject to an '*Achilles*', while Cowley sees in Colonel Charles Cavendish '*Hector* in his *Hands*, and *Paris* in his *Face*'.<sup>22</sup> The opposing heroes of the *Iliad* together offer a composite ideal of the Royalist soldier; Achilles is courageous, if individualistic, while Hector is the protector of his home and his nation.

Homer's conception of warfare had tremendous influence in the ancient world, yet in the Middle Ages in Western Europe his texts remained virtually unknown in the original. Renaissance England discovered Homer with George Chapman.<sup>23</sup> Chapman's *Iliad* appeared over a period of thirteen years. His labours first bore fruit in 1598, when *Seven Bookes of the Iliades of Homer, Prince of Poets* appeared. Later in the same year, he issued *Achilles Shield*, an extract from Book Eighteen, as a separate volume with its own prefatory matter. His version of the entire text, *The Iliads of Homer, Prince of Poets, Never Before in any Language Truly Translated* appeared in 1611.<sup>24</sup> For his translation, Chapman relied on a parallel Latin translation of the Greek text, which explains the number of long Latinate words in his version. At the same time as 'Latinising' the vocabulary of the *Iliad*, Chapman sought to make contemporary many of Homer's metaphors and similes. An arresting example of this is the death of Pisander in Book Eleven. Agamemnon decapitates this unfortunate, and in the Greek his head rolls away like a 'log' (XI. 146). In Chapman's version, the Greek king 'let him like a football lie for everie man to spurne'.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>I. M., in *Verses on the Death of the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenvill, Knight* ([Oxford], 1643; Wing O990), p. 3; *CW*, II. 139.

<sup>23</sup>The first English translation of the *Iliad* was an undistinguished version of the first ten books by Arthur Hall, published in 1581.

<sup>24</sup>The 1598 volume contained his renderings of Books I, II, and VII-XI. For the 1609 translation of Books I-XII, Chapman completely revised his earlier translation of the first two books. His version of the *Odyssey* appeared between 1614 and 1616.

<sup>25</sup>George Chapman, *Homer's Iliads*, XI. 136. All references are to Allardyce Nicoll (ed.), *Chapman's Homer: The Iliad* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998, pbk. ed.).

Furthermore, Chapman attempts to increase the import of his translation by emphasising a contemporary political allegory that he perceived in it. He dedicates the 1598 edition of his translation to Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex, as a ‘Most true Achilles (whom by sacred prophecie Homere did but prefigure in his admirable object and in whose unmatched vertues shyne the dignities of the soule and the whole excellence of royall humanitie)’ (p. 504). As well as flattery, there is a certain degree of self-aggrandisement in the dedication; in the preface to Achilles Shield, he asks that the earl rid England of ‘all the unmanly degeneracies now tyransying amongst us’(p. 546), making the country more martial and thus more suited to epics like Chapman’s rather than ‘sonnets and lascivious ballades’ (p. 549). John Briggs suggests that in this 1598 volume Chapman ‘seems determined to make good his hyperbolic flattery, to prove that Essex can discover himself in Homer’s story of Achilles’.<sup>26</sup> Essex had urged Queen Elizabeth to pursue a more aggressive policy towards Spain but found himself overlooked for promotion, and he consequently withdrew himself from court. Briggs points to various parallels between Essex’s recent career the contents of the books that Chapman translates in the 1598 publication.<sup>27</sup> In October 1598, Essex sought and gained the command of an expedition to Ireland to suppress a rising against the Queen, and Chapman’s publication of Achilles Shield around the same time may express his enthusiasm for Essex’s preparations for this campaign.

Chapman’s changing conceptions of the character of Achilles are of particular importance, not only because of his identification of Achilles with Essex, but also because he

---

<sup>26</sup>John Channing Briggs, ‘Chapman’s Seaven Bookes of the Iliades: Mirror for Essex’, Studies in English Literature 21:1 (Winter 1981), 59-73, p. 59.

<sup>27</sup>See Briggs, p. 66.

perceives Achilles as fulfilling a humanist ideal of a mirror of courage.<sup>28</sup> In the 1598 translation, Achilles, in response to Agamemnon's demand that he surrender Brisēis, rails against striving on the field of battle without reward:

O thou possessest with Impudence, that in command of men  
Affectst the brute mind of a Fox, for so thou fill thy denne  
With forced or betrayed spoiles thou feelest no sence of shame!  
What souldier can take any spirite to put on (for thy fame)  
Contempt of violence and death, or in the open field  
Or secret ambush, when the heyre his hie desert should yeeld  
Is beforehand condemnd to glut thy gulfes of avarice? (1598, I. 154-60, translating I.  
149-51)

The outburst obviously parallels Essex's withdrawal from the court. In the subsequent editions, Chapman tones down this outburst:

O thou impudent! of no good but thine owne  
Ever respectfull - but of that with all craft covetous-  
With what heart can a man attempt a service dangerous,  
Or at thy voice be spirited to flie upon a foe,  
Thy mind thus wretched? ... (I. 150-4)

At the same time, there is much to suggest that in the earlier publication Chapman 'attempts to temper as well as encourage Essex's rise to greater power'.<sup>29</sup> For example, in response to Nestor's oration at the council, Achilles argues that his own temperament does not bear burdens and insults, and this he would demonstrate to Agamemnon, 'Were it not hurt of common good more than mine owne delight' (1598, I. 306). What is important about this passage is that Achilles attaches more importance to the 'common good' than his 'owne delight'. Achilles, as Chapman conceives him in the 1598 volume, is thus no freebooter but a servant of a commonwealth. Colin Burrow suggests that, throughout the 1598 translation of Book One, 'Essex was presumably meant to hear ... about the willingness of men of fame to

---

<sup>28</sup>Chapman used the parallel Greek and Latin text prepared by Spondanus (Jean de Sponde), first, published in Basle in 1583, the commentary of which provides a humanist reading of Homer. See Charles Martindale, *John Milton and the Transformation of Ancient Epic* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), p. 55.

<sup>29</sup>Briggs, p. 66.



bear wrongs', and believes that the 'additions on the need for "men of fame" to consider "the common good" show an anxious desire to cap any possibility of aristocratic rebellion'.<sup>30</sup>

Chapman's cautioning advice went unheeded; Essex returned from Ireland against the Queen's wishes, and confronted his enemies at the court. He then led an abortive rising, but was arrested and subsequently executed in 1601. These events may have been in the minds of Chapman's readers as the English Civil War began, as the later conflict was characterised by Royalists as a reprise of Essex's 1601 rebellion, led this time by his son.<sup>31</sup> The intervening events certainly explain why Chapman subjected his translations of books One and Two to substantial revision. Yet, while he removed many troubling passages, in other cases he shows Achilles continuing to extol aristocratic independence. In the later version, Achilles' response to Nestor's oration reads

'Fearfull and vile I might be though if the exactions laid  
By all meanes on me I should beare. Others command to this:  
Thou shalt not me - or, if thou dost, farre my free spirit is  
From serving thy command. (I. 290-3, cf. 1598 I. 302-6 above)

Far from completely removing all of Achilles' potentially rebellious tendencies, the 1609 edition makes them more explicit; Chapman's Nestor states unequivocally that refusal to submit to authority creates 'intestine warre' (IX. 64). It is this peculiarly ambivalent nature of Chapman's *Iliad* that ensured that, in addition to providing a suitable idiom for the depiction of epic warfare, it maintained a potent political charge in a time of civil warfare.

It is important to recognise that Homeric descriptions of warfare were the most significant influence upon the classical text held in highest regard throughout Europe in the seventeenth century, Virgil's *Aeneid*. Virgil's epic elaborates a myth of the imperial

---

<sup>30</sup>Colin Burrow, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 216.

<sup>31</sup>See J. S. A. Adamson, 'The Baronial Context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5<sup>th</sup> series, 40 (1990), 93-120: p. 94.

establishment of Rome by Aeneas, a son of Priam and the survivor of the destruction of Troy. The Rome for which Virgil wrote 'could be a paradigm for any developing commonwealth or kingdom', and his works were the 'most easy and obvious to connect with the fortunes or misfortunes, the past and the future to which he belonged', with the result that they were afforded a status second only to the Bible.<sup>32</sup> An example of this status is found in Cowley's Davideis, where the only non-Biblical marginal citation in the poem, at Book III. 131, refers the reader to the episode of Aeneas carrying his father Anchises on his shoulders in Book II of the Aeneid, itself one of the passages in Virgil most hospitable to Christian allegory. Virgil's influence on warfare in seventeenth-century England extended beyond those who read his works; Virgil is quoted on seven of the recorded banners of the English Civil War, more than any other classical author.<sup>33</sup>

While Virgil's portrayal of warfare owes much to his readings in Homer, it is possible to identify several distinct characteristics of his depictions of battle. Homer offers his audience a wealth of detail concerning the ebb and flow of battle. My earlier discussion of Homeric warfare suggested that most fighting in the Iliad takes place at close quarters, and to this we might add that, through repeated use of certain narrative devices, Homer is able to imply with which side the advantage lies. M. M. Willcock identifies that 'the fighting falls into one of two situations', the *mêlée* (σταδῖος) and the rout (φόβος), and that Homer characterises a *mêlée* with a description of '*alternate killings*', and a rout with 'a list of

---

<sup>32</sup>William Frost, 'Translating Virgil, Douglas to Dryden: Some General Considerations' in Maynard Mack and George deForest Lord, edd., Poetic Traditions of the English Renaissance (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 271-286, pp. 273, 272.

<sup>33</sup>Ian Gentles, 'The Iconography of Revolution: England 1642-1649' in Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden eds., Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 91-113: p. 98.

continuous killings by one side'.<sup>34</sup> As Homer leaves us in little doubt as to which side any given warrior belongs, we can trace the fluctuations in battle through the lists of the fallen. We remain constantly aware of the context in which individual combats take place. In contrast, Virgil allows his reader to remain uncertain as to the general shifts in the fortune of war. Willcock finds that he cannot identify a single occurrence of alternate killing in battle in the Aeneid, and only one example of continuous killing by one side.<sup>35</sup> K. W. Gransden believes that, because Virgil compresses the action of his battles into a limited textual space, 'his structure of movement and counter-movement is sharper, less wayward, tighter, he pays scrupulous attention to the laws of cause and effect and to military probability'.<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, Willcock suggests that 'the general action of the armies, the ebb and flow of the battle, are disregarded much more than in the Iliad'.<sup>37</sup> Virgil, it seems, deliberately presents us with a view of warfare that is more confused than that of Homer, and this was to have an important influence on subsequent depictions of warfare, and, in particular, civil warfare.

Willcock adds that in the Aeneid 'what we are normally given is the fighting of individuals, without any clear attempt at localisation'.<sup>38</sup> In this way it is similar to much of the fighting in the Iliad, and both authors make extensive use of the *aristeia*. However, as Gransden identifies, Virgil, unlike Homer, does not try 'to represent the multiplicity of views, voices, characters, perspectives' of warfare.<sup>39</sup> Much of the confusion in the battle scenes stems from the fact that, while much of the fighting is between individuals, Virgil is reticent

---

<sup>34</sup>M. M. Willcock, 'Battle Scenes in the Aeneid', Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, n. s. 29 (1983): 87-99; pp. 87-88.

<sup>35</sup>Willcock, p. 89.

<sup>36</sup>K. W. Gransden, Virgil's Iliad (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 124.

<sup>37</sup>Willcock, p. 90.

<sup>38</sup>Willcock, loc. cit.

<sup>39</sup>Gransden, p. 124.

to individuate the warriors who appear in the poem's conflicts; Virgil does not reveal the history of many figures in the later books of his poem, and on numerous occasions does not specify on which side they are fighting. Willcock expresses surprise at this obfuscation, citing the example of the Rutulian commander Messapus when he states that 'many of the leaders in the Aeneid are names and nothing else'. He adds that this is the case 'partly because they never speak'.<sup>40</sup> This contributes further to Virgil's creation of uncertainty in the battle scenes in his epic. Virgil's unwillingness to name the soldiers fated to die may derive from his own experiences of Rome's civil wars. This feature of his style may have impressed Cowley during the composition of The Civill Warre. In Cowley's poem, it is only the King that speaks, and then in a speech before the battle of Newbury expressing conventional ideas of loyalty and honour. As none of Cowley's battle scenes approach the length of those in the Aeneid, it appears that Cowley is not striving to create a sense of uncertainty, but rather that he aims to suggest the necessary impersonality of a civil warfare that pits neighbour against neighbour.

In the light of much recent scholarship, it is unsurprising that Cowley turns to the Aeneid in his search for suitable structures and idioms to convey his impressions of civil warfare. The so-called 'Harvard School' of Virgilian criticism emphasises the pessimistic, even anti-Augustan aspects of the Aeneid. Brooks Otis uses the terms 'Odyssean', to describe the first six books of the epic, and 'Iliadic', to describe the latter six.<sup>41</sup> The point at which the reader would expect the epic to end, the landfall of the exiled Trojans in their destined homeland, marks instead the inauguration of a war and a siege no less bitter than that they

---

<sup>40</sup>Willcock, p. 90.

<sup>41</sup>See Brooks Otis, Virgil: a Study in Civilised Poetry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), chs. vi, vii.

have escaped. The second half of the poem represents Virgil's Iliad: the 'Twice captives Troians' arrive in Italy only to find themselves re-fighting the Trojan War against a warrior who boasts that they 'here ... hast Achilles found'.<sup>42</sup> In the previous discussion of Homeric warfare, it was suggested that it is possible to understand the Iliad as portraying a civil war, and the 'Iliadic' sections of the Aeneid are even more open to this interpretation. The war in the later books is between Trojan and Latin, present and future Roman, and represents for Virgil an uncomfortable recollection of the civil conflict that had engulfed Rome in the decades prior to his writing of the Aeneid. In Virgil's epic it is Juno who orders the Fury Allecto to arouse hateful passions among the Latins. Cowley appreciates this element of the Aeneid's construction when, at the opening of Book Two of The Civill Warre, he introduces Allecto encouraging the Parliamentary forces to renew conflict. The parallel between Virgilian myth and contemporary events was noted continually in mid-seventeenth century Britain; a 1649 pamphlet by Henry Hammond compares the rise in lay-preaching to the influence of so many Allectos.<sup>43</sup> As Colin Burrow suggests, the English Civil War 'compelled Virgilians to present a Virgil who had divided political loyalties, and alerted them to the ways in which the aftershocks of Rome's civil wars are registered in Virgil's poem'.<sup>44</sup>

In some respects, however, Virgil is noticeably reticent in registering these aftershocks of civil war. Virgil goes to some length to emphasise the difference between Trojan and Latin, where Homer stresses the many similarities between the opposing sides in the Iliad. The customs and religion of the Latins are different from those of the Trojans, despite it being

---

<sup>42</sup>Gransden, p. 1; Thomas Phaer and Thomas Twyne, The Aeneid, ed. Stephen Lally (New York: Garland, 1987), IX. 624, 769.

<sup>43</sup>CW, II. 5-8; Henry Hammond, To the Right Honourable, The Lord Fairfax, and His Council of Warre (London, 1649; Wing H607), p. 2.

<sup>44</sup>Colin Burrow, 'Virgil in English translation', in Charles Martindale, ed., The Cambridge Companion to Virgil (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997): 21-37; p. 27.

Juno who excites their wrath. The most marked difference between the two peoples appears on the battlefield. The Trojans are veterans of a long conflict against the Greeks and an arduous voyage; at this stage, they appear as veteran 'professional' soldiers, in the sense that very little else has occupied most of their lives. In contrast, the Latins are not a warlike people. The arrival of the Trojans and the influence of Allecto sees the Latins take up agricultural implements and improvised weapons, like bats and clubs (Phaer and Twyne, VII. 533-4). The English translation by Thomas Phaer identifies the Latins as 'contrey clownes' (VII. 550). This version, completed by Thomas Twyne, was perhaps the most influential translation of the early modern period. This distinction between the two armies was to influence Cowley during the composition of The Civill Warre, as it offered a literary model analogous to the class differences that he perceived in the English Civil War. He identifies the King's army with the Trojans, not only because they fight for a 'godly' cause, but also because they are aristocratic, and skilled in arts of war. In contrast, he appoints the Parliamentarian army to fulfil the role of the rustic Latins, an untrained rabble essentially plebeian in composition. In the longest of his battle narratives, that of the first battle of Newbury, he contrasts the Royalist noblemen with a number of invented Parliamentarian officers symbolically identified with the trades that they follow.

In the early modern period, writers were to use translation of Virgil as a means of expressing their own anxieties about political and civil strife. Phaer, a provincial solicitor living in the Welsh marches, dedicated his first essay in translating Virgil, The seuen fyrst bookes of the Eneidos of Virgil (London, 1558; STC 24799) to the Catholic Mary I. When she died, Phaer was forced to look elsewhere for dedicatees, as the marginal commentary that he provides suggests that he himself remained loyal to the Catholic faith. Phaer's translation is alliterative, and makes extended use of archaisms that evoke a mythical, heroic past. His

complete translation of the epic appeared in 1573. On the evidence of its frequent reprintings, this complete version seems to have had a considerable popular appeal, as editions appeared in 1596, 1600, 1607 and 1620. Phaer's translation was the first of many to show 'how writers on the margin of England have turned to Virgil in order to persuade themselves that they are at the nation's centre'.<sup>45</sup> Sir Richard Fanshawe, who served as secretary of war to King Charles during the Civil War, chose to translate Book Four of the Aeneid into Spenserian stanzas, and published it with a dedication to the imprisoned King in 1648. The choice of Spenserian rhyme scheme suggests a desire to connect Aeneas' search for a nation with an English epic of the quest for national identity. Fanshawe strengthens this link with a summary of Rome's civil wars appended to the 1648 volume, which suggests some of the parallels between Roman and English history. Fanshawe's Virgil is one 'that offers consoling prophecies to losing causes'.<sup>46</sup> Similarly, the translation of Book Two by Sir John Denham, published anonymously in 1656 as The Destruction of Troy: An Essay Upon the Second Book of Virgil's Aeneis, is an oblique elegy for the dead King Charles. The beheading of Priam and the subsequent destruction of Troy again have obvious parallels with the political situation in England following the execution of Charles in 1649. Royalist translators deliberately splinter Virgil's epic, as if the poem of imperial foundations can no longer speak to them, and shore the fragments against the ruins of their cause:

There is no simple triumphalism: fragments of the poem are produced by disparate translators, each commenting on their own life and their flagging state, and looking forward to an age which might allow for the whole imperial fabric of Virgil to be replicated.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup>Burrow (1997), p. 24.

<sup>46</sup>Burrow, (1997), p. 26.

<sup>47</sup>Burrow, (1997), pp. 26-7.

In this context, we can see that The Civill Warre, Cowley's epic fragment written at a time when the Royalist cause began to be lost, if not congruent with the Aeneid itself, has much in common with the practice of translating Virgil among his loyalist peers during the period of the Civil War.

Alongside the Aeneid, the Latin text that had the greatest influence on the description of warfare in the period was Lucan's Bellum Civile, or the Pharsalia. As a young man, Lucan was one of the emperor Nero's circle of friends. In AD 62 or 63, he published, by reading aloud, three books of his Pharsalia, at most two years before his death at the age of twenty-five, forced to commit suicide when his participation in a conspiracy to remove the emperor Nero was uncovered.<sup>48</sup> As the Pharsalia made epic poetry out of the events of recent history, it offered a way of thinking about the English Civil War for writers on both sides in the conflict. Given the poem's hostility to Caesar, and Lucan's eventual opposition to Nero, this may seem a little surprising. Yet, while the poem champions the cause of the republic and is hostile to Caesar, this can be understood as a defence of the *status quo* against a rebellious, potentially tyrannical innovation. Furthermore, Lucan had been one of Nero's friends, and in the proem dedicating the epic to Nero (I. 33-45), while admitting the destruction and suffering of the civil war, Lucan gives thanks that it resulted in Nero's accession, and looks forward to his deification. Frederick Ahl doubts the sincerity of the proem, commenting that 'we must not distort the remainder of the epic which is manifestly hostile to the Caesars in order to assert the sincerity of a few lines which are not necessarily favorable.'<sup>49</sup> O. A. W. Dilke similarly suggests that Lucan 'realized the emptiness of the traditional eulogy,' but 'hoped by it to

---

<sup>48</sup>See Frederick M. Ahl, Lucan: An Introduction (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976), pp. 36-41, and Appendix, pp. 333-353.

<sup>49</sup>Ahl (1976), p. 54.



secure Nero, himself a poet and champion of the arts, as patron of his poem'.<sup>50</sup> Of Lucan's personal political attitudes, Charles Martindale suggests that we can only rely on three key facts: 'Lucan wrote a poem attacking Caesarism, he was banned from promulgating his poetry, and he died in a conspiracy to remove a Caesar.'<sup>51</sup> The fact that Lucan's hostility towards Caesar, and possibly also towards Nero, does not entail opposition to monarchy is important when considering the impact of his poetry in the seventeenth century. As early as 1633, Cowley praises Charles for uniting England and Scotland without having to win his own battle of Pharsalia. James Howell, in The True Informer, compares Charles at Edgehill to Caesar at Pharsalia, and an elegy on Grenville likens the Royalist officer to Caesar's centurion Scaeva. There is no fixed series of correspondences among Royalist writers, as they seem less interested in the opposition between republic and empire than in developing a link between Charles and Caesar because of the historical fact of Caesar's greater success as a general.

Another important, and possibly influential aspect of the Pharsalia is its apparently incomplete state. The text as we have it breaks off at X. 546, either because it was unfinished at the time of Lucan's suicide (as most scholars accept), or because part of the original codex was lost at an early stage in the poem's transmission. Many commentators assert that Lucan intended a twelve-book epic on the model of the Aeneid, ending with Cato's suicide at Utica after the battle of Thapsus in 46 BC. This seems the most appropriate point for the poem to end, because a scene in which Cato 'committed suicide in hara-kiri fashion, driving his sword into his entrails' makes literal the metaphorical disembowelment of Rome by herself

---

<sup>50</sup>O. A. W. Dilke, 'Lucan's Political Views and the Caesars', in D. R. Dudley, ed., Neronians And Flavians: Silver Latin I (Greek And Latin Studies, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), 62-82, p. 76.

<sup>51</sup>Charles Martindale, 'The Politician Lucan', Greece and Rome 31:1 (April 1984), 64-79, p. 65.

announced at the opening of the epic.<sup>52</sup> Against this, Jamie Masters emphasises the similarity between the period covered by Lucan and by Caesar's own account of his war against Pompey, *De bello civili*, which, like *Pharsalia*, 'ends, abruptly enough, at the start of Caesar's war against the Alexandrians'.<sup>53</sup> The last two books, of which Book IX is far longer than any other, and Book X far shorter, can be understood as an 'epilogue' to the death of Pompey. While the epic appears to end abruptly as Caesar recalls the heroism of his centurion Scaeva, Masters suggests that Lucan intends the idea of 'evil without alternative, contradiction without compromise, civil war without ending.' Moreover, the text as we have it ends not with Caesar, but with the name of 'Magnus' (X. 564), so that 'Pompey is given, literally, the last word'.<sup>54</sup> There remains a possibility that Lucan intended his epic to be 'a counterpoise' to Caesar's history.<sup>55</sup> Caesar's commentary is in three books, and in publishing three books of his epic, Lucan perhaps aimed to emulate Caesar's account before outdoing him with the completion of the poem. The idea that Lucan intended the *Pharsalia* to appear as deliberately fragmentary remains a hypothesis, albeit a tantalising one, and the idea may have influenced Cowley during the composition of *The Civill Warre*, which also appears intentionally incomplete.

The fragmentary form of Lucan's epic accords with its contents, which describes the fragmentation of the Roman state, and, in battle, the fragmentation of its citizens. Throughout the poem, Lucan reaches after an idiom that will accurately convey the full horror of civil conflict. A literal darkness frequently confuses the action of battles, just as a metaphorical

---

<sup>52</sup>David Quint, *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 142.

<sup>53</sup>Jamie Masters, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's *Bellum Civile** (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 241.

<sup>54</sup>Masters, pp. 259, 258.

<sup>55</sup>Masters, p. 221; Ahl (1976), p. 307.

darkness envelops the Roman state. Lucan radicalises the confusion of Virgil's battle scenes, and makes explicit its connection to civil war. Before the battle of Pharsalia, the sun aims to run its daily course faster in order to avoid rising and thus to forestall the battle (VII. 1-6). The battlefield darkens the night before the battle, and the augur, Gaius Cornelius, reads the portents in the 'dark dimness' of the sun (VII. 177, 200). J. C. Bramble reveals that darkness dominates Lucan's epic:

From a total of 34 terms, white, grey and black are the dominant tones, accounting for 15 terms with 64 occurrences. Black is preferred to white, but Lucan draws no distinction between the epic *ater*, Virgil's option, and the more ordinary *niger*.<sup>56</sup>

The battles in the Pharsalia are dense, cramped and foggy; a remarkable example of Lucan's idiom occurs during Curio's defeat by Juba in Book IV. As the Africans launch a cavalry charge against the Roman horses, they darken the battlefield as the beating hooves create a sandstorm that Lucan compares to the Bistronian whirlwind (IV. 767-8), a figure which recurs at Pharsalia where Pompey's cavalry appear as a concentrated cloud as they charge their own infantry in error (VII. 531). Unable to see, Curio's infantry are surrounded and crushed by the massed javelins of the Africans (IV. 773-6). As the Romans huddle together, the infantry succeed only in stabbing each other, 'uix impune suos inter conuertitur enses' (IV. 779), and Roman armour is overcome by Roman armour, 'stipataque membra teruntur, / frangitur armatum conliso pectore pectus' (IV. 782-3). While it is Africans that the Romans fight, the rhetoric recalls the opening lines of the epic, and 'we are back in the civil war ambience, where the harm and violence is done to oneself'.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>J. C. Bramble, 'Lucan' in E. J. Kenney (ed.), The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, II: Latin Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 542.

<sup>57</sup>Bramble, p. 552.

Lucan's evocations of death in battle are deliberately grotesque, with a recurrent emphasis upon dismemberment and mutilation. This is the result of 'the lack of differentiation produced by the civil war itself: in the war of like against like, all bodies are indeed the same'.<sup>58</sup> Lucan takes this idea to an extreme by turning bodies themselves into instruments of death. During the siege of Dyrrachium, the centurion Scaeva mounts the ramparts and rolls corpses towards the Pompeians, smothering the enemy (VI. 170-2). The Republican soldiers become indistinguishable from the bodies thrown towards them as they are entombed by corpses. Lucan implies the aptness of this death in civil war through the speech in Book II recalling the internal conflict between Marius and Sulla. In this episode, Sulla massacres Marius' soldiers in the 'sheepfold' in Rome, and some of the slaughter is carried out by the headless bodies of the executed falling upon the survivors (II. 206). These images of suffocation particularly influenced Cowley's accounts of siege warfare in the later books of The Civill Warre. Similarly, images of dismemberment recur throughout the epic as examples of the peculiar fate of civil war. During the sea battle at Massilia, one of a pair of Greek twins fighting for Pompey grabs hold of a vessel and his right hand is severed and left clinging to the enemy ship. Reaching to retrieve it, his left arm too is severed (III. 609-17). Again, at Dyrrachium, Scaeva cuts off the hands of those attempting to scale the ramparts, leaving the hands alone clinging to the tops (VI. 175-6). The *aristeia* of Scaeva (VI. 138-262) is itself a uniquely grotesque rendering of the epic convention of a single combat, as one man takes on an entire army. His sword, blunted by blood, can only smash limbs, while javelins appear to have no effect, but stick in his armour so that he bears a 'forest of spears'. A javelin lands in his left eye, and is torn out still bearing the eyeball. At the conclusion of this episode, the

---

<sup>58</sup>Quint, p. 145.

reader catches a glimpse of the centurion's face 'stetit imbre cruento / Informis facies' (his formless face was stiff with a bloody stream) (VI. 224-5). Lucan does not flinch from showing us 'the face of war: a bloody unrecognizable pulp'.<sup>59</sup>

Lucan's influence on English literature was to a certain extent dependent upon the availability of translations, and it was in the seventeenth century, when Lucan was of most concern to the English, that the first full English translations appeared. Even before this, he was one of the Latin poets prescribed for lectures at Corpus Christi, Oxford, upon its foundation in 1517, and in a 1520 list of Latin poets sold by the University bookseller, Lucan ranks below only Terence, Virgil and Ovid in popularity.<sup>60</sup> Lucan's influence grows throughout the sixteenth century, and in 1593 a translation of Book I of *Pharsalia* by Christopher Marlowe was entered in the Stationer's Register, and was finally published in 1600. Marlowe's translation is one of the earliest English poems in blank verse, and renders the Latin original line for line:

Wars worse than ciuill on *Thessalian* playnes,  
And outrage strangling law and people strong,  
We sing, whose conquering swords their own breasts launcht,  
Armies alied, the kingdom's league vprooted,  
Th'affrighted worlds force bent on publique spoile,  
Trumpets, and drums like deadly threatning other,  
Eagles alike displaide, darts answering darts.

Marlowe's untimely death prevented him from continuing with the translation, but as he completed his version of the first book, Samuel Daniel (?1562-1619) applied Lucan's model to his epic treatment of English history, *The Civil Wars between the Two Houses of Lancaster and York*. The first four books of Daniel's epic appeared in 1595, and a final version in eight

---

<sup>59</sup>Quint, p. 146.

<sup>60</sup>O. A. W. Dilke, 'Lucan and English Literature' in D. R. Dudley, ed., *Neronians And Flavians: Silver Latin I* (Greek And Latin Studies, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), 83-112, p. 85.

books was published in 1609, although the poem appears to be unfinished. Several contemporaries refer to Daniel as an English Lucan, and the opening stanzas display a clear debt to the Latin poet:

I sing the ciuill Warres, tumultuous Broyles  
And Bloody factions of a mightie Land:  
Whose people hautie, proud with forraine spoyles,  
Vpon themselves turne-back their conquering hand;  
Whil'st Kin their Kin, Brother the Brother foyles;  
Like Ensignes all against Ensignes band;  
Bowes against Bowes, the Crowne against the Crowne;  
Whil'st all pretending right, all right's throwne downe.<sup>61</sup>

Michael Drayton (1563-1631), in his The Barons Warres, published in 1603, follows Daniel's example and applies the Lucanian model to earlier English history. Like Daniel, Drayton begins his epic with a paraphrase of the opening of Bellum Civile, but thereafter there are few structural parallels and fewer verbal echoes of Lucan.

The first translation of the whole of Lucan's poem was that by Sir Arthur Gorges, published in 1614. Gorges renders the epic in octosyllabic couplets, which in many places reduces Lucan's epic to the level of comedy. Thomas May (1595-1650) is far closer to Lucan, not least because his translation too 'is a political act as well as a political poem'.<sup>62</sup> In what was probably a conscious recollection of the publication history of Lucan's original, the first three books of his translation were published in 1626. The number of editions of this translation that appeared in the years following is a measure of its significance; the full translation was published in 1627, a second edition in 1630, a third in 1633, and a fourth in 1659. Two further editions appeared in 1659 and 1679. When the full translation appeared in 1627, May dedicated several of the individual books to men who had achieved prominence in

---

<sup>61</sup>See Dilke (1972b), p. 88.

<sup>62</sup>Ahl, 'Form Empowered: Lucan's Pharsalia' in A. J. Boyle, ed., Roman Epic (London: Routledge, 1993), 125-142, p. 125.

the military and navy, and who supported English intervention on the continent, suggesting the interest that Lucan's epic may have held for those of a martial turn of mind. The dedication of Book III to Edmund Sheffield, earl of Mulgrave, recalls his naval victories in Elizabeth's reign, while the dedicatee of Book VII, containing the battle of Pharsalia, is Sir Horatio Vere, who had led King James's intervention in defence of the Palatinate, as well as fighting in earlier campaigns against the Spanish. May also dedicates his translation to men who, lacking faith in Buckingham's organisational skills, had opposed the forced loan to finance the disastrous expedition to relieve French Protestants on the Ile de Rhé. He offers Book IV, describing the campaign in Africa, to Robert Devereux, the third earl of Essex, whose father had led a rebellion against Elizabeth, and who was active both in Parliament and as a military commander, while the address of Book IX to Robert Rich, earl of Warwick, who was to command the Parliament's navy during the civil war, also looks forward to his raid against the Spanish gold fleet. In addition to May's dedicatees, the Pharsalia appears to have been very popular with soldiers; for example, the much-quoted letter in which the Parliamentarian general Sir William Waller writes to his friend and Royalist opposite Sir Ralph Hopton, stating 'with what a perfect hatred I detest this warr without an Enemy', he is quoting from the Pharsalia (I. 682), and embodies the Lucanian idea that civil war is akin to self harm.

May added to his translation fifty lines allowing Caesar to swim safely to his fleet during the battle near Alexandria. Dilke suggests that this may have inspired his Continuation of Lucan's poem published in 1630, which takes the action as far as the Ides of March.<sup>63</sup> Norbrook observes that 'this new poem significantly diluted Lucan's anti-Cesarism'.<sup>64</sup> In the

---

<sup>63</sup>Dilke (1972b), p. 96.

<sup>64</sup>Norbrook, p. 63.

period between the publication of his original translation and the Continuation, May issued a translation of Virgil's Georgics. These later works impressed Charles enough for him to commission two historical narrative poems, on the reigns of Henry II and Edward III, which emphasise the risks of undue aristocratic influence on monarchy.<sup>65</sup> When the Civil War broke out, however, May sided with Parliament. This earned him a reputation as a political turncoat, and John Aubrey repeats the rumour that he bore a grudge after 'He stood Candidate for the Laurell after Ben Johnson; but Sir William Davenant caried it', while also inferring that 'His translation of Lucan's excellent Poeme made him in love with the Republique, which odorem stuck by him'. As Martindale suggests, 'neither motive necessarily excludes the other'.<sup>66</sup> Perhaps May remained true to Lucan, aware of the horrors of civil war and desperate to prevent them, he finally found himself, through a possible combination of personal and public motives, forced to take a stand against autocracy.

The translation of classical epic in the seventeenth century was an act of political and ideological significance. Even more importantly, for my present purposes, it provided a means for soldiers on both sides to think about the nature of war. It filled the heads of readers with enduring models of heroism, as well as being the foundation of many readers' knowledge of strategy and tactics. The extent of the influence of classical epic on military thinking is reflected in many of the military books published in the first half of the seventeenth century.

---

<sup>65</sup>See R. Malcolm Smuts, Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), p. 272.

<sup>66</sup>John Aubrey, Brief Lives, ed. John Buchanan-Brown (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000), pp. 195, 196; Martindale, p. 67.



‘BY RULE TO KILL’: MILITARY MANUALS 1600-1642

Writing after the Restoration, Andrew Cooper, a writer identified as the author of A Speedy post with more news from Hull, York and Beverley (1642), recalled his arrival at university some twenty years earlier:

*When first for Oxford fully there intent,  
To study learned sciences I went.  
Instead of Logicke, Physicke, School-converse,  
I did attend the learned troops of Mars.  
Instead of Books, I Sword, Horse, Pistols bought,  
And on the Field I for Degrees then fought.<sup>67</sup>*

Cooper’s arrival in Oxford coincided with the beginning of the First Civil War, and he pointedly shuns books in favour of combat. Yet, at the conclusion of the civil wars, Captain Samuel Jervis was to write:

*Till now we did but butcher Victories,  
And were but sloven Deaths-men: whil’st our eyes  
Were wanting to our hands, we fell upon  
A Miscellaneous Execution:  
So that it griev’d the slain, that they must die  
Without a method, and disorderly:  
But now we have attain’d the handsome skill,  
By order, method, and by rule to kill.<sup>68</sup>*

In this commendatory verse to a military manual, the soldier celebrates the capability of books to improve his use of the sword, pistol and pike. The gradual progress towards the civil war might have been apparent to an informed observer from the increasing number of military manuals issuing from the presses in the preceding decade. Between 1600 and 1634, almost sixty such manuals were published in England. As war drew closer, the number increased;

---

<sup>67</sup>A[ndrew] C[oooper], [Stratologia], or the History of the English Civil Vvarrs (London, 1660; Wing C6049), sig. [A4r].

<sup>68</sup>Richard Elton, The compleat body of the art military (London, 1650; Wing E653), sig. [†4r].

thirty-five appeared between 1635 and 1642.<sup>69</sup> Originally published to improve the training of the militia, these books were bought and read by officers and gentlemen. In March 1642, for example, Edward Harley, son of Sir Robert Harley and a Parliamentary colonel, records purchasing eleven manuals for the sum of £2 10s 0d.<sup>70</sup> Sir John Gell, the Parliamentary commander, appears to have taken books of this kind into battle with him, as his copy of The Pathwaie to Martiall Discipline by Thomas Styward, is stained with blood.<sup>71</sup>

The quality and utility of these manuals varied considerably. Gervase Markham, who, despite his experience in the Dutch service, was essentially a hack, compiled The Souldier's Grammar in 1626 from other manuals. This book, like its successor The Souldiers Exercise, was a complicated text of little practical use, as its concluding order of battle requires an army of fifty thousand troops.<sup>72</sup> Similarly irrelevant were the contributions of Edward Cooke, whose The Character of Warre suggests forty-four commands for the loading and firing of a musket. Conversely, Thomas Fisher, in his The Warlike Directions, or the Souldiers Practice, made use of his experience in the Low Countries and as a muster master for the Kent militia, yet still invented a drill that involved thirty-six orders for the musket and fifty-two for the pike.<sup>73</sup> A more comprehensive and thoughtful work was The Principles of the Art Militarie by Captain Henry Hexham. Hexham was another veteran of service in the Netherlands, and served as a quarter-master in Colonel Goring's regiment, so it is unsurprising that his book

---

<sup>69</sup>See M. J. D. Cockle, A Bibliography of English Military Books up to 1642 (London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1900).

<sup>70</sup>See F. J. Varley, Cambridge during the Civil War, 1642-1646 (Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1935), p. 125.

<sup>71</sup>See Derby and the Great Civil War: Catalogue of Exhibition, 2-23 October 1971 (Derby: Derby Museum, 1971), item 59.

<sup>72</sup>Gervase Markham, The Souldier's Grammar (London, 1626; STC 17391); The Souldiers Exercise (London, 1639; STC 17390).

<sup>73</sup>Thomas Fisher, The Warlike Directions, or the Souldiers Practice (London, 1634; STC 10918.5). This text was considered popular enough to reissue in a pocket version in 1643 (Wing F1060).

concentrates particularly on logistics and supply. Nonetheless, his drill still includes thirty-two orders for the musket, and thirty-six for the pike.<sup>74</sup> Despite its brevity, The Yong Soldier manages to include sixty-nine orders for the musket, although mercifully only eleven for the pike.<sup>75</sup> The needless complication of these manuals led to official responses, with the Parliament issuing the far simpler Instructions for Musters in 1623, which contains only ten pike movements, and the King publishing the similarly concise Military Orders of Articles Established by his Majesty in 1642. At the same time, longer works, such as John Cruso's Militarie Instructions for the cavallrie, remained popular perhaps because of their length, which many purchasers must have equated with comprehensive coverage.<sup>76</sup>

In general, these books aim to combine varying amounts of experience and theory in order to impart knowledge. Edward Cooke announces in his preface that '*it seemes a farre better and shorter way ... to joyne experience unto knowledge, then to get knowledge by experience*' while insisting on the fundamental differences

*betweene the science that wise men haue in Books, and the experience that others have in war, betweene the skill to write with the pen, and others to write with the sword; betweene one that for his pastime is set round with deskes of Bookes, and another in perill of life, encompassed with troops of enemies.*<sup>77</sup>

William Barriffe, in his Military Discipline, suggests that 'No man is borne a Souldier, neither can any attain, to be skilfull in the Art Military without practice ... by practice is gained knowledge, knowledge begets courage and confidence'.<sup>78</sup> At the same time, Donald Lupton warned that 'Soldiers are not for sport and jest, but for earnest; neither is Warre to be

---

<sup>74</sup>Henry Hexham, The Principles of the Art Militarie (London, 1637; STC 13264).

<sup>75</sup>John Raynsford, The Yong Soldier (London, 1642; Wing R419D).

<sup>76</sup>Instructions for Musters (London, 1623; STC 7683); Military Orders of Articles Established by his Majesty ([Oxford], 1642; Wing C2495); John Cruso, Militarie instructions for the cavallrie (Cambridge, 1632; STC 6099).

<sup>77</sup>Cooke (1628; 5670), sig. [A4r].

<sup>78</sup>William Barriffe, Military Discipline: or, the Yong Artillery Man (London, 1635; STC 1506), p. 1.

accounted as a May-game or Morrice-dance, but as a Plague and a Scourge'.<sup>79</sup> Another shared aim of these various texts is to raise the status of military science and writing, as evinced by the long and fulsome dedications to noble patrons with which the authors preface them. Fisher's manual is dedicated to Philip Herbert, earl of Pembroke, Hexham's to Henry Rich, earl of Holland, who was to become Lieutenant-General of the Horse and to lead an expedition to Scotland in the First Bishops' War, while Raynsford dedicates his book to Viscount Say and Sele, one of the King's most vocal opponents. Indeed, we may attribute the complication of many of the drills presented by these books to a desire to raise the status of the military writer's art, by making it appear far more specialised and involved than was necessary. Many of the authors are keen to display evidence of great learning through extensive classical allusion. The authority of the ancients extended to military matters, so that tacticians still asked soldiers to use formations better suited to Romans fighting the Carthaginians; Cooke insists that the greatest commanders succeed through '*diligent learning and study of the Art of Warre, written and set forth by Historicall Writers and Poets*'.<sup>80</sup> A consequence of this practice was an over-reliance on the pike in drills and formations, as a weapon known to the ancients; in 1642, Lupton issued A warre-like treatise of the Pike, which, despite its title, decries the continued use of pikes in formations and urges officers to introduce tactics more suitable to an age of gunpowder. Lupton's warnings went unheeded as writers, from poets to the editors of the newsbook Mercurius Aulicus, continue to portray valiant soldiers, in particular those on the Royalist side, achieving great victories using the pike and the poleaxe.

---

<sup>79</sup>Donald Lupton, A warre-like treatise of the pike (London, 1642; Wing L3496), p. 87.

<sup>80</sup>Cooke (1628; 5670), sig. [A4r].

These possible flaws apply even to the most popular of the manuals written during this period, William Barriffe's Military Discipline, or the Yong Artillery Man.<sup>81</sup> Barriffe had gained experience as an officer in the Honourable Artillery Company in the City of London, which had trained the London militia since the reign of Henry VIII. His book is dedicated to, among others, Algernon Percy, the earl of Northumberland, the effective commander-in-chief of the British Army, and the officers of the Artillery Garden, as the training ground in Spitalfields was known. In the prefatory material, Barriffe admits that he 'can better mannage the *Pike* then the *Pen*' and adds that 'if any carpe at the *plainnesse* of the *stile*, I conceive that it *fits best* with the *Subiect*: workes of this nature, chiefly requiring it'.<sup>82</sup> It was this plainness of style and clarity of layout that explained its continuing popularity with officers and readers. It is a measure of its simplicity and abstraction that the third edition, published in 1643, nowhere mentions that a civil war is in progress; the only hint is the extension of the dedication to the Artillery Company officers to include Major General Philip Skippon, who had led the London Trained Bands with distinction against the king.<sup>83</sup> While Barriffe is not immune from the disadvantages of other writers, with sixty-two orders for the musket and fifty-four for the pike, his manual was popular because it told an officer what he needed to know in a plain but comprehensive manner. His warning to 'expect not ... to finde my *Booke* set forth with *fine phrases*, nor to be deckt with *historicall discourses*, of *forraine fought Battels*' was another selling point,<sup>84</sup> as he thus avoids the tendency to rely on classical authorities and to illustrate ossified tactics and procedures.

---

<sup>81</sup>Barriffe, (1635; 1506). This book appeared in six further editions in 1639 (STC 1507), two in 1643 (Wing B917 and B918), 1647 (Wing B919) and 1661 (Wing B920).

<sup>82</sup>Barriffe (1635; 1506), sigs. [70-6r], Av.

<sup>83</sup>Barriffe, (1643; B917), sig. [A6r].

<sup>84</sup>Barriffe, (1635; 1506), sig. [70-6r].

While Military Discipline was popular because of the focus on practical matters, other books, many of which are coincidentally dedicated to King Charles, adopt a more theoretical approach. One of the earliest tracts of this kind is Five Decades of Epistles of Warre by Francis Markham, published in 1622. Markham (1565-1627) was a brother of the hack Gervase Markham, who had seen service in the Low Countries and later in Ireland under the second Earl of Essex. His book consists of fifty epistles on different aspects of military life, each dedicated to a particular member of ‘the noble Troupe of all our suruiuing English Barons’, arranged into five ‘decades’.<sup>85</sup> The dedications, both to Prince Charles and to the various noblemen, identify the text as belonging to the ‘advice to princes’ genre, ‘*for Warre is onely proper to Princes ... for indeed but they for themselues, and others by their Authoritie, none else may draw the Sword*’.<sup>86</sup> While appearing to praise King James for having ‘*sheathed his Sword*’, it looks towards Charles to prepare for war, through a circumspect reference to the fight for the Palatinate, suggesting that the time may come when Charles will need to fight ‘*either to recouer your right in forain parts, or relieue your friēds in other parts*’.<sup>87</sup> In terms of his discussion of military manners, Markham aims to balance carefully the competing claims of learning and of practical experience, answering those who protest how he ‘dare professe this Trade of making Book-Souldiers, as if the Arte of Warre were not better attain’d by Practise than Contemplation’. In his defence, he insists on how ‘I spent my Summer Progresse in the warres, so I consumed my Winters quiet in the wholesome delights of forraine Accademies’, concluding that ‘*Caesar* must be able to write his Commentaries, and *Tullie* know how to put on his Armor when *Rome* is ready to be fired’.<sup>88</sup> Caesar is, for Markham, the

---

<sup>85</sup>Francis Markham, Five Decades of Epistles of Warre (London, 1622; STC 17332), f. 1.

<sup>86</sup>Markham (1622; 17332), sig. A3v.

<sup>87</sup>Markham (1622; 17332), sig. A3v, sig. [A4]r.

<sup>88</sup>Markham (1622; 17332), f. 2.

supreme example of 'the compounded man which consisteth of equall and excellent parts ... for he sees and doth, knowes and can execute'.<sup>89</sup>

Another volume dedicated to Charles similarly appears to be a work that adopts a literary approach to war, yet, upon closer examination, it seems that the book has its roots in more earthly problems. The Bible-Battells, or the Sacred Art Military by Richard Bernard (?1567-1641), rector of Batcomb in Somerset, is addressed to the King as '*Defender of the Faith*' and 'the great *Man of warre*'.<sup>90</sup> The dedicatory epistle goes on to advise the king that 'the poore distressed *Churches* cry aloud for help' and that 'Religion it selfe saith to her *Defender* set forward', using flattering language to criticise the monarch's irenic stance towards the religious conflicts in Europe as a dereliction of duty.<sup>91</sup> In his preface to the reader, Bernard insists that all wars follow a preordained pattern, and that it has been God's people that have '*commonly got the day*'; his book 'aims to support a biblical aim with a classical one, to show that the Bible was comparable in value as a source of military information to the popular classical texts of ... Vegetius, Frontinus, and Caesar'.<sup>92</sup> At the same time, Bernard draws an important distinction between himself and the writers of more practical textbooks, stating that '*I here in my labour doe not so undertake to prescribe Rules, as to write an History of Holy Warres*' adding that '*my principall aime in the use of Armes is to bring into the Campe the Practise of Piety*'.<sup>93</sup> Bernard sees military training as a moral education, and his

---

<sup>89</sup>Markham (1622; 17332), f. 6.

<sup>90</sup>Richard Bernard, The Bible-Battells, Or The Sacred Art Military (London, 1629; STC 1926), sigs. ¶2r-v.

<sup>91</sup>Bernard (1629; 1926), sig. ¶3r.

<sup>92</sup>J. R. Hale, 'Incitement to Violence? English Divines on the Theme of War, 1578 to 1631', in Renaissance War Studies (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), 487-517: p. 499. This essay was drawn to my attention by Martin Steward.

<sup>93</sup>Bernard (1629; 1926), sig. ¶5r-v.

belief is that the correct attitude towards God can improve the soldier's mastery of more practical skills.

A similar perspective informs the most comprehensive work on military science published prior to the English Civil War, Robert Ward's Anima'dversions of Warre, or a miliatrie magazine of the trvest rvles, and ablest instrvctions for the managing of warre, issued in 1639. Like Bernard, Ward dedicates his book to the King, but his warnings of the possibility of war have a greater urgency, the author admitting to 'Having had many thoughts of the vicissitude of times, and the mutation and change of this pretious Iewel Peace'. He states baldly that 'neither Peace nor Warre can bud nor flourish, but under the well-managed Sword'.<sup>94</sup> Ward's book is not intended for the same audience as Barriffe's, being exceptionally learned and detailed, in order to fulfil its stated aim of creating 'a more perfect Souldier ... then those that content themselves with a few common Precepts and broken Rules' through citing examples 'of the manifold accidents which rise from the varietie of humane actions'.<sup>95</sup> Milton was an admirer of Ward's book, as his references to it in his commonplace book testify.<sup>96</sup>

The opening section of Ward's book, 'The Mvtability of Flovrishing Kingdomes', restates the warning to the King, suggesting that the transition from peace to war is as inevitable as the passing of the seasons: 'The Winter Solstice must succeed the Summer, and Warre must follow Peace'.<sup>97</sup> In this section, the concern is that peace will end because of an

---

<sup>94</sup>Robert Ward, Anima'dversions of Warre ... (London, 1639; STC 25025), sig. \*2r.

<sup>95</sup>Ward, (1639; 25025), sig. \*3r.

<sup>96</sup>See James Holly Hanford, 'Milton and the Art of War', in John Milton: Poet and Humanist (Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1966), pp. 191-5.

<sup>97</sup>Ward (1639; 25025), p. 1.



invasion from abroad, and in the succeeding section, 'How To Provide In Peace For Warre',

Ward suggests the causes of his concern in a satiric vignette:

our custome and use is now adayes, to cause our Companies to meet on a certaine day, and by that time the Armes be all viewed, ... it drawes towards dinner time; ... Wherefore, after a little carelesse hurrying over of the Postures, with which the Companies are nothing bettered, they make them charge their Muskets, and so prepare to give the Captaine a brave volley of shot at his entrance to his Inne; where having solaced themsleves a while after this brave service, every man repaires home, and that which is not well taught them .. is easily forgotten before the next Training.<sup>98</sup>

The following sections deal with topics such as munitions, the geometry of ordnance and the construction of fortifications. In the seventh section, 'The Duties Of Sovldiers In Generall

Both In Fort And Field', he outlines the attitudes that are appropriate for a soldier facing battle. Chief among these 'is to shew their Magmanimitie and forwardnesse to the uttermost of their powers, to the last breath and drop of bloud, in the defence of true Religion'. No less important is the exhortation 'to seeke, gaine, preserve, and defend, the honour of our King'.<sup>99</sup>

As this section progresses, the tone darkens; Ward's repeated emphases on the paramount importance of obedience are the result of his prescient view of the coming civil wars. His celebration of obedience in this seventh section already possesses a decidedly melancholy air:

No Kingdome so Fortunate and happy, as those where obedience flowes in a clear streame; so farre from the power of gusts and stormes, that gentle calmes are perpetuated to times, and all seasons are as Halcion dayes; when Subjects of all conditions, and in all respects sympathize with their Sovereigne in authority to his lawfull body, or as the parts of the body are ready bent to observe and execute the pleasures and intents of the heart and the faculties of the minde.<sup>100</sup>

Ward pointedly refers to 'Halcion dayes', the fleeting period in winter when kingfishers build their nests, suggesting the transitory nature of the state of peace. In Book Two of the

Anima's dversions, Ward draws the majority of the aphorisms on the office of the general from

---

<sup>98</sup>Ward (1639; 25025), pp. 30-1.

<sup>99</sup>Ward (1639; 25025), p. 150.

<sup>100</sup>Ward, (1639; 25025), p. 158.

Machiavelli. Like Machiavelli, Ward believes that the proper training and maintenance of an army is fundamental to the security and cohesion of a successful state. As fears of invasion give way to alarm at the prospect of war from within, the tone of his work grows ever more desperate.

Unlike Barriffe's Military Discipline, these volumes by Francis Markham, Bernard and Ward were less likely to have been read by ordinary soldiers. They did, however, help to create an enthusiasm for the idea of war among many of the gentlemen who took up arms in the English Civil War. Their repeated emphases on concepts like honour, obedience and duty increased their appeal among the men who came to be known as 'Cavaliers'; these emphases, however, were often at the expense of consideration of the new technology of war, and of the tactics and strategies that evolved around the new weaponry. The emphasis on a more chivalric conception of warfare represented a backward step from the knowledge that could be gleaned from epic, where the weapons forged by Hephaestus were still the equal of the courage of Ares. Military manuals also exercised an influence on those who lifted their pens for the King's cause, and among the most important of these figures were the contributors to the most exciting literary product of the Civil War: the newsbook.

## ‘THE ENGLISH ILIADS IN A NUTSHELL’: THE NEWSBOOK AND WAR REPORTING

Recalling his experiences during the civil wars, Richard Baxter writes

So that hearing such sad news on one side or the other was our daily work, insomuch that duly I was awakened in the morning I expected to hear one come and tell me such a garrison is won or lost, or such a defeat received or given. And ‘do you hear the news?’ was commonly the first word I heard.<sup>101</sup>

This trend was not only apparent in hindsight. Shortly after the first shots of the conflict had been fired, the author of a pamphlet claims that

Humane nature is covetous of novelties, never had that Axiome so pregnant proofes as in these dayes; never were the people so appetitious of newes; never were their desires so answered with diversity of Narrations, and to say truth, never were there broacht so many false and improbable relations: ...<sup>102</sup>

In the 1640s, the most important agent for the satisfaction of these desires was the newsbook, the forerunner of the modern newspaper. Recently, the research of Nigel Smith and Joad Raymond has greatly enhanced our understanding of these publications. In the early decades of the seventeenth century, it was illegal to publish domestic news in Britain, a policy that was enforced with varying degrees of success by the Stationers’ Company after a Star Chamber decree of 1586. Occasional news pamphlets appeared, and printers exported news serials in English known as corantos, most often from the Low Countries and Germany, encouraging James VI and I to place a ban upon their import in 1621. Other corantos were printed in London, and in the same year as the royal ban, either Nathaniel Butter or Nicholas Bourne gained an official licence to print foreign news, translated from foreign sources, in London.<sup>103</sup> Richard Cust has outlined how in this decade news travelled by a combination of

---

<sup>101</sup> Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696), quoted in John Adair, *By the Sword Divided: Eyewitness Accounts of the English Civil War* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), p. 163.

<sup>102</sup> *Good and Joyfull Nevves ovt of Buckinghamshire* (London, 1642; Wing G1035, received by Thomason November 3), p. 3.

<sup>103</sup> See Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 7-9.

formal and informal means, and, in his view, ‘contributed to a process of political polarization’.<sup>104</sup> A Privy Council decree of 1632 banned the printing of foreign news, effectively stopping the corantos, although Butter and Bourne continued to produce irregular digests of recent history, variously entitled The Swedish Intelligencer and The Swedish Discipline. In the mid-1630s, interest in foreign news appeared to decline. Domestic news was scarce in the period too, because of the personal rule of Charles I: ‘Parliaments generated news, and facilitated its transmission by bringing the provincial gentry to the metropolis’.<sup>105</sup>

The first English newsbook, called Heads of Severall Proceedings, appeared on 29 November 1641, and was devoted to Parliamentary news. Raymond emphasises that its appearance coincided with a turning point in the history of the Long Parliament:

debates over the Irish rebellion and over the publication of the Grand Remonstrance had brought political tensions to the surface. The uneasy rhetoric of compromise and consensus, which had characterized both parliamentary debate and political writing, was falling away to reveal conflict and faction.<sup>106</sup>

Many others followed. Newsbooks were normally weekly publications, and were usually quarto booklets containing news gathered from important towns, like London, York and Edinburgh, as well as news from abroad. They were produced collaboratively between ‘an editor and a printer and a publisher, who was usually a bookseller’.<sup>107</sup> The first newsbooks employed a plain style, mainly to conceal their political persuasion. The many publications that issued from the presses of London usually had parliamentary allegiances, and it became common practice to imply, rather than to declare this allegiance; A Perfect Diurnall of the

---

<sup>104</sup> Richard Cust, ‘News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England’ in Margo Todd, ed., Reformation To Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England (London: Routledge, 1995), 232-51: p. 247.

<sup>105</sup> Raymond, p. 89.

<sup>106</sup> Raymond, p. 20.

<sup>107</sup> Raymond, p. 21.

Passages in Parliament, for example, featured a woodcut of Parliament on its first page. The political bias of these publications was most clear in stories which were anti-royalist, anti-Catholic, or, as was often the case, some combination of the two. Newsbooks circulated throughout the cross-section of literate society:

the capacity of the newsbook, 'mercury' or diurnal publication, to cross barriers of social difference was matched by the divergent background from which the newsbook writers came.<sup>108</sup>

Furthermore, they were distributed from London using carriers and the postal service. Using references in correspondence as evidence of distribution, Raymond writes that

while there is an unsurprising concentration of references around London, where literacy was highest for both men and women and where most printers were based, there is none the less much information about provincial readers. From London, newsbooks moved outwards ... they reached every county of England; some made it into the dark corners of Wales.<sup>109</sup>

It is important to be aware of the general features of the various newsbooks that may have had a bearing on the style and design of the poetry of the period. The style and content of newsbooks was completely heterogeneous. Smith states that the newsbook offered the 'potential for a variety of genres and styles to be deployed within a compressed textual space', arguing further that 'generic interaction and disturbance were functions of civil unrest'.<sup>110</sup> While they reported real events and aimed to give the impression of fidelity, this did not preclude embellishment and outright fabrication, with the result that 'the writing of news existed in the margin between fact and fiction'.<sup>111</sup> This habit of expanding on bare facts often results in newsbook writers presenting soldiers and their actions as if they were characters in

---

<sup>108</sup>Nigel Smith, Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 54.

<sup>109</sup>Raymond, p. 240.

<sup>110</sup>Smith, p. 56.

<sup>111</sup>Smith, p. 57.

an epic or a romance; reporting the battle of Roundway Down, for example, the Parliamentary newsbook Wednesday's Mercury declares that 'the noble Commander Sir *Arthur Haslerigge* deserves a second *Homer* to set forth his valour in this action'.<sup>112</sup> Cleveland pours scorn on the '*Quixotes* of this Age [who] fight with the Windmills of their owne heads', and characterises London newsbooks as 'the *Round-heads* Legend, the Rebels Romance; Stories of a larger size, then the Eares of their Sect'.<sup>113</sup>

The newsbook was in no way an exclusively parliamentary phenomenon, however. Charles I, despite his general dislike of propaganda, acknowledged the newsbook's effect when, in January 1643, 'he sanctioned the appearance of Mercurius Aulicus in an attempt to turn the allegiances of hard-pressed Londoners',<sup>114</sup> and the first issue began with a defiant statement of intent:

The world hath long enough been abused with falshoods: And there's a weekly cheat put out to nourish the abuse amongst the people, and make them pay for their seducement. And that the world may see that the Court is neither so barren of intelligence, as it is conceived, nor the affaires thereof in so unprosperous a condition, as these Pamphlets make them: it is thought fit to let them truly understand the estate of things that so they may no longer pretend ignorance, or be deceived with untruthes: which being premised once for all, we now go on unto the businesse; wherein we shall proceed with all truth and candor. ... New-yeares-day shall give entrance to this new-designe ...<sup>115</sup>

This newsbook was edited first by the divine Peter Heylyn, and then by the more aggressive Sir John Berkenhead; Heylyn's issues are marked by 'mannered writing' and 'occasional heavy-handed humour',<sup>116</sup> and it was under Berkenhead that the newsbook evolved its

---

<sup>112</sup>Wednesday's Mercury (19 July 1643; NS 669. 1), p. 3.

<sup>113</sup>[Cleveland], (1646; C4662), p. 3.

<sup>114</sup>Smith, p. 56.

<sup>115</sup>Mercurius Aulicus, 1 (1-7 January 1643; 275. 101B), p. 1.

<sup>116</sup>P. W. Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 33.

‘elevated style, and pointed, calculated, and snobbish satirical criticism of its enemies’.<sup>117</sup> It was generally of high quality, and among contemporaries it had a reputation for accuracy. Among its readers were clerics, academics, and gentleman, and even William Prynne, Sir Samuel Luke and the Earl of Essex appear to have been familiar with its contents.<sup>118</sup>

There are several features of Mercurius Aulicus’ reporting of battles and skirmishes that deserve further attention. Smith notes that Berkenhead is fond ‘of describing individual acts of heroism by royalist commanders, and likes to show the pole-axe at work’.<sup>119</sup> At the same time, both Heylyn and Berkenhead were aiming for as much accuracy as was possible. The critic Peter Thomas suggests that the editors were ‘trying genuinely to establish a viable technique of war-reporting’.<sup>120</sup> The technique that Aulicus employs is to focus to a far greater extent on the detail of military engagements than the earliest newsbooks, which were based in London, and dealt mainly in Parliamentary news. When it came to reporting the war, these journals were often content to claim a victory, to list the names of prominent figures present, and to guess at the number of casualties. Aulicus offers much more detail, listing not just the exact date but the time of the encounter, as well as appending accurate lists of casualties and a wealth of seemingly trivial detail, even down to the colour of the soldiers’ buff-coats. It also records the precise time that news reached the editor in Oxford, probably to circumvent criticism from London newsbooks that its information was faked. Aulicus was also careful to use a similar terminology to that encountered in military manuals, describing tactics and manoeuvres in sometimes quite technical detail, as in the following relation of the battle of Lansdown:

---

<sup>117</sup>Raymond, p. 26.

<sup>118</sup>See Thomas, pp. 57-8.

<sup>119</sup>Smith, p. 57.

<sup>120</sup>Thomas, p. 67.

having gotten this ground wee found the Enemie in an entire Body, his Foot placed within certain stony walls of great strength, through which he had prepared divers places for his Horse to sallye, being drawn up in Battalio in the Reere of his Foot.<sup>121</sup>

In the face of all this detail, claims of Royalist success take on an extra authority. The disadvantage of this approach is that it becomes difficult to report reverses. In the later stages of the First Civil War, when the tide was decisively against the Royalist cause, these difficulties became more and more apparent. Aulicus published two accounts of the battle of Marston Moor in 1644, the first claiming victory, the second reluctantly conceding its mistake. Rather than publish inaccurate reports after the battle of Naseby in 1645, Aulicus took the decision not to publish at all, and there was a nine-week hiatus in the series. While Aulicus was loth to report difficulties for the Royalists, when events were favourable, it ‘emphasised the cheering’.<sup>122</sup> Aulicus elevates skirmishes into major engagements, and reports battles of indecisive outcome (most notably the first battle of Newbury) as victories. London newsbooks continually mocked Aulicus’ style, suggesting that the majority of its details were faked. One Parliamentarian satire puts into the mouth of a Royalist soldier the complaint that Aulicus ‘kills more in a sheet in a week than we can kill in many months in the field’.<sup>123</sup> These aspects of Aulicus’ style emphasise the extent to which the view of the conflict that it presents is a construct; even its much-trumpeted accuracy is a rhetorical tactic, a weapon with which it can attack its opponents. As Raymond suggests, ‘the real significance of Aulicus lay not in its popularity or improved standards of accuracy, but in its incipient violence’.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup>Mercurius Aulicus (8 July 1643; NS 275. 127), p. 361.

<sup>122</sup>Thomas, p. 69.

<sup>123</sup>The Soldier’s Language (London, 1644; Wing S4426), n. p.

<sup>124</sup>Raymond, p. 152.



Of the publications against whom this violence was directed, there are two that require special attention. The first issue of Mercurius Civicus appeared in May 1643, and the similarity of its title to that of Aulicus implies that it initially appeared as a response to, as well as suggesting the influence of, the Royalist newspaper. The political position of Mercurius Civicus is difficult to identify; in common with other London periodicals, it appears as a pro-Parliament newsbook, yet its tone was often so moderate that Smith can describe it as a 'royalist sympathiser ... (which was in fact more Presbyterian)'.<sup>125</sup> The qualification here is the key, as Civicus can best be described as representing the mainstream of metropolitan Parliamentary opinion. Modelled on Aulicus, Civicus follows that newspaper's rhetorical tactic of accuracy and impartiality in order to convey greater authority. One striking feature of Civicus is the regular appearance of a woodcut portrait on its cover, usually depicting the person who has played the most important role in the week's events. These illustrations helped to individuate both the newsbook and the individual being represented, encouraging a view of the war as various actions of great men, and which finds its poetic equivalent in the *aristeia*. Raymond concludes that 'when printed images were few and expensive, the impact of these cheap woodcuts on a weekly basis should not be scorned'.<sup>126</sup> The other important Parliamentary response to Aulicus was Mercurius Britanicus, which first appeared in August 1643, coinciding with the first real downturn in Royalist fortunes. While Civicus spoke for the city, Britanicus, under the editorship of Marchamont Nedham, spoke for the country. While it is unclear whether this newsbook began with official sanction, it came to be seen as the chief Parliamentary response to Aulicus.

---

<sup>125</sup>Smith, p. 64.

<sup>126</sup>Raymond, p. 35.

Certainly, it effectively turned Aulicus' weapons back on itself, projecting 'a barbed and witty style, frequently described as "railing"'.<sup>127</sup>

For both sides, newsbooks represented interventions in the conflict, and often adopted the military names, such as the Parliament Scout, which first appeared in 1643; this newsbook is notable for the frequency with which it compares its own activities in gathering news with those of a soldier in the field, who similarly will stand in the 'vanguard' or 'scout' for the enemy. The importance of this development will be understood when we come to examine the extent to which other forms of writing, specifically poetry, were 'militarised' in the course of the English Civil War. Just as the gap between the soldier and the writer narrowed during the period, so did the difference between the journalist and the poet. In the next chapter, I shall examine the beginnings of this development amidst the mass of print which surrounded the death of King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden.

---

<sup>127</sup>Raymond, p. 32.

**‘TO WAR AND ARMES I FLIE’:**

**CHANGING ATTITUDES TO WAR, 1632-1642**

‘THE TOO TRUE NUSE OF THE DEAD CONQUERING KING’: ENGLAND, EUROPE AND  
THE THIRTY YEARS WAR

In December 1632, as news reached London of the victory of the Swedish forces led by their king Gustavus Adolphus over the Imperialists at Lützen on 6 November, King Charles lay suffering from a bout of smallpox. Upon his recovery, his queen, Henrietta Maria, requested the reprieve of 14 condemned prisoners as a public display of thanksgiving for the deliverance of her husband. This act was understood by a large minority of the citizens of London to mean that Adolphus, who was missing and presumed dead after the battle, had in fact survived, and they were only just dissuaded from lighting celebratory bonfires.<sup>1</sup> This anecdote is revealing of the esteem in which the Swedish monarch was held in Britain, and throughout Protestant Europe in the early 1630s. It also indicates that in certain quarters this popularity was at the expense of the reigning British monarch, Charles. How did a foreign monarch manage to achieve such popular eminence in England during this period? To arrive at an answer, it is necessary to examine the career of Adolphus, and to understand the means through which his exploits were mediated in the British Isles.

The period of the personal rule of Charles I was often remembered as a golden age of peace and prosperity. Clarendon, writing in 1646 from his exile in the Isles of Scilly, recalls that

all his majesty's dominions ... enjoyed the greatest calm and the fullest measure of felicity that any people in any age for so long time together have been blessed with; to the wonder and envy of all the parts of Christendom.<sup>2</sup>

Writing in the midst of conflict, Abraham Cowley, in his epic The Civill Warre, looks fondly upon ‘those happy Yeares of late’:

---

<sup>1</sup>Thomas Birch, ed., The Court and Times of Charles the First, 2 vols, (London: Henry Colburn, 1848), II, 211, and see Loxley, RP, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup>Clarendon, I. 159.

As gloriously, and gently did they move,  
As the bright *Sun* that measur'd them above:  
Then onely' in *Bookes* the *learn'd* could mis'ery see,  
And the *unlearn'd* ne're heard of Miserie.<sup>3</sup>

Both Cowley and Clarendon concur with the image of peace projected by the Stuart monarchy in the early decades of the seventeenth century. When Peter Paul Rubens arrived in London in 1629 as a member of a Spanish peace delegation, King Charles commissioned from the painter the decoration of Inigo Jones' Banqueting House, designed for James I, whose three great central panels acclaimed the late king as a peacemaker. At the same time, Cowley's reminder that '*Rhene and Sennen* for our Armies call' (CW, I. 74) brings into view the wars raging throughout Europe during the period. Clarendon, too, places England's peaceful state in its European context, recalling the Virgilian topos of '*toto divisos orbe Britannos*', characterising the British Isles as a garden apart from the rest of the world:

The happiness of the times ... was enviously set off by this, that every other kingdom, every other province, were engaged, some entangled, and some almost destroyed, by the rage and fury of arms ... whilst alone the kingdoms we now lament were looked upon as the garden of the world.<sup>4</sup>

The image of England as a peaceful garden, and a refuge from the chaos of warfare, further recalls another painting begun by Rubens during his mission to England. His A Landscape with Saint George and the Dragon portrays Charles as Saint George, with his queen Henrietta Maria as the princess whom he has rescued from the dragon. Just as Saint George rescues the princess from the dragon, so Charles rescues his nation, represented by the idealised landscape in the background, from the rapine and destruction which at the same time is ravaging Europe, embodied in the dragon.<sup>5</sup> Of equal interest are the figures that Rubens

---

<sup>3</sup>CW, I. 79, 83-6.

<sup>4</sup>Clarendon, I. 162.

<sup>5</sup>See Smuts, p. 249, and David Howarth, Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649 (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 72-5.

includes around the royal couple. On the left stand three women, one of whom is being carried by the other two, having apparently been raped. In the foreground lie corpses alongside civilians begging for mercy.<sup>6</sup> Even a peaceful nation must keep in mind the miseries of war.

Various voices tried to keep this thought in the minds of Englishmen during the peaceful decades of Charles' reign. In 1628, Sir Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon, writing after the failed Cadiz expedition that he had led, writes that England 'hath been too long in peace' and 'the knowledge of war and almost the thought of war is extinguished', continuing by writing that 'the danger of all is that a people not used to war believeth no enemy dare venture upon them'.<sup>7</sup> In the Spanish Netherlands, writes Sir William Trumbull, the English are thought 'effeminate, unable to endure the fatigations and travails of a war: delicate, well-fed, given to tobaccos, wine, strong drink, feather beds; undisciplined, unarmed, unfurnished with money and munitions'.<sup>8</sup> And, as Robert Johnson asked in his translation of Giovanni Botero's The travellers breuiat, 'What hath effeminated our English, but long disuse of arms?'<sup>9</sup>

This concern becomes more pressing because of the spectre raised by the Thirty Years' War, the defining European conflict of the seventeenth century, and one which was to have a profound effect in England almost from the outset. The war effectively began in 1618, when the German Calvinist Prince Frederick of the Palatine, husband of Elizabeth, daughter of James VI and I, was elected to and accepted the throne of Bohemia, in the process

---

<sup>6</sup>See P. Bjurström, 'Rubens' "St. George and the Dragon"', Art Quarterly (Spring 1955), 27-42.

<sup>7</sup>Sir Edward Cecil, quoted in C. H. Firth, Cromwell's Army (1905; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Methuen, 1962), p. 6.

<sup>8</sup>PRO State Papers Flanders SP 77/18.164v.

<sup>9</sup>Giovanni Botero, The travellers breuiat, or an historicall description of the most famous kingdomes (London, 1630; STC 3404), 28.

upsetting the delicate balance between Catholic and Protestant in central Europe. The conflict was essentially between the Protestant states of northern Europe and the Catholic Holy Roman Empire, and the stage was Germany. The first phase of the fighting saw Frederick and his wife Elizabeth removed from both Bohemia and the Palatinate by Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. The popularity of Elizabeth, the '*Queene of Graces*',<sup>10</sup> placed pressure on James to intervene, something the country could ill afford, either politically or financially. Eventually, in 1620, James assembled a token expeditionary force of around 2,000 volunteers under Sir Horace Vere.<sup>11</sup> In the second phase of the conflict, Denmark, a country to which James was linked by ties of marriage, was overrun by the Imperial forces under the marshals Tilly and Wallenstein; only a Swedish army under the Scottish field marshal Alexander Leslie held out in Stralsund. In the third phase, Adolphus, 'the Lion of the North', started a campaign at Stralsund, which he prosecuted with tremendous success, defeating the Emperor's army at Breitenfeld in 1631, until his death at Lützen in 1632. The Swedish army continued the campaign under able generals like Wrangel and Baner into a fourth phase, beginning in 1635 and lasting until the war's end in 1648, in which France intervened in order to curb the power of the Hapsburg Holy Roman Empire.

News of the conflict filtered home in the letters of the combatants. A large number of British soldiers volunteered as mercenaries in the conflict, driven in some cases by Protestant, internationalist ideals, in a number of others by necessity. Sir James Turner, a minister's son who left the University of Glasgow with an MA in 1631 at the age of sixteen, chose the sword rather than the cloth because of 'a restless desire ... to be, if not an actor, at least a spectator of

---

<sup>10</sup>Sir Thomas Kellie, *Pallas Armata, or Militarie Instructions for the Learned* (Edinburgh, 1627; STC 14906), sig. 2r2v.

<sup>11</sup>See John Kenyon, *The Civil Wars of England*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988; repr. London: Phoenix, 1996), pp. 10-11.

these warres which at that time made so much noyse over all the world'.<sup>12</sup> Turner's desire to be an 'actor' speaks of a desire for adventure, and it was this, alongside an uncomfortable awareness of England's recent military embarrassments, that provoked Sydenham Poyntz to venture towards Germany. He writes that

To bee bound an Apprentice that life I deemed little better then a dogs life and base.  
At last I resolved with myself thus: to live and dy a souldier would bee as noble in  
death as Life.<sup>13</sup>

As information of the events of the war came to England in newsbooks, views on the experience of war entered the country through personal testimony and recollection. Some of these English soldiers began their campaigns with high ideals and expectations, but found these quickly turned to disillusion, as Thomas Raymond later recalls:

... I observed how briske and fyne some English gallants were at the beginning of this campagne, but at the latter end their brisenenes and gallantry soe faded and clowdy that I could not but be mynded of the vanity of this world with the uneasines of this profession. And truly, by what I have seene and felt, I cannot but thinck that the life of a private or comon soldier is the most miserable in the world; and that not soe much because his life is always in danger - that is little or nothing - but for the terrible miseries he endures in hunger and nakednes, in hard marches and bad quarters ...<sup>14</sup>

During a siege, Turner notes grimly that his 'best entertainment was bread and water, abundance of the last, but not so of the first'. On the other hand, as he fought on, he 'learnd so much cunning ... that I wanted for nothing, horses, clothes, meate, nor moneys'.<sup>15</sup> Raymond also accepts the prosaic truth that 'soe long as money lasted wee had a merry life'.<sup>16</sup> Despite the hardships that they experienced, both Turner and Raymond became accustomed to the

---

<sup>12</sup>Sir James Turner, Memoirs of His Own Life And Times (Edinburgh, 1829), p. 3.

<sup>13</sup>The Relation of Sydnham Poyntz 1624-1636, ed. T. S. Goodrick (Camden Society, Third Series, vol. 14, 1908), p. 45.

<sup>14</sup>The Autobiography of Thomas Raymond, ed. G. Davies (Camden Society, Third Series, vol. 28, 1917), p. 43.

<sup>15</sup>Turner, pp. 6, 7.

<sup>16</sup>Raymond, p. 38.



existence of a soldier. Turner describes himself as ‘so well inured to toile, I fullie resolved to goe on in that course of life which I had made choyce, ... so true it is that *Habitus est altera natura*’.<sup>17</sup> Raymond, ‘seeing no other waye to make out a fortune ... buckled [him] selfe to the profession’;<sup>18</sup> he attaches himself to his way of life in the same way that he would attach his sword to his belt. Simone Weil, writing on the *Iliad*, writes of the dehumanising effects of war ‘that turn anybody who is subjected to it into a thing’;<sup>19</sup> similarly, at the level of language at least, Raymond appears less as a person and more like an instrument of war himself.

The steady trickle of volunteers fed a growing stream of printed matter concerning the wars, in particular memoirs and military manuals. An example is Monro his expedition with the worthy Scots regiment, by Robert Monro, a Scottish officer who led a regiment of volunteers under Adolphus. The work, published in 1637, has a didactic purpose, divided into ‘Duties’, which relates the events witnessed by Monro, and ‘Observations’ upon these events, aiming to instruct in military innovations. The intention seems to be to prepare against ‘the decision or abitrement of Fortune’ that Monro sees as playing too great a role in battle.<sup>20</sup> The volume shares the perception that the war in Germany was a crusade, and in places appears as a hagiography of Adolphus. He attacks cowardice, describing cannon fire as ‘musick being scarce worth the hearing’, while ‘the players would not stay for the world to receive the last of it, being over-joyed in their flying’.<sup>21</sup> In his observations upon the battle of Leipzig, Monro elaborates his belief in the rightness of dying for a cause: ‘O would to GOD I had once such a

---

<sup>17</sup>Turner, p. 6.

<sup>18</sup>Raymond, p. 44.

<sup>19</sup>Simone Weil, The Iliad, or The Poem of Force, transl. Mary McCarthy (Wallingford; Pendle Hill, 1956), p. 3.

<sup>20</sup>Robert Monro, Monro his expedition with the worthy Scots regiment (London, 1637; STC 18022), sig. Xx3v.

<sup>21</sup>Monro (1637; 18022), sig. Iir.

Leader againe to fight such an other day; in this old quarrell! And though I died standing, I should be perswaded, I died well'. Elsewhere, speaking again of this 'Leader' Adolphus, he asks

Who would not obey such a Commander to fight well, being assured under his fortunate conduct after travell and paine, to obtaine Glory and honour here, and an immortall Crowne after death, for fighting well the Battells of the Land?<sup>22</sup>

Monro's book does not seem to have had a wide circulation,<sup>23</sup> so it was other texts which had a greater influence on popular understanding of the war in Germany.

One text that appears to have had a particular impact was The Lamentations of Germany, by Philip Vincent. The pamphlet's title recalls the biblical Lamentations, and warns the reader to expect a Jeremiad, a genre of great popularity in the seventeenth century, when 'Jeremiah and Hosea were so many cassettes, to be inserted into the tape-deck of the present'.<sup>24</sup> Instead of Israel, the author offers Germany as a mirror for England, reminding his readers that Germany was 'before a large, populous, fertile, and flourishing Countrey', and asks 'were their sinnes greater than ours? No, but except wee repent, what may wee expect?'<sup>25</sup> This booklet reports the miseries of the fighting and the catastrophic effects on the wider population, and is illustrated by a number of copper etchings displaying acts of horrific cruelty and barbarism. On one page, for instance, there are graphic representations of '*A Diuine burnte in the middell of his bookes his Childe pulled from ye brest & tost on a speare*' and '*Mens guttes pulled out of there mouthes*'. The sufferings of the civilian population are

---

<sup>22</sup>Monro (1637; 18022), sigs.Ii2r, Xx4r.

<sup>23</sup>The copy in the library of the Royal Artillery Institution has a manuscript note: 'this book was printed at the sole expense of Lord Rhees, and most of the copies (which were but few) given to his friends' (STC, 18022).

<sup>24</sup>Patrick Collinson, 'Biblical rhetoric: the English nation and national sentiment in the prophetic mode' in Claire McEachern and Debora Shuger, eds., Religion and Culture in Renaissance England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 15-45, p. 25.

<sup>25</sup>Philip Vincent, The Lamentations of Germany (London, 1638; STC 24761), sigs. Br-v.

brought to the fore, showing famine reducing the populace to the eating of carrion and cadavers, as thousands die as a result of plague, and the dead remain unburied.

Two readers on whom this pamphlet created a particular impression were the popular balladeer Martin Parker and the London artisan Nehemiah Wallington. In the following year, Parker issued a book of verse entitled A Briefe Dissection of Germaines Affliction. This pamphlet is made up of a number of verse stanzas, many of which appear directly inspired by illustrations from The Lamentations of Germany. A suitable example is the description of a cleric, stripped and tethered, who had a cat placed upon his stomach:

they beate and pricked the Cat to make her fixe her teeth and clawes in the poore mans belly. So the Cat and the man, partly through famine, partly through paine and anguish, both breathed their last.<sup>26</sup>

Parker's rendering of this episode borrows some of Vincent's phrasings:

But one thing more is to be wonderd at  
Then all the rest (O note this hellish art,  
A Reverend Channon tortured with a cat,  
Fix'd to his naked belly ne're to start,  
Till man and cat (through horrid paine and hunger)  
Yeelded to death, when they could live no longer.<sup>27</sup>

The Lamentations of Germany made such an impact on Wallington that he copied whole sections into the notebook, to which he gave the title 'Of the Bitternesse of warre And the miseries that warre brings with it'. Wallington describes reading in a book 'wherein as in a glasse you mite see the mourn full face of this our sister nation now drunke with misery', and follows Vincent's preface in asking 'What are wee that God should alwaies spare us?'.<sup>28</sup> The illustrations appear to have drawn Wallington's attention to the parts of Vincent's text that he

---

<sup>26</sup>Vincent (1637; 24761), sig. b6r.

<sup>27</sup>Martin Parker, A Briefe Dissection of Germaines Affliction (London, 1638; STC 19222), sig. [A5]r.

<sup>28</sup>BL Add. MS 21935, ff. 80v-81r. See Paul S. Seaver, Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), p. 160. Seaver does not identify Wallington's source.

transcribes, noting that soldiers thrust knotted ropes ‘Down the throates of others ... and then with a string pulled it up againe to moue the bowels out of their place’.<sup>29</sup> In a much later notebook, Wallington recalled the first illustrations in Vincent’s volume, ‘*Snalles and froges eagerly eaten*’, stating that in Germany ‘they did boil whole pots and kettles of frogs and did eat them with their entrails’.<sup>30</sup>

One of the ironies of the English response to the war is that the phases of the conflict that least directly involved England drew the most passionate response. In the 1630s, the war assumed the character of a Protestant crusade, with Adolphus as its figurehead. This enthusiasm for Adolphus is reflected in, and was influenced by, the newsbooks describing his campaigns. In a somewhat circular fashion, popular curiosity about continental events encouraged the publication of newsbooks, and in turn their portraits of heroism increased public enthusiasm for Adolphus. As Joad Raymond suggests, ‘newsbooks needed heroes’,<sup>31</sup> and Adolphus fulfilled this role. Corantos, which were essentially digests of foreign news, were printed in England from the early 1620s onwards, and whetted the public appetite for war news. In October 1632, the Privy Council issued a decree prohibiting the printing of overseas news, in addition to the existing ban on domestic news, stopping the appearance of these corantos. News did continue to seep through, however, as Nathaniel Butter and Nicholas Bourne, who had published corantos, continued to supply reports of the war in an irregular serial, variously entitled The Swedish Intelligencer or The German History. The Swedish Intelligencer, like the corantos, was ‘implicitly anti-Catholic’.<sup>32</sup> The various parts of the Intelligencer were issued in response to events, and were later collected, sometimes

---

<sup>29</sup>BL Add. MS 21935, f. 81v.

<sup>30</sup>Vincent (1637; 24761), sig. ar; MS Folger, V. a. 436, f. 26v., and see Seaver, pp. 156, 208.

<sup>31</sup>Raymond, p. 197.

<sup>32</sup>Raymond, p. 10.

revised and expanded, to form volumes like The Swedish Intelligencer Compleat, which combined the newsbooks with a volume that mixed further reports of the war with a military manual entitled The Swedish Discipline. These volumes did not only circulate in metropolitan circles. John Rous, the incumbent of Santon Downham in Suffolk, notes excitedly in 1631 that ‘there came forth a booke called “The Swedish Intelligencer”’, and the following year comments that ‘About the newes in Germany, France and the Lowe Countryes, bookes daily come forth, and the Swedish Intelligencer is come to a fifth parte’.<sup>33</sup> In addition, the three elegies on Adolphus that he copied into his diary were printed in The Swedish Intelligencer.

Another writer for whom the Intelligencer was a particular inspiration was John Russell, a poet and polemicist of Puritan sympathies, who received an MA from Magdalene College, Cambridge, in 1632. He was almost certainly the author of The Spye Discovering the Dangers of Arminian Heresie and Spanish Trecherie in 1628, a poem attacking the peaceful policies of James I and Charles I and their refusal to defend the rights of Princess Elizabeth of the Palatine. In 1634, he produced The Two Famous Pitcht Battels of Lypsich, and Lutzen, a heroic poem in two books. The poem is at once an elegy for Adolphus, and a powerful war poem that draws on the journalism that the war inspired. The poem’s bipartite structure may follow Old Testament books like Samuel and Kings, but also seems to reflect the influence of the journalistic literature, as the events of each of the eponymous battles occupy a single book, just as each separately published part of the Intelligencer concerned a particular campaign. Russell’s poem is written consciously in imitation of Lucan:

Send *Virgils Genius* to direct my quill,  
His grave Majestick vein do thou instill;

---

<sup>33</sup>The Diary of John Rous, ed. M. A. E. Green (Camden Society, 1856), pp. 67, 75.

Or rather *Lucans*, whose so loftie rhymes  
Do best befit the *Genius* of these times.<sup>34</sup>

The reasons why Russell believes Lucan a more suitable model emerge elsewhere in the poem, where he presents a view of the Thirty Years' War as being not unlike a civil war, showing the 'barb'rous *Turk*' laughing 'To see us Christians by our selves so torn' (Russell (1634; 21460), 6). Russell aims for an epic idiom that was unfashionable in the England of the 1630s,<sup>35</sup> and appears to feel anxiety about the reception of his poem, asking whether his dissonant verse will

Displease our *British* eares, who are of late  
(It seems) grown tender and effeminate? (Russell (1634; 21460), 32)

He argues that the harsher sound of his verse is more suited to his loftier subject matter, so that 'the more *Discords* that my verses show, / The better *Harmonie* from thence will flow' (Russell (1634; 21460), 33). In a rather pointed metaphor at the poem's opening, thousands of people 'fill the troubled aire with confuse cries' while 'the woodie *Choristers* ... stand as mute' (Russell (1634; 21460), 2). The noise of war drowns out the poetry of pastoral idyll.

Russell makes the writing of war poetry appear a far from easy task, often returning to the rhetorical problem of being unable to witness the events that he narrates. He sees his muse faint at one sight, while at another he 'dare not upward lift my fainting eyes' (Russell (1634; 21460), 9). War is the result of 'discording *Passions*' and Russell relates this to the genesis of his poem in an image of conflict and contingency as

a world of discords circling runne  
Within my breast, like *Atomes* in the sunne,  
That crosse, and meet, and meet, and crosse agen. (Russell (1634; 21460), 4)

---

<sup>34</sup>John Russell, *The Two Famous Pitcht Battels of Lypsich, and Lutzen* (Cambridge, 1634; *STC* 21460), p. 3.

<sup>35</sup>See Smuts, p. 252.

The confusion that Russell feels concerning the war and his task in writing about it reflect the chaos of the war itself, and recall the disorder of Virgilian and Lucanian battles. Russell's poem imposes order on his own conflicting emotions, and so parallels the activities of the authors of the military manuals that were proliferating at the same time, who similarly seek to impose order on the experience of warfare. Their aim is to demonstrate that good generalship, namely that of Adolphus, can overcome Fortune through '*Valour mixt with Art*' (Russell (1634; 21460), 23).

Russell's poem presents a narrative of the battles that is largely accurate. For most of these details he seems to have relied upon the reports found in The Swedish Intelligencer and The Swedish Discipline. The battle's outcome was to be a mixed one for the Swedes and their king; in a *mêlée*, Adolphus was shot and killed. The Intelligencer reports Adolphus' particular vulnerability, stating that he 'was that day attired, (as usually he was accustomed) in a plaine Buffe-coate, and un-armed', and, when offered armour on the morning of the battle 'said *The Lord God was his Armour*, and refused it'.<sup>36</sup> Russell repeats Adolphus' refusal, and interjects in his narrative:

'Tis not a valiant *Heart*, and *Coat of Buffe*,  
That in these warres is *Armour* proof enough.  
Rare *Jewels* do deserve a costly Case,  
And to be lodg'd within the safest place. (Russell (1634; 21460), 55)

The effect of the interjection is to delay, and perhaps even to obscure the moment of Adolphus' death. With so much uncertainty surrounding the death of the king, which occurred during close fighting in a deep mist, it is rather fitting that Russell's poem remains oblique at this point. Paradoxically, there is less confusion in the poem surrounding the identity of Adolphus' killer:

---

<sup>36</sup>The Swedish Intelligencer, compleat all 4 parts, with the Discipline (London, 1634; STC 23525.2), sig. Q3v.

He, from whose hand was sent that cursed lead,  
That with *GUSTAVUS* struck so many dead,  
Liv'd not to triumph, no nor scarce to view  
What he had done: ... (Russell (1634; 21460), 57)

The Intelligencer is equally unyielding, claiming that the soldier who shot the King was himself killed, so 'that no man might ever live to glory, how hee had slaine the King of *Sweden*'. The report of the incident goes on to state that the Imperialist regiments 'charged so fiercely in upon the *Swedish*, that they were not able to bring off the dying King'.<sup>37</sup>

Russell's apparent desire for accuracy does not preclude the deployment of traditional epic conventions; in fact, his source material could be said to encourage their use. One such convention is the Homeric single combat, and in his account of Leipzig, Russell relates the story of 'two Captaines' who meet

Like furious Rammes, they do each other charge;  
Till at the last the thorough-piercing steel  
Made one of them begin to faint and reel: ... (Russell (1634; 21460), 19)

This is likely to have been inspired by the report in the Discipline of 'a gallant *Imperiall* Cavalier' and a '*Saxon*, Rit-maister or Captaine, who, 'their Horses being shot vnder them', launch into a duel; it concludes as they 'fell downe dead together, one vpon another', and '*Death*' awards the victory to the Saxon 'by laying him uppermost in the fall'.<sup>38</sup> Russell adds to this vivid description the conceit of their being entombed by bodies, as their soldiers die around them as if 'they meant / Their Captains should not want a *Monument*' (Russell (1634; 21460), 20). Russell also follows Lucan in presenting a disorientating view of the fighting, where 'fierie flashes and thick clouds of smoke ... the pure aire do choak', the soldiers stand enveloped 'Within a muffled vail, a foggie mist', and the battlefield covers 'Her mournfull

---

<sup>37</sup>(1634; 23525.2), sig. K4r.

<sup>38</sup>(1634; 23525.2), sigs. 2c2r-v.



face within a pitchie cloud' (Russell (1634; 21460), 19, 47,50). The Discipline reports that this Lucanian fog did actually descend on the battlefield, as, before Leipzig, Imperial troops set fire to gunpowder 'by the smoake thereof ... to blinde and trouble', and that at the battle's conclusion the same troops escaped as in 'the smoake and dust [they] were so shadowed from our sight', while a witness to the battle is reported as saying that 'we could not possibly see aboute foure paces before vs'.<sup>39</sup> At the same time, Russell dispenses almost entirely with epic machinery, since he wanted to show the triumph of Adolphus' '*Valour*' and '*Art*', as well as to allow God's actions to be read in the human agency of the faithful soldiers. God, or the gods, never appear directly, only in simile and allusion, as when the mist descends at Lützen, concealing the Imperialist troops, as 'Venus once her warlike sonne did shroud' (Russell (1634; 21460), 55). The reference to Book Five of the Iliad is a slur on the bravery of the Imperialist 'cavaliers', saved from the battle by the goddess of love. On the Swedish side, God manifests himself in the seemingly miraculous appearance of Adolphus' new tactic, the salvo:

The first rank couched on their knees: the next  
 Stood half-way bended: but the third erects  
 His armed trunk upright. ...  
 Then at a word did all give fire, and powre  
 Among th'enraged Horse a leaden showre,  
 That flew as thick as hail, when *Boreas* blast  
 Doth from the clouds his frozen treasure cast. (Russell (1634; 21460), 26)

That the Protestants are saved by human ingenuity, rather than any divine intervention, is evidence again of Russell's reliance on his source material. The Swedish Discipline was conceived of as a didactic text, and devotes considerable space to descriptions of tactics. The

---

<sup>39</sup>(1634; 23525.2), sigs. 2br., 2c3r., 2dv.

book reports the recollections of a Lieutenant Colonel Muschamp, who ‘gave order to the three first rancks to discharge at once; and after them the other three’, with the result that

the Muskettiers; who all on the sudden doubling of their rancks, making their Files then but three deepe: and the first ranck, falling vpon their knees, the second stooping forward, and the third standing vpright, and all giving fire together: they poured so much leade in at once amongst the enemies, that their ranckes were much broken by it.<sup>40</sup>

Russell’s comparison of the fallen Imperialists to fallen autumn leaves, when ‘with another garment then her own / The under-sited ground is thickly strown:’,<sup>41</sup> recalls Glaucus’ speech in *The Iliad* comparing his generation to leaves on the wind, rendered by Chapman as ‘The wind in Autumne strowes / The earth with old leaves; ... And so death scatters men on earth’ (*Homer’s Iliads*, VI. 143–4, 145). This Homeric simile may have been inspired by Muschamp’s remark that ‘strange it was to see, how so many Colours fell at one instant into the feild’.<sup>42</sup> This combination of an epic topos with journalistic fact was to recur many times in the writings concerning the English Civil War.

Russell elides the precise moment of Adolphus’ death in his poem, and any relation of it is also absent in the elegy on Adolphus included in the same volume, and issued separately as a broadside. In this poem, Russell again attempts to impress upon his English reader the reality of the war in Germany; asking himself whether the victories of Adolphus were imaginary, he retorts:

These! These were reall, and thy direfull steel,  
(Victorious Prince!) shall after ages feel!<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>(1634; 23525.2), sigs. 2c4v-2dr.

<sup>41</sup> Russell (1634; 21460), p. 27.

<sup>42</sup>(1634; 23525.2), sig. 2c4v.

<sup>43</sup>I. R. (i.e. John Russell), *An Elegie Upon The Death Of The Most Illustrious Gustavus Adolphus* (n.d.; STC 20573).

Russell builds his elegy upon a contrast between noise and silence, beginning by asking 'What strange sad silence doth the world astound?'. In The Two Famous Pitcht Battels,

Russell defended his poetics of dissonance and cacophony, but now

All tongues are silent, and our greedie eares,  
Heare nothing now; but terrours, doubts, and fears!

The ensuing silence disturbs, not only because the noise of war had accompanied Protestant victories, but because the English now languish in a drought of news. The 'curious' and 'greedie eares' do not even know for certain whether the king is dead. The images of Adolphus, though, imply a sense of ferocious energy that cannot be controlled. As his dust mingles with the earth, the earth is unable to contain him:

Though mighty mountains prest this living flame;  
Yet it would teare them and an entrance frame,  
His Hellish breath, and dismall noise to vent;  
Nor would it cease, till all his furie spent.

The pent Adolphus' spirit becomes like Mount Etna, and implicitly like one of his cannons (Russell (1634; 21460), 50). Russell's elegy appears to recognise the unpleasant implications of this image when he considers that 'No *Warres* no *Ruines* could his ire content'. In the apocalyptic image that closes his poem, Russell imagines the sea merging with rain that falls like tears from the 'Northern starres', to create a second Flood:

And let its murmuring waves, make such a noise,  
As may expresse to us, the dolefull voice  
Of some that crie, that roar, that shreik, that groan:  
Of some that mourn, that wail, that weep, that moan!

Noise finally returns to the poem, as nature metaphorically provides the noise of war.

Adolphus has become the force of nature to which he was before likened.

A sense that Adolphus cannot be contained is common to many of his English elegists; in his verse on Adolphus' death, Richard Corbett expresses the idea that the Swedish king will escape any constraint placed upon him:

What now! allready are those wagers layd  
Which not these thousand yeares are to be payd? ...  
Now to contend is an abortive strife, -  
'Tis to make Butter's booke his booke of life.  
Who can say Gideon yet, or Josua's dead,  
Whilst their eternall deeds of armes are read?<sup>44</sup>

Corbett's poem refers to the hope in London that Adolphus had survived, to the extent that people were prepared to settle wagers on the matter.<sup>45</sup> The reference to 'Butter's booke', namely the Swedish Intelligencer, suggests that for Corbett this is largely an academic matter, as he will metaphorically continue to live while he remains an inspiration to others, in the same manner as Gideon or Joshua. While his exploits may be contained in 'Butter's booke', the book will not in turn 'contain' his spirit.

Others are less convinced about Adolphus' transcendence. Sir Richard Fanshawe, sees that Adolphus succeeded only in that he 'Conquer'd himself a grave':

Kings are but mortall Gods I see,  
And they must dy like men, and fall  
Diff'ring from one of base degree  
Butt in their Funerall.<sup>46</sup>

These objections are in part answered by 'Vpon the most puissant and victorious Prince and Souldier, *Gustavus Adolphus*, King of *Sweden*', probably written by Richard Love, which scorns those, like Fanshawe, who 'mistake a *Trophie* for a *Tombe*.' In this poem, Adolphus'

---

<sup>44</sup>Richard Corbett, 'A small remembrance of the great King of Sweden', ll. 1-2, 5-8, in Poems, eds. J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 89-90.

<sup>45</sup>See Loxley, RP, p. 26.

<sup>46</sup>Sir Richard Fanshawe, 'Upon the report of fowre Kings dead at once', ll. 12-16, in Poems and Translations, ed. Peter Davidson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), Vol. I, p. 39.

transcendence is implicit in the fluidity of the imagery. For the Imperialists, the only escape from the Swedish king lies in death, so, at the moment at which he is killed, Adolphus quits his body 'to pursue the Chase'. Adolphus shifts from the realities of war to their metaphorical representation as he slips from his actual life to a figurative one. In the last line, as his body is thus sacrificed, a pun turns weapons into the means of preserving reputation: 'He is not canon'd: no, Hee's canonized.' Adolphus' career becomes a game with death, expressed in terms which again imply continuing influence: 'The game is done, / Others can part the stake, which he hath wonne'. The Swedish army, and by extension the Protestants in Europe, will be the ones to share Adolphus' 'winnings'.<sup>47</sup> Fanshawe emphasises the opposite in his poem, in which 'pale death' holds 'A Mournevell of Kings', that is, one of each suit, as in a game of cards. A certain scepticism in the humanist tradition emerges from Fanshawe's turn towards the idea of life as a game; for all his successes on the battlefield, what Adolphus finally achieved was a grave.

The only elegy included in The Swedish Intelligencer to carry an attribution is that by Henry King, which, like that of Russell, begins with a feeling of anxiety in silence. It is confirmation of Adolphus' death that King desires, and he addresses 'hoarse Rumour', asking her to 'Speake it again; and lowder; Lowder yet'.<sup>48</sup> Like Russell's, King's poem is suffused with images of spent energy:

In Great Gustavus' flame  
That Stile burnt out, and wasted to a Name  
Does barely live with us. (ll. 7-9)

---

<sup>47</sup>(1634; 23525.2), sig. 2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>48</sup>Henry King, 'An Elegy Upon the most victorious King of Sweden Gustavus Adolphus', ll. 15-7, in King, pp. 77-81.

Adolphus is a candle that has been snuffed out, and his 'Fame and Honour' (l.12) are the ash that remains. In both poems, the spending of energy, while creating confusion for the living, leads to a calm for the dead king. Towards the end of his elegy, King likens the fallen

Adolphus to a spring that slackens:

So thy Steele nerves of Conquest, from their steep  
Ascent declin'd, ly slack't in thy Last Sleep. (ll.119-20)

King's elegy also has in common with others a lament that Adolphus was merely flesh, and like everything else, transient; the example of the Swedish king, who 'Dost from Thyself a mournfull Lecture read / Of Man's short dated Glory' (ll. 54-5), implicitly becomes a 'mirror for princes':

Make Truth your Mirrour now; since You find all  
That flatter You, confuted by His Fall. (ll. 65-6)

What King adds to the other elegies is a greater historical emphasis; he considers Adolphus' 'Falcon-like' conquests (the image implies both stealth and speed, but also control and restraint) when he did 'cuff the Eagle in the German Sky' (ll. 43-4). The 'Eagle' here is that upon the Hapsburg arms, and stands for the Holy Roman Empire. As the poem progresses, King draws a comparison between Adolphus and Julius Caesar, who also fought in Germany:

When ore the Germans first his Eagle tow'r'd,  
What saw the Legions which on them he pow'r'd?  
But massy Bodyes, made their Swords to try,  
Subjects not for his Fight , but Slavery. (ll.93-6)

Caesar's conquest was over an unworthy opponent; he did not find a 'conqu'ring Army, nor a Tilley there' (l. 100). This is made clearer when King goes on to emphasise that Caesar's 'conquest' of Germany was not in fact a conquest at all, as he did 'the bank of Rhenus only touch':

But though his march was bounded by the Rhine,  
Not Oder, nor the Danube Thee confine ... (ll.106-8)

The 'Eagle' that Adolphus cuffed was not only that of the Holy Roman Empire, but also that of the earlier Roman armies. Had death not stopped him, King foresees Adolphus continuing to greater conquests, outspanning those of Caesar:

Thou mightst Vienna reach, and after Span  
From Mulda to the Baltick Ocean. (ll. 111-2)

Having thus exalted Adolphus to the level of the greatest of all generals, King offers the reader a sharp reminder of his earlier warnings: 'But Death hath Spann'd Thee' (l. 113). Gustavus is himself outspanned; the greater conquest will always belong to Death. The elegy concludes with King's contradictory impulses to demonstrate Adolphus' continuing influence, and to emphasise the irreparability of his loss. King's praise will allow Adolphus to claim a celestial influence over the mortal world:

The Breath of our just Praise  
Shall to the Firmament Thy Vertues Raise:  
Then Fixe, and Kindle Them into a Starre,  
Whose Influence may crowne Thy Glorious Warre. (ll. 129-32)

At the same time, the identity of the successor upon whom he will have influence remains unclear; King states that it is beyond him to 'divine / What Heire thou leavst to finish Thy Designe' (ll. 113-4).

Perhaps the most idiosyncratic poetic response to the death of Adolphus was that offered by Aurelian Townshend in a poem circulated in manuscript, 'Aurelian Townshend to Thomas Carew upon the death of the King of Sweden'. Townshend begins the poem by praising his fellow poet, Thomas Carew, for the musicality of his amorous verse:

I loue thy witt, that chooses to be sweete  
Rather then sharpe, therefore in Lirique feete  
Steales to thy mistris; letting others write  
Rough footed satires that in kissing bite.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup>Aurelian Townshend, 'Aurelian Tounsend to Thomas Carew upon the death of the King of Sweden', ll. 7-10, in Carew, Appendix D, pp. 207-8.

As he continues, Townshend perceives that, in the wake of Adolphus' death, public affairs now take precedence over private matters, and that in these changed circumstances, 'it was the duty of the poet to tune Orpheus's harp accordingly'.<sup>50</sup> What Townshend requests is a response from Carew to 'The too true nuse of the dead conquering king', a task to which he would be equal as an elegist of the 'deuine *Donne*' (ll.18, 16). In suggesting the form that such a poem might take, Townshend employs a conventional image of tears swelling the seas and inundating the world:

Lett our land waters meeting by consent  
The showres desending from the Firmament;  
Make a new floode; ... (ll. 19-21)

The world without Adolphus visibly darkens, turning the swan's 'snowe white plumes ... to sable black' (l. 28), leaving only Adolphus' sword as a source of light:

His sword shall like a fierie piller stand,  
Or like that graspt in the angrie Angells hand,  
Before his Herse: needing no other light  
But what hee gaue it to make day of night. (ll. 29-32)

This passage has several possible meanings, depending on the book of the Bible to which Townshend alludes. If, as Peter Davidson suggests, the reference is to Genesis 3:24, 'and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way', then the hearse stands looking over a world that after Adolphus' fall is postlapsarian.<sup>51</sup> Alternatively, if we accept Sharpe's judgment that the allusion is to Revelation 1:16, 'and out of his mouth went a sharp twoedged sword: and his countenance *was* as the sun shineth in his strength', then the passage is more apocalyptic, but also more hopeful, as Adolphus' death

---

<sup>50</sup>Kevin Sharpe, Criticism And Compliment: The politics of literature in the England of Charles I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 176-7.

<sup>51</sup>See PR, p. 199n.



presages a rebirth, and ultimately salvation.<sup>52</sup> A third possibility is that the passage refers to the pillar of cloud and fire that leads the Israelites through the desert (Exodus 13: 21-2), and Townshend presents Adolphus at Lützen as a Moses standing on Pisgah, in sight of a Protestant promised land that he will not enter. In a similar manner to King, Townshend implies that Charles must fulfil the role of Joshua to Adolphus' Moses:

His gloryus gauntletts shall vnquestioned lye,  
Till handes are found fitt for a monarchie. (ll. 35-6).

It is the 'Phenix' (l. 47) of Adolphus' fame that continues on earth, just as King sees the 'Phœnix' of his soul rising from the flames

Whilst, as in Deathless Urnes, each noble mind  
Treasures Thy Ashes which are left behind. (King, ll. 125-6)

Recalling Adolphus' popular soubriquet of 'lion', Townshend ends by addressing his poem once more to Carew:

If in the toyle of tongues his feareles name  
Be caught by such as would perplex his fame,  
A mouse may free him from those Aspes that lye  
Hissing in holes till they truthbitten dye. (ll. 55-8)

The reference is to Aesop's fable of the Mouse and the Lion; Adolphus is the lion whose name is caught in the trap of rumour and detraction, with poetry, and perhaps Carew's elegy specifically, as the mouse that will free him from these bonds.

Carew produced a response to Townshend, known by the title. '*In answer of an Elegiacall Letter upon the death of the King of Sweden from Aurelian Townsend, inviting me to write on that subject*'. In *The Two Famous Pitcht Battels*, Russell openly criticises those who take a more irenic stance towards the Protestant struggle in Germany, complaining that English complacency towards '*Warres and Woes*' is such 'That now you cannot their rough

---

<sup>52</sup>Sharpe, p. 174 and n.

Name endure'. It is unclear whether Russell has in mind Carew's poem, which circulated only in manuscript, and instead he may criticise more generally the 'explicit' and 'pervasive' style of 'Caroline Arcadianism'.<sup>53</sup> The opposing stances with regard to the wars in Europe find expression in aesthetics; Russell voices his anxiety that his dissonant verses will displease the tender English, and states that

Your *Amorettoes* think them farre to rough,  
Not smooth, nor pleasing, nor half low enough:  
They cannot screw them any wayes to suit  
Or consort with their sweet-tun'd warbling *Lute*: ... (Russell (1634; 21460), 32)

Carew's poem was for a long time read on these terms as displaying a 'smug and complacent insularity', although more recent criticism has emphasised the means by which the text's vigorous affirmation of the benefits of peace emerges from an awareness of the realities of war and an appreciation of Adolphus' achievement.<sup>54</sup>

Carew begins by addressing Townshend, 'Why dost thou'sound, my deare *Aurelian*, / In so shrill accents, from thy *Barbican*'.<sup>55</sup> This is at once a personal reference to the area of London near Aldersgate where Townshend was living, and a joke chiding him for appearing to take up a martial position, and securing himself within fortifications. Carew's response is

---

<sup>53</sup>Annabel Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 147.

<sup>54</sup>Gerald M. Maclean, *Time's Witness: Historical Representation In English Poetry, 1603-1660* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), p. 95; Malcolm Smuts agrees that the poem is 'the single most effective statement of the theme that innocent pastoral pleasures are superior to military heroism' (Smuts, p. 252); Thomas Corns instead sees a more active nationalism in the poem, in the form of a confident statement that involvement in the conflict will not serve the national interest (Thomas N. Corns, 'Thomas Carew, Sir John Suckling, and Richard Lovelace' in Corns, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry, Donne to Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 200-220, p. 205); For James Loxley, the poem performs 'a balancing act' that attests to the merits of an international Protestantism while it 'also forcefully asserts the importance of a complementary emphasis' (Loxley, *RP*, pp. 25-6); Robert Wilcher contends that 'the creation of an image of that golden age through art does not preclude an awareness of the facts of the real world', and holds that Carew's object 'was to counter an unthinking enthusiasm for the *idea* of war' among his contemporaries (Wilcher, *WR*, pp. 15-16). For a reading that prefigures my own in certain respects, see Sharpe, pp. 145-8.

<sup>55</sup>Thomas Carew, 'In answer of an Elegiacall Letter upon the death of the King of Sweden from Aurelian Townsend, inviting me to write on that subject', ll. 1-2, in Carew, pp. 74-7.

to decline Townshend's invitation; he instead surveys the carnage caused by the European wars:

And (since 'twas but his Church-yard) let him have  
For his owne ashes now no narrower Grave  
Then the whole *German* Continents vast wombe,  
Whilst all her Cities doe but make his Tombe. (ll. 31-4)

Like Fanshawe, Carew sees that Adolphus succeeded only in conquering himself a grave, albeit one so large that it swallows an entire country along with him. Nothing less than all of Germany's cities will sufficiently house the remains of a man who stood as large on the world scene as Adolphus: 'Whilst all her Cities doe but make his Tombe'. He then evokes the language of the first of Virgil's *Eclogues* as he counsels Townshend to count his blessings:

But let us that in myrtle bowers sit  
Vnder secure shades, use the benefit  
Of peace and plenty, which the blessed hand  
Of our good King gives this obdurate Land, ... (ll. 45-8)<sup>56</sup>

England is 'obdurate' in the sense that there exists a large and vocal minority demanding intervention, who at the same time must be hardened to accounts of slaughter and suffering. Carew includes in the poem a long description of a masque which he names as 'the *SHEPHERDS PARADISE*', a pastoral drama by Walter Montagu performed at the Queen's court, but which in fact more closely fits Townshend's masque *Tempe Restored*.<sup>57</sup> The aim is to offer a vision of peace in contrast to the clamour for war. The poem ends with Carew once again turning to Townshend:

Beleeve me friend, if their prevailing powers  
Gaine them a calme securitie like ours,  
They'le hang their Armes up on the Olive bough,  
And dance, and revell then, as we doe now. (ll. 101-4)

---

<sup>56</sup>Michael P. Parker notes that Carew's 'peace and plenty' expands on Virgil's 'otia' in order 'to suggest a national concord as opposed to a state of mere individual repose' ('Carew's Politic Pastoral: Virgilian Pretexts in the "Answer to Aurelian Townsend"', *John Donne Journal* 1 (1982), 101-16: 109).

<sup>57</sup>See Carew, p. 252n.



earth, and made our darknesse bright' (ll. 14-16). Carew does not compare himself with a fancy of such energy, and professes his unworthiness to commemorate the older poet:

And so whil'st I cast on thy funerall pile  
Thy crowne of Bayes, Oh, let it crack a while,  
And spit disdain, till the devouring flashes  
Suck all the moisture up, then turne to ashes. (ll. 83-6)

The elegy concludes with Carew conferring on Donne the title of 'King' as he ascends to 'The universall Monarchy of wit' (ll. 95-6), exalting 'his taste, his judgement, his word, his authority', and, with Donne gone, leaving Carew himself as 'sole and absolute ruler of the monarchy of wit that he created'.<sup>61</sup> One of the commendatory poems in Russell's volume attacks poets 'That th'Empire claim of *Poetrie* and *Prose*', and is perhaps a response to Carew's elevation of Donne (and of himself) to a kingly position.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, Russell's complaint that martial poetics 'are too loftie for a *Womans* voice' may seek to pour scorn on the idea of 'a line / Of masculine expression' that Carew perceives in his elegy (ll. 38-9).<sup>63</sup>

Returning to the letter to Townshend, we see that Carew cites two reasons for declining his friend's request. The first is that his 'Lirique feet', that Townshend admired, know only 'the smooth soft way / Of Love, and Beautie', so that it is inappropriate for him to 'Prophane' Adolphus' hearse 'with th'humble touch of their low verse' (ll. 6-10), following the conventional topos in elegiac literature that words are futile.<sup>64</sup> The second is that he will

---

<sup>61</sup>Diana Benet, 'Carew's Monarchy of Wit', in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., "The Muses Common-Weale: Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century" (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988), 80-91, p. 91.

<sup>62</sup>Russell (1634; 21460), sig. 2<sup>r</sup>1<sup>r</sup>.; see Norbrook, WR, pp. 66-7.

<sup>63</sup>Scott Nixon suggests that neither Carew nor his contemporaries would necessarily have considered Carew's 'soft melting Phrases' inferior to Donne's 'masculine expression, and cites Townshend's poem to Carew as evidence ('Carew's Response to Jonson and Donne', Studies in English Literature 39:1 (Winter 1999), 89-109: 102). Nonetheless, one could equally cite Russell's poem in support of what Nixon terms a 'modern critical assumption'.

<sup>64</sup>Raymond A. Anselment, 'Thomas Carew and the "Harmlesse Pastimes" of Caroline Peace', Philological Quarterly 62:2 (Spring 1983), 201-219: 204.

not presume that he is equal to the task, invoking '*Virgil ... Lucan ... Tasso ... Donne*', and claiming that 'the united labour of their wit' would not provide a fitting epitaph (ll. 11-14). This assertion is double-edged. At first glance, it seems that Carew is restating that his poetics are not suited to martial elegy, but the following lines give the impression that he doubts the fitness of this topic for any poet:

His actions were too mighty to be rais'd  
Higher by Verse, let him in prose be prays'd,  
In modest faithfull story, which his deedes  
Shall turne to Poems: when the next Age reades  
Of *Frankfort, Leipsigh, Worsburgh*, of the *Rhyne*;  
The *Leck*, the *Danube*, *Tilly*, *Wallenstein*,  
*Bavaria*, *Papenheim*, *Lutzenfield*, where Hee  
Gain'd after death a posthume Victorie, ... (ll. 15-22)

The catalogue of foreign names mimics the similar lists of Adolphus' victories and opponents that one finds in The Swedish Intelligencer, and sounds deliberately unnatural; the wars in Germany are not only alien to English interests, but also to English poetry. An elegy on Adolphus would be beyond the worthies that Carew names, because it is properly the subject of history or the chronicle; the concerns of poetry should be different:

Leave we him then to the grave Chronicler,  
Who though to Annals he can not refer  
His too-briefe storie, yet his Journals may  
Stand by the *Caesars* yeares, ... (ll. 25-8)

Like Corbett, Carew implies that the reader should turn to The Swedish Intelligencer for a proper tribute to the Swedish king. The naming of 'Annals' most probably refers to Tacitus, and, like King, Carew suggests that, commemorated in prose, Adolphus' victories will outlast the achievements with of Caesar, including the Julian calendar ('*Caesars* yeares').

Carew is drawing an important distinction here; whereas Russell's volume may criticise him for claiming dominion over both poetry and prose, here he insists upon their essential separation. Looking again at Townshend's verses, we note how he imagines

Adolphus' bodie 'wound about with bayes' (l. 23), as well as leading the funeral procession 'to the muses hill' until it is come 'vpon Pernassus double Toppe' (ll. 25, 43). Parnassus, of course, symbolises the ideal home of poetry and is the source of all artistic inspiration; in short, Townshend's imagined obsequies grant Adolphus the status of poet. It is against this, rather than any notional war faction, that Carew writes. If Townshend means an allusion to Christ in the Revelation in his poem, then he intends Adolphus to be, in Sharpe's phrase, 'a monarch over all nature',<sup>65</sup> and implies that the Swedish monarch may usurp Donne's 'universall Monarchy of wit'. It is in this context that we can understand his description of Townshend's masque as a reminder to his friend of the primacy of poetry, capable of expressing truths far higher than history. For Carew, poetry is more than the mouse that will free the lion of Adolphus from the bonds of rumour and detraction.

Yet for all that, Adolphus is a figure who looms large in, and even dominates Carew's poem.<sup>66</sup> Carew's affirmation of the benefits of the Caroline peace derives its force from his clear-sighted appreciation of not only the shortcomings, but also the substantial achievements of Adolphus' martial exploits. The many allusions to Virgil's first Eclogue are not mere decoration, but serve to heighten the contrast between the Britain cut off from the world, and the wars that ravage the rest of that world. The pastoral masque sits at the centre of Carew's poem, but is surrounded by descriptions of Adolphus' achievements, and of the destruction in Germany. Carew's poem may celebrate 'our *Halcyon* dayes' (l. 96), but his choice of phrase, referring to the short period in winter when kingfishers build their nests, 'reflects his own recognition of how tenuous the *pax carolina* really was'.<sup>67</sup> The strength of the 'Answer to

---

<sup>65</sup>Sharpe, p. 174.

<sup>66</sup>Joanne Altieri, 'Responses to a Waning Mythology in Carew's Political Poetry', Studies In English Literature 26 (1986), 107-124: 116.

<sup>67</sup>Parker, 'Carew's Politic Pastoral', 113.

Townshend' lies in Carew's understanding that, in the duel between English violins and German guns, there is a real risk that the roar of cannon will be triumphant.



‘HALCYON DAYES’: POETRY OF THE CAROLINE PEACE 1632-1639

Similar emotions are expressed in Sir Richard Fanshawe’s poem that in the 1648 edition of his works bears the title ‘Ode Upon occasion of His Majesties Proclamation in the yeare 1630. Commanding the Gentry to reside upon their Estates in the Country’, although James Loxley suggests a later date for the poem.<sup>68</sup> The Proclamation to which the title refers was in fact issued twice, on 9 September 1630 and 20 June 1632. Loxley suggests that the date of the first proclamation, concerned specifically with the effects of an outbreak of plague in London, is incompatible with the poem’s description of an ideal rural summer. Certainly, the campaign of Gustavus Adolphus mentioned in the fourth stanza had only been in progress for two months before the first proclamation, and the references to him in the present tense, as if he were still alive, would place the date of the poem’s composition between the issuing of the second proclamation and his death in the November of the same year, making the ‘Ode’ closer temporally to Carew’s ‘Answer’, and the similarities between them even more striking.

Fanshawe’s ‘Ode’ begins as the poet cast his eyes over a world ravaged by war, albeit from a distance. The war in the Spanish Netherlands resumed in 1621, a distance in time which Fanshawe emphasises with his use of the perfect tense: ‘*Holland* for many yeares hath beene / Of Christian tragedies the stage’.<sup>69</sup> The causes of this conflict are lost in the past, and are of no concern to the present speaker. ‘*France* that was not long compos’d’ finds herself again embroiled in war; the construction of the sentence implies the country’s passivity as she ‘Receives new wounds’ (ll. 9, 12). The only active figure in Fanshawe’s Europe is Adolphus, who ‘Plucks the Imperiall Eagles wing’, anticipating King’s image of the Swedish monarch as a falcon, while ‘Revenging lost *Bohemia*’ (ll. 14, 17). Fanshawe suggests his remoteness

---

<sup>68</sup>See Loxley, *RP*, p. 47.

<sup>69</sup>Sir Richard Fanshawe, ‘An Ode Upon occasion of his Majesties Proclamation in the yeare 1630’, ll. 5-6, in *Poems And Translations*, Vol. 1, pp. 55-9.

from the war between the Poles and the Russians by his disinclination to tell of that conflict: 'What should I tell of Polish Bands, / And the blouds boyling in the North?' (ll. 21-2). The war distracts the Russians from their usual business of repelling 'Th'invading Turke' (l. 28). While Russell later describes the Turks gloating over Christendom's division, Fanshawe shows the Muslims themselves 'suffer schisme', as Turkey 'now sustaines a Persian storme', fighting a war 'to reforme / Mahumetisme' (ll. 29-32). Fanshawe employs a Virgilian topos as he ascribes this disorder to the activity of the Furies, Tisiphone, Megara, and Alecto, noting that 'everywhere *Erynnis* raignes'; everywhere, that is, except England.

Using phrasing similar to that contained in the second proclamation of 1632,<sup>70</sup>

Fanshawe decries the behaviour of the gentry, who behave as if England were at war,

And come to save our selves as twere  
In walled Townes. (ll. 51-2)

This stanza anticipates Carew's playful chiding of Townshend for residing in a '*Barbican*'. In both poems, people at peace voluntarily and unnecessarily subject themselves to a state of siege. The walled town is a microcosm of the position that Britain occupies in Europe. Fanshawe emphasises this in his recall of Virgil's first *Eclogue*, describing the British Isles as '(A world without the world)' (l. 34). While the gentry 'Leave the despised Fields to clownes' (l. 50), the English abandon the fields of Europe to war; the 'clownes' may perhaps derive from the usual term for the Rutulian forces in Phaer's *Aeneid*. Charles' proclamation will restore the gentry, and with them, order, to the countryside. Rural peace and order are the result of an organic connection with the land:

The sapp and bloud o'the land, which fled  
Into the roote, and choackt the heart,  
Are bid their quickning pow'r to spread

---

<sup>70</sup>See Loxley, *RP*, pp. 46-7.

Through ev'ry part. (ll. 65-8)

Just as the gentry will spread life throughout the land, so 'White Peace' (l. 37) may similarly spread peace throughout Europe from her abode in England. The means that will achieve this are unclear, as weapons are absent from this poem. The implication is that peace will breed from the ordered land in the same way that it will breed a '*Virgill*' (l. 76), and the '*Augustus*' that he will commemorate. In its movement from microcosm to macrocosm, the poem implies the emergence of a 'pax Carolina'.

This organic connection between peace and proper husbandry of the land is emphasised by other contemporaneous poems. Ralph Knevet's 'The Vote' celebrates the laying down of arms and a turning towards agriculture.<sup>71</sup> In a series of emblematic commonplaces, organic life reclaims weaponry. A helmet becomes a beehive, rabbits and doves breed in cannons, and it is only mice that fight in musket-barrels. The cacophony of war is silenced:

The ventriloquious drumme  
(Like Lawyers in vacations) shall be dumme: ... (ll. 17-18)

Knevet plays with the meaning of the word 'drumme'; in one sense, the 'ventriloquious drumme' is the actual instrument and its low, throbbing sound. The same word also applies to the officer who would beat the drum to recruit soldiers or begin a march, and who 'should also be a linguist, because often times he may be sent unto the enemy' as one who speaks for his army.<sup>72</sup> Weapons turn into agricultural implements:

Sharp pikes may make,  
Teeth for a rake:  
And the keene blade, th'arch enemy of life,  
Shall bee digraded to a pruneing knife: ... (ll. 5-8)

---

<sup>71</sup>Ralph Knevet, 'The Vote', in *PR*, pp. 217-8.

<sup>72</sup>Hexham (1637; 13624), p. 5.

These lines seem to draw on a passage from Isaiah 2:4:

and they shall their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

With this allusion in mind, it is possible to perceive the similarities in sentiment between 'The Vote' and Fanshawe's poem. In both, England chooses peace, concentrating on making the land live rather than run with blood. Each poem looks forward to a coming era of peace, free of conflict between nations because they have all followed the example of England. In 'The Vote', arms are given up as the necessary sacrifice in order to secure peace.

Thomas Randolph's 'An Ode to Mr Anthony Stafford to hasten him into the Country' is another poem that extols the virtue of rural life over 'the chargeable noise of this great Towne'.<sup>73</sup> The poet bids farewell to the 'City-wits that are / Almost at Civill warre' (ll. 10-11), and appears prescient in his identification of London as a source of unrest, and of the need to retreat as 'all the world grows mad' (l. 13). The 'Clownes' that Fanshawe sees occupy the countryside now populate the city (l. 45). This poem too employs the georgic topos that connects peace with husbandry, but the last stanza remains ambiguous; Randolph and Stafford will raise their cups to drink the health of George, Baron Berkeley, the dedicatee of Stafford's The Guide of Honour:

I'll take my pipe and try  
The *Phrygian* melody;  
Which he that heares  
Lets through his eares  
A madnesse to distemper all the braine.  
Then I another pipe will take  
And *Dorique* musique make,  
To Civilize with graver notes our wits againe. (ll. 77-84)

---

<sup>73</sup>Thomas Randolph, 'An Ode to Mr Anthony Stafford to hasten him into the Country', l. 4, in PR, pp. 223-6.

Randolph implies the power of verse both to incite 'A madnesse' and to 'Civilize with graver notes'. He contrasts the abandon of the Phrygian mode, associated with 'frightful wars' by the painter Nicolas Poussin,<sup>74</sup> with the steady control of the Dorian, and may be making a similar point to that made in Carew's answer to Townshend concerning the civilising, pacifying qualities of poetry. Yet, as Plato suggests, the Dorian mode was appropriate for the brave man in warlike action, or a similarly difficult task. Randolph's pastoral thus ends with the scholars retreating to the country, perhaps not to restore the peace, but instead to prepare for a military undertaking.

Other poets maintain Carew's and Fanshawe's identification of the king with peace as the decade continues. Writing after Charles' return from a state visit to Scotland in 1633, Henry King likens the king's re-entry into London on 20 July to the return of summer and golden weather:

So breakes the Day, when the Returning Sun  
Hath newly through his Winter Tropick run:  
As You (Great Sir!) In this Regresse come forth  
From the remoter Climate of the North.<sup>75</sup>

In certain respects, King's image accords with other commemorative interpretations of Charles' return, such as the medal produced by Nicholas Briot, which depicts, above a detailed view of London, the sun emerging from behind the clouds to the north.<sup>76</sup> The sun, of course, was also an image that was very recently associated with Adolphus, and there may certainly be an implicit criticism of the royal couple in the idea that Charles' Catholic consort, lacking his beams to reflect, only 'dimly shone, like Venus in a Cloud' (l. 24). More explicitly

---

<sup>74</sup>See Richard Wendorf, William Collins and Eighteenth-Century English Poetry (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981), p. 139.

<sup>75</sup>Henry King, 'Upon the King's happy Returne from Scotland', ll. 1-4, in King, pp. 81-2.

<sup>76</sup>See John Peacock, 'The visual image of Charles I' in Thomas Corns, ed., The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 176-239: p. 193.

panegyric is the poem contributed by a youthful Abraham Cowley to a collection from Westminster School to commemorate the event, where he compares Charles favourably to the great generals of antiquity:

Great *Charles*; Let *Cæsar* boast *P[ha]rsalias* fight,  
*Honorius* praise the *Parthians* unfeyn'd flight.  
Let *Alexander* call himself *Joves* peere,  
And place his image next the Thunderer, ...<sup>77</sup>

Charles is above Caesar as he appears in the Pharsalia, and, by extension, above civil war.

Cowley seems to be suggesting that Charles has moved beyond Caesar and Alexander, meaning that his monarch remains aware that the arts of war are necessary to the preservation of peace, but that the 'equall balance' of Charles' reign renders them unnecessary, making the king 'most neere, most like the Deitie' (p. 47).

---

<sup>77</sup>Abraham Cowley, 'On his Majesties returne out of Scotland', in Cowley, Vol. II, p. 47.

## ‘THIS NORTHERN STORM’: THE BISHOPS’ WARS 1639-1641

Charles’ next return from Scotland was in far less happy circumstances. Clarendon recalls the surprise at the sudden arrival of rebellion into the garden of England:

A small, scarce discernible Cloud arose in the North; which was shortly after attended with such a Storm that never gave over raging, till it had shaken, and even rooted up the greatest and tallest Cedars of the three Nations; blasted all its Beauty, and Fruitfulness; brought its Strength to Decay, and its Glory to Reproach, and almost to Desolation; by such a Career and Deluge of Wickedness, and Rebellion, as by not being enough foreseen, or, in Truth suspected, could not be prevented.<sup>78</sup>

In The Civill Warre, Cowley conveys a similar sense of shock:

Then Sixteene Yeeres we endur’d our Happinesse:  
Till in a Moment from the *North* we find  
A *Tempest* conjur’d up without a *Wind*. (CW, I. 92-4)

If in this passage, as one critic states, ‘Cowley lacks any of Lucan’s sense of the tensions and disharmonies within political orders’,<sup>79</sup> it is because of the general surprise that greeted the northern uprising. Indeed, Cowley may intend a parallel between Roman and English history, recalling Lucan’s comparison of Caesar’s army with a thunderbolt that strikes from a cloudless northern sky (Pharsalia, I. 533-5). Cowley was perhaps inspired to draw this parallel by the passage in The True Informer in which the interlocutor Peregrine ‘must looke Northward, for there the cloud began to condense first’.<sup>80</sup> The cause of the Bishops’ Wars of 1639 and 1640 lies in Charles’ attempt in 1637 to press the Book of Common Prayer onto the church of Scotland. In response, an assembly of Scottish noblemen meeting in Greyfriars’ Kirk in Edinburgh on 28 February 1638 drew up the National Covenant, a declaration of Calvinist doctrine and Presbyterian church government in opposition to Charles’ plans. All attempts at settlement failed, and Charles sought to impose the Prayer Book by force. In the

---

<sup>78</sup>The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon ... Written by Himself (3 vols.; Oxford, 1759), I, p. 71.

<sup>79</sup>Norbrook, WR, p.84.

<sup>80</sup>Howell, (1643; H3122), p. 10.

event, the First Bishops' War was a military disaster for Charles. An expeditionary force largely composed of Irish Catholics, under the command of the Marquis of Hamilton, failed to prevent the Covenant Army from securing important strongholds like Aberdeen and Edinburgh Castle. As the Scots subsequently marched south, a royal army of around twenty thousand men was joined by Charles at the border on 30 May 1639. On 4 June, the Earl of Holland led an advance party of a thousand cavalry and three thousand infantry into Scotland. Mounted soldiers being capable of far swifter advance than their counterparts on foot, the cavalry were on their own when they encountered the Covenant Army, under their general Alexander Leslie, at Kelso. In the face of the Scots' numerical superiority, the English force retreated. Soon after this embarrassing incident, peace negotiations began on 10 June.

After this defeat, Charles returned to London, and in December of the same year decided to call a Parliament. The 'Short Parliament', as it came to be known, opened on 13 April 1640, but was quickly dismissed by Charles on 5 May. With the collapse of the parliament came the collapse of the peace negotiations, and this led towards the Second Bishops' War. The English record in this affair was even less auspicious than that in the First. On 20 August 1640, Charles once again left London to join his army, as the Scots crossed the border and marched towards Newcastle. Charles' army, though numbering at least twenty-five thousand, were a far from efficient fighting force, barely trained and badly armed, and only a token defence could be mustered to resist the advancing Scots. At Newburn, the two armies met across the river Tweed, and waited for the tide to go out. When an impetuous English officer opened fire at the enemy, the covenanters angrily crossed the river, upon which the English refused to fight, and retired to Newcastle, before retreating south. The upshot of the 'war' was that Charles was forced to sign the Treaty of Ripon, which acquiesced to Scottish occupation of Northumberland and Durham, and paid the Scots £850 a



day until peace was concluded. It was the hole that this made in royal finances that forced Charles to call another parliament.

The Bishops Wars were largely bloodless affairs, and on the part of the English there was a reluctance to draw their swords in a conflict for which they had little enthusiasm. John Kenyon points out that things 'might have been different if the army had been stiffened by a corps of mercenaries, or led by a committed, warlike nobility', and suggests that in the second conflict Charles was hampered both by fears that his raising an army would leave 'no further restraint on his authority' and that, in his efforts to raise the militia, 'southern counties, well out of the Scots immediate reach, proved even less willing to give of their best'.<sup>81</sup> This is not to say that Charles' call for military support was met with complete indifference. Sir Henry Slingsby recalls seeing troops training, regarding such events as

strange spectacles to this nation, in this age that have lived thus long peaceably, without noise of drum or shott, and after we have stood neuters, and in peace, when all the world besides hath been in armes.

He adds that the war entailed 'extraordinary preparation', and that 'the greatest part of the nobility and gentry of this kingdom was personally engaged, every one comeing according to his ability'.<sup>82</sup> Among the many that volunteered or provided troops were poets - Sir John Suckling, Thomas Carew and Richard Lovelace. Suckling was particularly animated in his preparations for the campaign; according to John Aubrey, he 'at his own chardge, rayased a Troope, of a hundred very handsome young proper men, whom he cladd in white doublets and scarlett breeches; and Scarlet Coates, hatts and ... feathers, well horsed and armed'.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> John Kenyon with Jane Ohlmeyer, 'The Background to the Civil Wars in the Stuart Kingdoms', in John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds., The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland and Ireland 1638-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 14-26.

<sup>82</sup> 'Memoirs of Sir Henry Slingsby, Bt.' in Original Memoirs, Written During The Great Civil War (ed. Sir Walter Scott) (Edinburgh, 1806), pp. 22-3, 26.

<sup>83</sup> John Aubrey, Brief Lives (ed. John Buchanan-Brown) (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000), p. 299.

Suckling's letters written during the campaign reveal a desire to fulfil an ideal of chivalric conduct, as well as a tendency towards self-dramatisation. The sight of the 'uneven running' of the Tweed brings to his mind Hotspur's quarrel in Henry IV, Part One, where the River Trent comes 'cranking in' (III. 1. 96-100). Writing in the days before Holland's disastrous advance, he is able to conceive of his regiment as 'like the Tower-Lyons in their Cages, leaving the people to think what we would do if we were let loose'.<sup>84</sup> The emphasis in the preparations of the royal army seems to have been on display and the representation of the king's power. Writing before a single shot had been fired, an English officer serving in the First Bishops' War states that 'here is a gallant company of cavaliers as brave in courage as in clothes'.<sup>85</sup> The reality of the condition of the king's armies could not match such an idealised image. John Aston, who volunteered for the king's service, complained in his journal that 'wee were never disciplined, nor mustered'.<sup>86</sup> On 1 May 1639, Sir Edmund Verney wrote that 'ther was never soe Raw, soe unskilfull & soe unwilling an Army brought to fight'.<sup>87</sup> These uncomfortable facts did little to dampen Suckling's spirits, for his greatest fear is that 'the Men of Peace will draw all this to a dumb shew, and so destroy a handsom opportunity which was now offered, of producing glorious matter for future Chronicle' (Letter 39, p. 144). His idea of the conflict becoming a 'dumb shew' suggests a mime, a dramatic representation of battle, and betrays an insecurity that the whole adventure will amount to no more than a gesture, a mere display of power rather than exercise of it. Suckling's fears are thus similar to

---

<sup>84</sup>Sir John Suckling, Works: The Non-Dramatic Works, ed. Thomas Clayton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), Letter 39, p. 144.

<sup>85</sup>David Stevenson, The Scottish Revolution, 1637-44: the triumph of the covenanters (Newton Abbot: David and Charles, 1973), p. 140.

<sup>86</sup>'The Journal of John Aston, 1639' in J. C. Hodgson, ed., Six North Country Diaries, Publications of the Surtees Society, CXVIII (1910), p. 5.

<sup>87</sup>Memoirs of the Verney Family ... from the papers ... at Claydon House, eds. F. P. and M. M. Verney (Third Edition, London: Longmans, 1925), vol. 1, pp. 183-4.

Aston's hopes, who believed that 'the king once heere, the faction in Scotland, like a mist by the breaking forth of the sunne, would dissipate and vanish'.<sup>88</sup> Aston may recall the language of the preacher Henry Valentine, who claims that the King 'by his *Lawes*, as the *Sun* by his *Beames*, dispels and scatters those deeds of Darknesse which otherwise would cover the face of the Common-weath'; in any case, as Wilcher notes, Valentine takes 'the conventional stuff of court panegyric and entertainment' and mobilises it 'to defend the office of the King against men ... over whom such imagery had no persuasive power'.<sup>89</sup> Aston hopes that the settlement of the conflict will require nothing more than a gesture from the monarch. Both Suckling and Aston were to be disappointed.

Watching events from a greater distance were two poets for whom the king's cause was bound up with the fate of one individual, Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland. Edmund Waller's 'To my Lord of Falkland' suggests that distance from the events described only increased the distortion of reality:

Brave Holland leads and with him Falkland goes.  
Who hears this told and does not straight suppose  
We send the Graces and the Muses forth,  
To civilize and to instruct the north?<sup>90</sup>

Although it is phrased as a rhetorical question, Waller makes a bald assertion that is immediately undone by an awareness that in no way will 'these ornaments make swords less sharp' (l. 5). As ostentatious display confronts very real weapons, the presence of the learned and wise will not be enough to avert war, any more than will the presence of the king. All that Waller can do is retreat into the world of myth, and hope that Falkland, like Apollo, can

---

<sup>88</sup>*Six North Country Diaries*, p. 5.

<sup>89</sup>Henry Valentine, *God Save The King* (London, 1639; STC 24575), p. 5; see Wilcher, *WR*, pp. 26-7.

<sup>90</sup>Edmund Waller, 'To my Lord of Falkland', ll. 1-4, in *Selected Poems of Abraham Cowley, Edmund Waller and John Oldham*, ed. Julia Griffin (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1998), pp. 58-9.

handle the 'bow' as well as he can the 'harp' (ll. 6-10). The consoling thought that Waller allows himself is that 'Some happy wind' will 'over the ocean blow / This tempest yet' (ll. 21-2). Rather than conclude with this hope, Waller continues by relating a 'dream' in which he compares England to Rebecca, who, pregnant with Jacob and Esau, 'found her womb the seat of civil war' (ll. 25, 28). The story is perhaps chosen because the biblical passage on which he draws is apposite given the situation within Charles' kingdom:

Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people will be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger. (Genesis 25:23)

The 'two nations' could easily be identified as England and Scotland, but Waller finds the comparison problematised because neither nation can be said to be the elder. The threat of one nation being stronger than the other becomes uncomfortable, as in Suckling's observation that 'the danger [of rebellion] now grown nearer, will divide the Body, by perswading each man to look to his own particular safety',<sup>91</sup> so Waller overcomes this by instead offering to the nation a message which looks beyond its immediate situation:

'Heav'n sends,' quoth I, 'this discord for our good,  
To warm, perhaps, but not to waste our blood;  
To raise our drooping spirits, grown the scorn  
Of our proud neighbours, who ere long shall mourn  
(Though now they joy in our expected harms)  
We had occasion to resume our arms.' (ll. 31-6)

Looking to the countries beyond 'all the sea our own' (l. 23), Waller is able to preserve Falkland's safety by portraying the present conflict as manoeuvres on the Artillery Ground, a mere dress rehearsal for a foreign campaign that will preserve peace and security. A reunified Britain becomes like a lion who appears distracted, but will turn on its foes with greater ferocity (ll. 37-40).

---

<sup>91</sup>Suckling, Works, Letter 42, p. 148.

Abraham Cowley's 'To the Lord Falkland. For his safe Return from the Northern Expedition against the *Scots*' is an even more distanced view of the events on the border; where Waller can address Falkland as a 'noble Friend', Cowley sees him as the treasured property of the nation:

Great is thy *Charge*, *O North*; be wise and just,  
*England* Commits her *Falkland* to thy trust;  
Return him safe: *Learning* would rather choose  
Her *Bodley*, or her *Vatican* to loose.<sup>92</sup>

Cowley's poem, in comparing Falkland to the libraries of Oxford and Rome, implies the snug confines of the academic world from which he writes his martial tribute. Much of Cowley's poem is spent establishing the space that exists between the military sphere and the scholarly one:

Whilst we who can no action undertake,  
Whom *Idleness* it self might *Learned* make,  
Who hear of nothing, and as yet scarce know,  
Whether the *Scots* in *England* be or no,  
Pace dully on, oft tire, and often stay,  
Yet see his nimble *Pegasus* fly away. (p.19)

There is a physical distance between Cowley and Falkland, which the poem emphasises in the faltering rhythm of the line 'Who hear of nothing, and as yet scarce know', where the only word that scans is 'nothing', suggesting the anxiety of the man left in England. There is also a mental distance between the man prepared to take arms and the man who will not:

Such is the *Man* whom we require the same  
We lent the *North*; untoucht as is his *Fame*.  
He is too good for *War*, and ought to be  
As far from *Danger*, as from *Fear* he's free. (p. 20)

Cowley's poem asks whether it would be possible for a man like Falkland (and by extension Cowley himself) to take up arms successfully. The poet recognises that the bringing of war to

---

<sup>92</sup>Abraham Cowley, 'To the Lord Falkland. For his safe Return from the Northern Expedition against the Scots', in Cowley, Vol. I, p. 19.

British soil has led to the emergence of some unsavoury characters ‘Whose *Valour* is the only *Art* they know’ (p. 20). Russell had celebrated Adolphus for mixing ‘*Valour*’ with ‘*Art*’; similarly, around the time of Cowley’s writing, Robert Ward observes that ‘*Valour* and *Policie* must goe inseparably together’, and requires that a Marshal ‘ought to bee a most approved Scholler ... [and] is also to be a most approved Souldier’, while a General must be ‘well studied in the liberall Arts’ and must possess ‘knowledge, valour, foresight, authority, and fortune’.<sup>93</sup> Cowley’s poem, in the form of the verse, for the moment maintains the distinction between the scholar and the soldier, in the poise of the last line: ‘Let *Them* the *State Defend*, and *He Adorn*’ (p. 20). The repetition of the ‘d’ sound in this last line perhaps mimics the beating of a drum, and the lure of the excitement of the battlefield which the scholar tries to resist.

Cowley’s distance from the embarrassment that was the Scottish campaign becomes clearer in his later poems on the subject. In *The Civill Warre*, he transforms the truce at Ripon into a divine act:

Noe bloud did then from this darke Quarrell flow:  
It gave blunt wounds that bled not out till now;  
For *Jove* who might have us’d his thundering power  
Chose to fall calmely in a golden shower. (CW, I. 101-4)

By recasting the treaty in which Charles bought peace at a punitive rate into Jupiter’s visit to Danaë, Cowley denies the humiliation that Charles suffered. In ‘*On his Majesties Return out of Scotland*’, he similarly celebrates that ‘This happy *Concord* in no *Blood* is writ’, and declares to Charles ‘You like a *God* your ends obtain’.<sup>94</sup> Like Waller in his poem on Falkland, Cowley hopes that the British can turn their military instincts to pursue glory abroad:

---

<sup>93</sup> Ward (1639; 25025), Book I, pp. 176, 207, Book II, p. 2.

<sup>94</sup> Abraham Cowley, ‘*On his Majesties Return out of Scotland*’, in Cowley, Vol. I, p. 22.

No *Blood* so loud as that of *Civil War*;  
It calls for Dangers from afar.  
Let's rather go, and seek out *Them* and *Fame*;  
Thus our *Fore-fathers* got, thus left a *Name*. (p. 23)

Cowley even uses the same image as Waller to represent England's position: 'So a bold *Lyon* ere he seeks his prey, / Lashes his sides, and roars, and then away' (p. 24). However, the call for Charles to become 'a new *Gustavus*' now sounds despairingly hollow, as if it belongs in a poem from the beginning of the decade, as does his belief that the treaty will herald a new era of peace:

The *Armour* now may be hung up to sight,  
And onely in their *Halls* the *Children* fright. (p. 23)

While Cowley seeks retreat from the distant threat of war, Lovelace finds solace in alcohol. In 'To Generall *Goring*, after the pacification at *Berwicke*', the poet and his comrades turn items of armour into bowls from which they drink to commiserate their loss:

Now the *Peace* is made at the Foes rate,  
Whilst men of Armes 'to Kettles their old Helmes translate,  
And drinke in Caskes of Honourable Plate;  
In ev'ry hand a Cup be found,  
That from all Hearts a health may sound  
To *Goring*! to *Goring*! see't goe round.<sup>95</sup>

Lovelace pointedly toasts his commanding officer, rather than a King who had bought peace at too high a rate, at least in terms of honour. The King is also absent from another poem by a writer seeking recuperation from the miserable experience of war. In his country-house poem 'To My Friend G. N., from *Wrest*', Carew compares his present feelings of tranquillity with those felt during his military experience:

I breathe, (sweet *Ghib*:), the temperate air of *Wrest*,  
Where I no more, with raging storms opprest,  
Weare the cold nights out by the banks of *Tweed*,

---

<sup>95</sup>Richard Lovelace, 'Sonnet. To Generall *Goring*, after the pacification at *Berwicke*', in Lovelace, p. 81.

On the bleake Mountains, where fierce tempests breed,  
And everlasting Winter dwells; ...<sup>96</sup>

Carew invokes the familiar figure of the rebellion as stormy weather, but now the expedition to the banks of the Tweed is but a memory. The poet escapes from the 'everlasting winter' of the Scottish border to Wrest Park in Bedfordshire, which is 'cherisht with the warme Suns quickning heate' (l. 11). Here, Carew employs the conventional imagery of the King's power, but it no longer serves as a metaphor, instead referring to its actuality. Charles is conspicuously absent from 'This Island Mansion' (l. 79). The characterisation of Wrest Park as an island implies its status as a fortress, and recalls the imagery of Fanshawe's 'Ode'. War and disorder have entered Fanshawe's bucolic paradise, and the land of peace and security has visibly shrunk. Carew ends the poem with an address to 'G. N.':

Thus I enjoy my selfe, and taste the fruit  
Of this blest peace, whilst toyl'd in the pursuit  
Of Bucks, and Stags, th'embleme of warre, you strive  
To keepe the memory of our Armes alive. (ll. 107-10)<sup>97</sup>

In 1604, Lodovick Lloyd writes 'hunting is a military exercise ... the like stratagems are often invented and executed in war against soldiers as the hunter doth against diverse kinds of beasts'.<sup>98</sup> The hunt becomes a suitable symbol of the situation beyond Wrest Park because, above all, it is a regular activity. G. N. will persist 'in the pursuit', and, if not successful, will resume the hunt; its recurrence is, if not inevitable, then confidently anticipated. For Carew, however, participation is not advisable, not least because G. N. is 'toyl'd' in it, as if the

---

<sup>96</sup>Thomas Carew, 'To My Friend G. N., from Wrest', ll. 1-5, in Carew, pp. 86-9.

<sup>97</sup>While Loxley is right to point out that the hunt in these lines is only 'the *representation* of the Scottish war', and that no direct involvement with the war is established by the poem (p. 60), we might also agree with Wilcher that Carew's poem addresses itself to those 'not content with the settlement reached at Berwick' (p. 32).

<sup>98</sup>Lodovick Lloyd, The practice of policy (London, 1604; STC 16627), pp. 32-3.



hunter becomes 'a prisoner of his own activity',<sup>99</sup> suggesting the potential self-destruction of the Scottish conflict. Carew's view of G. N.'s pursuit initially seems to be one of quiet disdain, with his striving resulting in failure, but his syntax does allow us to read his address as 'you strive *And* keep' alive the martial spirit, implying a heroism in his friend's activities. This ambiguity suggests that the poem does not necessarily mark a final retreat from public involvement, but rather suggests a questioning of the continued pursuit of armed conflict by the party surrounding the king.

---

<sup>99</sup>Michael P. Parker, "'To my friend G. N. from Wrest': Carew's Secular Masque' in Summers and Pebworth, eds., Classic And Cavalier: Essays on Jonson and the Sons of Ben (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982), 171-191, p. 186.

## ‘THE APPROACHING CLOUD’: HONOUR AND ARMED ROYALISM

Following the Bishops’ Wars, it was perceived in some quarters that the Thirty Years War, so long feared by Englishmen, had finally reached English shores. In some respects, the war in Germany had literally come to Britain; Suckling notes caustically that ‘*Lesly* [the Scottish general] ... took up a trade of killing men abroad, and now is return’d for Christs sake to kill men at home’.<sup>100</sup> The performance of men such as Leslie may have provoked the fears of men like Lord Brooke, the Lord Lieutenant of Warwickshire, who in late 1642 warns the officers of his county’s militia of the dangers of employing mercenaries:

we have now too woefull experience in this Kingdom of the German warres; and therefore cannot so well approve of the ayde of forraigne and mercinary auxiliaries. In Germany, they fought only for spoile, rapine and destruction, meere money it was and hope of gaine that excited the Souldier to that Service: ...

Brooke’s fear is not only that mercenaries have an interest in prolonging a conflict, but also that they will introduce into England the practice of the atrocities that scarred Germany. He concludes, ‘I had rather have a thousand or two thousand honest Citizens that can onely handle their armes, whose hearts goe with their hands, than two thousand of mercinary Souldiers, that boast of their forraigne experience’.<sup>101</sup> Others, mainly on the Royalist side, disagreed; in 1643, Sir Arthur Aston writes to Prince Rupert to complain he is

soe extreame dejected at this busines that I doe wish with all my harte that either I had sum German souldiers to commaund, or that I could infuse some German corradge into them, for yr English Commen souldiers are so poore and base that I could never have a greater affliction light uppon me than to be put to command any of them.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup>Suckling, *Works*, Letter 38, pp. 143–4.

<sup>101</sup>*A Worthy Speech Made by The Right Honourable the Lord Brooke, at the election of his Captaines and Commanders at Warwick Castle* (London, 1643; Wing B495), p. 7.

<sup>102</sup>Sir Arthur Aston to Prince Rupert, in W. A. Day, ed., *The Pythouse Papers* (London: Bickers and Son, 1879), pp. 12–13.

While the Bishops' Wars caused nothing like the carnage of the Thirty Years War, they did demonstrate that there were men in the country willing to take up arms for (or against) their king.

In the same letter, intended for general circulation under the title 'An Answer to a Gentleman in Norfolk that sent to enquire after the Scottish business', Suckling scorns the idea that the Scottish dispute was religious in origin, stating 'I should believe the question to be rather *A King or no King*, then *A Bishop or no Bishop*' (p. 143). While Suckling says little else in his letters concerning motivation, it is possible to glimpse a motive for his volunteering. In another letter, he reports the accusation made by Lord Lowden, who led one of the king's regiments, who claimed that Suckling's troops 'were Cavaliers that studied not the Cause but came for honor and love to the king' (Letter 40, p. 145). Suckling's use of the word 'cavalier' also suggests the influence of the Thirty Years' War on the British scene. The word, imported from Spanish, at the time still primarily meant 'horseman', although, in a dictionary published in 1611, John Florio further defined the term as meaning 'a poore beggarly knight that hath nothing but his sword and cloake' and 'a knight of *the drawn sword*, that an excellent whoremonger or notable wench' (my italics).<sup>103</sup> Graham Roebuck, investigating how the word came to be applied to soldiers of the King in the civil war, agrees with some contemporary commentators, including Clarendon and the astrologer William Lilly, that 'cavalier' became a term of abuse in London in 1641 at the earliest. He suggests that the 'unfamiliar' word was used because of a shared memory, among Puritan preachers at least, of its use during the Marprelate controversy, where it carried connotations of papism.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> John Florio, Queen Anna's New World of Words or Dictionarie of the Italian and English Tongues (London, 1611; STC 11099).

<sup>104</sup> See Graham Roebuck, 'Cavalier', in Summers and Peabworth, eds., The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 9-26.

One should also keep in mind the term's currency in the pages of The Swedish Intelligencer, where it is frequently used to refer to the Imperialist soldiers, again with connotations of papacy and barbarism. The cause that Lowden asserts, the primacy of the king's authority over the kirk in Scotland, may not have fired Suckling or his followers, but in trying to uncover the reasons why men chose to fight for their king in 1642, we find that the concepts of 'honour' and 'love to the king' are the most frequently reiterated.

The idea of the chase recurs in perhaps the most famous poem of Cavalier martial honour, Lovelace's 'To Lucasta. Going to the Wars'.<sup>105</sup>

True; a new Mistresse now I chase,  
The first Foe in the Field;  
And with a stronger Faith imbrace  
A Sword, a Horse, a Shield. (ll. 5-8)

In Carew's poem, hunting serves as a metaphor for war, while here, as Thomas Corns observes, war is a metaphor for hunting, or the 'chase'.<sup>106</sup> As the poet runs from the 'Nunnerie' of his beloved's breast towards 'Warre and Armes', we understand that these are not the arms of another woman, but instead his weapons. The new 'mistress' that he aims to conquer and subdue is in fact his enemy, whom he will fight in a single combat; he moves from the metaphorical warfare of love to a literal battlefield. Yet, this battlefield is also only a

---

<sup>105</sup>Richard Lovelace, 'To Lucasta, Going to the Wars', in Lovelace, p. 18. See also C. J. Wortham, 'Richard Lovelace's "To Lucasta, Going To The Warres": Which Wars?', Notes and Queries 26 (1979), 430-1, where it is argued that 'the poem has no direct connection either with the Civil War or with the Cavalier spirit of militant Royalism', but instead was occasioned by Lovelace's service abroad in support of France in 1646. Wortham bases his argument on two of Anthony Wood's assertions, specifically that Lovelace's 1649 collection was titled Lucasta because the poet had been in love with this lady 'some time before', and that 'To Althea. From Prison' was written in 1642. Wortham's interpretation of the first assertion is that Wood's phrase cannot refer to a period of seven years or more, and of the second that a lyric to another woman 'would then intrude within the cycle of poems to Lucasta'. Wortham's argument relies on a definite later date for the poem 'To Lucasta. From Prison', which may also belong to 1642. My own view is that the wars to which the poem refers, if any, are the Bishops' Wars, for, as Gerald Hammond suggests, 'while a civil war was being waged in England, involving all his family and many of his friends, Lovelace had fought in a side-show in France - a strange honour to have embraced in preference to the nunnery of Lucasta's chaste breast' ('Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', Proceedings of the British Academy 71 (1985), 203-34: 224).

<sup>106</sup>Corns, 'Thomas Carew, Sir John Suckling, and Richard Lovelace', p. 214.

metaphor, and, in a sense, make-believe. The weapons that he will pick up, 'a Sword' and 'a Shield', suggest a yearning for a more chivalric age, and a disappearing code of gentlemanly conduct. The lines also suggest a difficulty in conceiving of the reality of warfare, particularly for those more used to its metaphoric applications in the poetic tradition; as Simone Weil observes of novice soldiers,

they go off as though to a game, as though on holiday from the confinement of daily life ... the first contact of war does not immediately destroy the illusion that war is a game.<sup>107</sup>

The shield that Lovelace carries will afford little protection against the musket or the cannon. Far more genuine is the masculine 'imbrace' that he seeks, the presence of the comrades who will afford him the honour that he extols in the final stanza:

I could not love thee (Deare) so much,  
Lov'd I not Honour more. (ll. 11-12)

The placing of Lucasta in parentheses may suggest that she has all but slipped from his mind, yet she appears to have remained central to his thoughts. His love for honour will increase her esteem of him, so that while he appears inconstant, his becoming a soldier will make him more of a man, and so is in fact the highest display of fidelity.

In a sense, Lovelace's poem engages with the conventional opposition between the warrior and the lover. The Iliad, for example, compares unfavourably Paris, who pursues his wife, with Hector, who pursues the enemy. Helen, Paris' wife, joins Hector in this censure, wishing that her husband:

Had bene a man of much more spirit, and, or had noblier dar'd  
To shield mine honour with his deed or with his mind had knowne  
Much better the upbraids of men, that so he might have showne  
(More like a man) some sence of grieffe for both my shame and his.  
(Homer's Iliads, VI. 387-90)

---

<sup>107</sup>Weil, p. 21.

At the same time, Homer's epic suggests that love can be an important spur to the virtuous soldier, as when Hector expresses to Andromache that he would rather die than let his wife be enslaved, when people would say, 'This dame was Hector's wife' (VI. 500).<sup>108</sup> The overcoming of Mars by Venus, a union which produces as offspring the demi-goddess Harmonia, was a popular subject with late-Renaissance painters, and was familiar in the England of the 1630s because of the association of the myth with the marriage of Charles and Henrietta Maria.<sup>109</sup> That these views were of practical concern as well is shown in the correspondence of Henry Oxinden, and his cousin, also called Henry, who were, like Lovelace, both natives of Kent. His cousin writes to Oxinden in January 1642, advising him to lay his hands on some arms:

itt is Mars, not Venus, that now can helpe; shee is now so much outt of fashion that where shee herselfe heere present, in all her best fashines, she would bee the gazing stock of contempt to all but lashe and effeminate mindes. Were you but heere to heare the drummes, see the warlike postures and the glittering armour up and downe the towne, and behold our bleeding libertis att stake, itt would rouze your Sperits, if you have any left, socour that deepe drowsie lethergie you are now orewhelm'd in, ...<sup>110</sup>

Oxinden's response echoes the sentiment of Lovelace's final stanza:

Your counsell to rouse myself from the drowsie letargie you conceive I am in by being in Love, which you hold a signe of an effeminate minde, I take not amisse, yett give me leave to tell you, that he who doth not more then ordinarily love Venus, will hardly proove a good soldier under Mars.<sup>111</sup>

Sir William Davenant expresses disagreement with Oxinden's sentiments in 'The Souldier Going To The Field':

For I must go where lazy Peace

---

<sup>108</sup>See George Fenwick Jones, "'Lov'd I Not Honour More': The Durability of a Literary Motif", *Comparative Literature* 11:2 (Spring 1959), 131-143; pp. 135-6.

<sup>109</sup>See Edgar Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968), pp. 85-96.

<sup>110</sup>*The Oxinden Letters 1607-1642*, ed. Dorothy Gardiner (London: Constable, 1933), p. 272.

<sup>111</sup>*The Oxinden Letters*, p. 283.

Will hide her drouzy head;  
And, for the sport of kings, encrease  
The number of the dead.<sup>112</sup>

The battlefield is again the bed of a sleeping mistress, in this case 'peace'; like Lovelace, Davenant sees war as a metaphor for hunting, 'the sport of kings'. Davenant presents himself with a stark choice; he can serve his king or his mistress:

Can I in war delight,  
Who being of my heart bereft,  
Can have no heart to fight?

The conclusion of the poem suggests that he opts for his mistress. Oxinden's words find a stronger echo in Alexander Brome's '*To his Mistres affrighted in the wars*', where the poet announces, 'These troubles shall never trouble me':

Let *Canons* keep roaring  
And bullets still fly;  
While I am adoring  
Thee, my deity.<sup>113</sup>

Vowing to be his beloved's '*Champion*', Brome makes play with similar puns to Lovelace: '[No] Castle defends like a lover's arms' (ll. 11, 14). In the final stanza, which uses the traditional metaphor of the lovers' bed as battlefield, he states baldly, 'I *Venus* serve, a fig for *Mars*' (l. 21). While, in the preceding decade, the opposition of Mars and Venus was celebrated for finally producing harmony, as in Rubens' portrait of Charles as Saint George, in the 1640s poets seem to choose, metaphorically at least, one or the other. We should perhaps note that a word that is absent from Brome's poem is 'honour', as if he tacitly admits that this is what he will sacrifice in continuing the pursuit of his mistress.

---

<sup>112</sup>Sir William Davenant, 'The Souldier going to the Field' in The Shorter Poems, And Songs From The Plays And Masques, ed. A. M. Gibbs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

<sup>113</sup>Alexander Brome, '*To his Mistres affrighted in the wars*', ll. 2, 5-8, in Poems, ed. Roman R. Dubinski, 2 vols., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982).

Honour, in the sense of ‘reputation’ or ‘good name’ was an important commodity among the gentry in early modern England. While families could possess honour, and it could descend like a title, it was essentially something that is conferred: according to James Cleland, in his Propaideia, or the Institution of a Young Nobleman, ‘Honour is not in his hand who is honoured, but in the hearts and opinions of other men’.<sup>114</sup> Honour was not necessarily commensurate with wealth; in 1645, Lord Napier protests that his unjust imprisonment is ‘a wound to my honour and reputation, which men of honour prefer to life or fortune’.<sup>115</sup> Sir Thomas Peyton, who remained loyal to the King, writes to the Committee of Kent after the sequestration of his estates in 1644 that ‘all these I shall willingly give up and yett bee happie still if in the expiration of my fortune ... there appeare anything of iust honour’.<sup>116</sup> When he exclaims ‘Hang this wealth! let this money flee, / They cannot undo me, while I have thee’ (‘To his Mistres affrighted in the wars’, ll. 9-10), Brome seems to accept this division between wealth and honour. On the other hand, a military career was still considered to be a suitable occupation for gentleman, and a useful means of achieving honour. As I have already suggested, this prospect was enough to encourage many Englishmen to fight abroad during the seventeenth century, among them William Lovelace, the poet’s father.

The most ready path to honour lay through service to the King, as J. G. Marston explains:

The ultimate source of all honor was the King ... as the code of honor was based upon reciprocal obligations, the gentleman owed certain things to the King in return; among these were obedience, duty and reverence, as well as such specific services as might

---

<sup>114</sup>Cited in A. J. Fletcher, ‘Honour, Reputation and Local Officeholding in Elizabethan and Stuart England’ in Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson (eds.), Order And Disorder In Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 92-115, p. 93.

<sup>115</sup>Cited in J. G. Marston, ‘Gentry Honor and Royalism in Early Stuart England’, Journal of British Studies 13:1 (November 1973), 21-43, p. 27.

<sup>116</sup>The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642-1670, ed. Dorothy Gardiner (London: Sheldon Press, 1937), pp. 72-3.



from time to time be requested. Like the obligations to one's family, honorable gentlemen owed these duties to the King in the same concrete sense that they owed repayment to the creditor.<sup>117</sup>

Sir Edmund Verney, who was to die holding the royal standard at the battle of Edgehill, expresses this feudal idea of obedience to the King, in a famous letter to his friend Clarendon:

My conscience is only concerned in honour and gratitude to follow my master. I have eaten his bread and served him near thirty years, and will not do so base a thing as to forsake him, and choose rather to lose my life, which I am sure to do, to preserve and defend those things which are against my conscience to defend, for ... I have no reverence for the bishops, for whom this quarrel subsists.<sup>118</sup>

Many others echoed Verney's sentiments. Goring, Lovelace's commander in the Bishops' Wars, similarly explains that he merely gives tribute where due: 'I had it all from his Majesty, and he hath it all again'.<sup>119</sup> While Verney died holding the standard, the king's flag was an encouragement to others. Sir Bevil Grenville, who was also to die early in the king's service, observed of his decision to enlist for the king that 'I cannot contain myself within my doors, when the King of Ends Standard waves in the field upon so just occasion'.<sup>120</sup> It was after the civil war had begun that Edward Symmons, Chaplain to the Prince of Wales' Lifeguard, defined the cavalier ethos:

A complete Cavalier is a Child of Honour, a Gentleman well born and bred that loves his King for conscience sake, of a clearer countenance and bolder look than other men, because of a more loyal heart.<sup>121</sup>

The prince provides a pattern of obedience (in his service of God) that is to be followed by the subjects. This idea of loyalty could be difficult to renounce. Sir William, fifth Baron Paget, had criticised many of the king's policies in the Long Parliament, and was rewarded by

---

<sup>117</sup>Marston, pp. 35-6.

<sup>118</sup>Sir Edmund Verney, letter to Sir Edward Hyde, cited in Kenyon, p. 39.

<sup>119</sup>Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1644, p. xxxvi.

<sup>120</sup>Roger Granville, The History of the Granville Family (Exeter: William Pollard, 1895), p. 213.

<sup>121</sup>Edward Symmons, A Militarie Sermon ... Preached at Shrewsbury ... To His Majesty's Army (Oxford, 1644; Wing S6346), n. p.

the parliament with the position of Lord Lieutenant for Buckinghamshire, but, as war loomed, he wrote that

when I found a Preparation of Armes against the KING under the shadow of Loyaltie, I rather resolved, to obey a good Conscience then particular ends, and am now on my way to His Majesty, where I will throw my selfe down at his feet, and die a loyall Subject.<sup>122</sup>

Similarly, in 1642, as he marched with the king's army towards Edgehill, the 22-year old Lord Henry Spencer, who, like Paget, had been awarded a position of Lord Lieutenant (of Northamptonshire) by the Parliament, but could not take up arms against the Crown, wrote to his wife of his little enthusiasm for the conflict:

Neither is there wanting, Daily, handsom Occasion to retire, were it not for Grining Honour ... If there could be an Expedient found, to salve the Punctillio of Honour, I would not continue here an Hour.<sup>123</sup>

Ward perceives a connection between the virtue of loyalty to the King and that of military valour; in 1639, he writes that 'Obedience and loyalty are the Nerves and Sinewes which strengthen and unite the members of a body politicke to the head, and the strongest Fortifications that Kingdomes can bee defended with', adding that 'the true root from Whence Loyaltie and obedience springs' is the 'seeking and working such things as may bring Honour and safetie to their Prince and State'. He goes on to suggest that the highest motive for which a soldier can fight is to gain honour: 'hee that hath a love to follow the Warres, takes a pleasure and delight in it, which ariseth from the sweetnesse of the object,

---

<sup>122</sup>William, Baron Paget, The Copy of the Letter sent from The Right Honourable The Lord Paget unto The Honourable House Of Parliament ([London], 1642; Wing P170).

<sup>123</sup>Lord Henry Spencer, letter to Lady Dorothy Spencer, 21 September 1642, in Letters And Memorials Of State ... Faithfully transcribed from the Originals at Penshurst Place, ed. Arthur Collins, 2 Vols. (London, 1746), Vol. 2, p. 667.

which is honour and riches'.<sup>124</sup> The surest fight in which to gain honour was that on behalf of the King.

The idea of 'love to the king' and obedience to his authority was instilled in the people through the pulpit. While it is possible to exaggerate the influence of any particular sermon on its audience, and to a lesser extent, its readers, the effect of the official homilies that were repeatedly read in churches, was cumulative, and likely to have been far greater. An important factor in encouraging rank-and-file support for the king was An Homily against Disobedience and Wylful Rebellion, which was first appointed to be read in 1570, in response to the Northern Rebellion of 1569, when Queen Elizabeth's Catholic subjects rose in support of Mary, Queen of Scots. The homily quotes the thirteenth chapter of St. Paul's letter to the Romans in order to make plain the idea that kings are God's appointed agents on earth:

for he beareth not the sword for nought, for hee is the Minister of God to take vengeance upon him that doth evill: Wherefore yee must be subject, not because of wrath onely, but also for conscience sake; for, for this cause yee pay also tribute, for they are God's ministers, serving for the same purpose. Give to every man therefore his due: tribute, to whom tribute belongeth; custome, to whom custome is due; feare, to whom feare belongeth; honour, to whom yee owe honour.<sup>125</sup>

William Ingoldsby, using the initials 'G. I.', reissued this homily in 1642, under the title The Doctrine of the Church of England, Established by Parliament against Disobedience and wilfull Rebellion. When the time came to encourage men to take up arms on behalf of the King, the Royalist party was able to appeal to the deep-seated notions of obedience and loyalty that had been inculcated into the people through the pulpit.

After the First Bishops' War, Sir Thomas Peyton thought the prospect of renewed fighting so appalling that he wrote to his friend Henry Oxinden that 'Death's harbinger, the

---

<sup>124</sup>Ward (1639; 25025), Book I, pp. 158, 162, 177.

<sup>125</sup>G. I. (i.e. William Ingoldsby), The doctrine of the Church of England established by Parliament against disobedience and wilful rebellion (London, 1642; Wing I188), pp. 3-4.

sword, famine and other plagues that hang over us are ready to swallow up the wicked age'.<sup>126</sup>

After the Scottish debacle, Parliament was recalled, and as the voices in opposition to the king's policies grew louder, it began to look as if the sword hung over the kingdom by the slenderest of threads. Men who had counselled peace found themselves thinking of war. In particular, a group gathered around the king, to whom enemies would apply the pejorative name of 'cavalier'. The cavalier was, according to Florio's definition, 'a knight of the drawn sword'. While they may not have welcomed the name, stories began to circulate in which followers of the king were literally prepared to draw their swords, and with little reluctance. In 1641, a pamphlet appeared detailing the circumstances in which Sir Kenelm Digby had literally drawn his sword on behalf of Charles. Sr. Kenelme Digbyes Honour Maintained describes Digby's duel with a French nobleman, Mount le Ros, who defamed Charles as 'the arrantest coward in the world'. Digby draws his rapier and runs it through the luckless Frenchman's breast.<sup>127</sup> Digby's action was echoed by Sir Francis Wortley, who drew his sword in public in defence of the king, in April 1642, after Sir John Hotham had refused to surrender Hull's armouries. Wortley was not motivated by the subtler arguments of Royalist propaganda; he drew his sword to punish what was, for him, a blatant act of rebellion. Wortley's action clearly distinguished armed followers of the king from his opponents. In London, John Turbervill writes to John Willoughby:

if the King take up arms against the Parliament, the Parliament may take up arms against the King, not to hurt him, but those about him. All men that are for the Parliament, are no more termed Roundheads, but Hothamites, from Sir John Hotham; and all those that are for the King, are called Wortheleshites, from Sir George Wortheley [sic], that drew his sword in defence of the King at Hull, against Sir John

---

<sup>126</sup>The Oxinden Letters 1607-1642, p. 174.

<sup>127</sup>See Loxley, LR, p. 74.

Hotham; and 'tis thought if he could have come nigh him, he would have quickly despatched him.<sup>128</sup>

Wortley also issued a pamphlet, A Declaration from York, defending his actions, and in it he states

I was willing to doe my Prince and Countrey that good service (as I conceived it) and being amongst others of my quality, the first in order of ranke, and his Majesties servant, I must acknowledge that I was well pleased with the service, my heart and conscience, excusing me from all malignant thoughts of contradiction or opposition.

He concludes by saying that he who 'dares call his Sovereign the Anointed of God ... He conceives passive obedience always due to the power of the King'.<sup>129</sup>

The drawing of the sword figures prominently in an episode that illustrates a more active obedience on the part of the king's followers. On 19 April 1642, the quarter sessions opened at Maidstone in order to prepare a petition of loyalty to the Parliament. The sessions were interrupted by Lovelace and his friends, who burst into the courtroom, and 'in a furious manner, cried No, No, No: and then with great contempt of the court, clapped on their hats and said ... that ... [there were] many falsities therein, and ... they were ashamed of it'.<sup>130</sup> Taking the offending document in his hand, Lovelace tore it in pieces upon his sword's point.<sup>131</sup> Following this disturbance at Maidstone Assizes, Lovelace, along with Sir William Boteler, a younger member of the gentry, mobilised several thousand men from the county and determined to march on London and force the Parliament to accept a petition of loyalty to

---

<sup>128</sup>Trevelyan Papers, Part III, eds. Sir W. C. Trevelyan and Sir C. E. Trevelyan (Camden Society, 105; 1872), p. 223.

<sup>129</sup>See P. R. Newman, 'The King's Servants: Conscience, Principle, and Sacrifice in Armed Royalism', in John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf, eds., Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 225-242: pp. 235-6.

<sup>130</sup>BL Harleian MS 163, f. 99.

<sup>131</sup>See Alan Everitt, The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660 (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966), p. 102.

the king. Marching to Blackheath common, the leaders were first outmanoeuvred and then imprisoned, as a contemporary pamphlet reports:

And on the 29 of Aprell. 1642 a Cording to ther appointment they came from Blakeheath a bout the number of 14score marching 2 in a ranke and when they came in the Boro the Chane was drawn or whort the Bredg and Captene Bunch with his Cumpnie, at the Bredg sta and demanded ther intent, and the 2 foremost told them that they came to delivre ther petsiou to the Parlement and there petsione was red and Captene Bunch asked them why they came armed and they told him that thay had no harmes but the armes of Gentlemen and deliured there Sordes there.<sup>132</sup>

These events inspired a poem that seems to have enjoyed a wide circulation in manuscript. In one of these copies, the poem is given the title ‘Kents Invitation to take Armes’:

Doe not belye your Scabberds with a dresse  
of faigned favours from your mistresses  
While the meane time the Coward Steele within  
to your Dishonour sleepes in a whole skinne; ...<sup>133</sup>

The sword should no longer be worn as an affectation. While earlier in the decade service to the king meant preserving the peace, now a man risks his honour if he will not draw his sword:

Giue me the man that hangs upon his hilt  
A traitours bloud when his base bloud is spilt,  
that dares assist his reason with his sword  
and speake bol Pym to Atomes in a word, ...  
The longest life may haue the greatest cryme  
Honour takes date from action not from time  
and he whose bloud in his Kings cause is spent  
outliues an Euerlasting parliament. (f.34v)

Again, we notice, the appeal is to the ‘honour’ of the reader, and the repetition of ‘blood’ leaves him in no doubt what will be exacted for it.

---

<sup>132</sup>Strange Newes From Kent (London, 1642; Wing S5894), n. p.

<sup>133</sup>BL Harleian MS 6918, f.34r. See Loxley, LR, pp. 75-7.

Lovelace himself was imprisoned in the Gatehouse. It was during the period of his imprisonment that he wrote the poem 'To Lucasta. From Prison. An Epode.',<sup>134</sup> in which he imagines parting from Lucasta in the search for another woman whom he can serve in order to achieve honour:

Long in thy Shackels, liberty,  
I ask not from these walls, but thee;  
Left for a while anothers Bride  
To fancy all the world beside.<sup>135</sup>

In the word 'Bride' there is perhaps a pun on 'Bridewell', a generic nickname for a gaol, but the word also hints at an increased seriousness; where Lovelace had earlier sought war as another mistress, here he searches for a bride, implying a more lasting commitment. In his search he considers as replacements in turn '*Peace*', '*War*', '*Religion*', '*Parliament*', '*Liberty*', '*Property*', '*Reformation*' and the '*Publick Faith*', although none prove satisfactory. H. M. Margoliouth suggests that the poem reflects Lovelace's support of the Kentish petition, noting that while the lines on '*Peace*' and '*War*' are quite general, those on '*Parliament*', '*Liberty*' and '*Property*' relate to various clauses of the petition.<sup>136</sup> While I do not disagree with Margoliouth, it seems that Lovelace considers various means of achieving honour, such as a military career and service of the Church. He rejects the pursuit of wealth as 'There's nothing you can call your owne'. Having discarded all these possibilities, he settles on the one remaining path:

---

<sup>134</sup>Dosia Reichardt points to a manuscript version of the poem in the Bodleian Library, which omits the first stanza of the version printed in 1649. Reichardt suggests that the poem dates from after 1646, because of a similarity between the twelfth stanza of the printed version ('When seeking to ecclipse his right, / Blinded, we stand in our owne light') and G. Hils' 1646 translation of one of the odes of Casimir Sarbiewski ('Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts', *Notes and Queries* 49 (2002), 336-338: p. 338). However, the idea of the King as an eclipsed sun was current as early as the Bishops' Wars, and need not be indebted to Casimir.

<sup>135</sup>Lovelace, 'To Lucasta. From Prison. An Epode' in Lovelace, pp. 48-51.

<sup>136</sup>H. M. Margoliouth, review of Wilkinson's edition, *Review of English Studies*, 3 (1927), 89-95, p. 95.

Since then none of these can be  
Fit objects for my Love and me;  
What then remains, but th'only spring  
Of all our loves and joyes? The KING.

Lovelace restores the King to his position as the source of honour, and asks the King to guide him to a place 'where I soon may see / How to serve you, and you trust me'. If there is doubt expressed in these last lines, then, as one critic observes, it 'concerns Lovelace's own trustworthiness', because at the time 'he was already contemplating making his submission to Parliament with a view to obtaining his release',<sup>137</sup> an action that would mean the sacrifice of his honour, as he symbolically had surrendered his sword to Captain Bunch. The Kentish petition makes clear that men were prepared to take up weapons on behalf of the King, and were willing once again to submit to armed conflict. While Henry Slingsby, who 'had but a very short time of being a soldier' could claim it to be 'as commendable a way of breeding for a gentleman',<sup>138</sup> Prince Rupert, who fought many European campaigns, could have informed him that the professional soldier's existence 'is a life of honour, but a dog would not lead it'.<sup>139</sup> Many cavaliers were to discover this truth for themselves.

---

<sup>137</sup> Alan Rudrum, 'Royalist lyric' in N. H. Keeble (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 181-197, pp. 187-8.

<sup>138</sup> Original Memoirs Written During the Great Civil War, p. 28.

<sup>139</sup> Quoted in C. V. Wedgwood, Velvet Studies (London: Jonathan Cape, 1946), p. 32.



**‘RAGE OF SWORDS’ AND ‘BITTERNESSE OF PENS’:**

**POETRY, NEWSBOOKS AND HISTORY IN THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR  
1642-1643**

‘A warlike, various, and a tragical age is best to *write of*,’ Abraham Cowley famously remarks, ‘but worst to *write in*.’<sup>1</sup> While it is difficult to construct a narrative of any war, particularly without the perspective of hindsight, a civil war presents even more difficulties for the historian. Thomas May observes that the conflict in which he writes has

divided the understandings of men, as well as their affections, in so high a degree, that scarce could any vertue gaine due applause, any Reason give satisfaction, or any Relation obtaine credit, unlesse amongst men of the same side.<sup>2</sup>

How various historians of the conflict, writing both in poetry and prose, tried to resolve these difficulties will be the subject of this chapter. It is through the examination of their various sources of ideas and imagery that I hope to demonstrate the differing strategies employed.

Cowley’s remarks are taken from the 1656 Preface to his Poems, and refer to his poem in three books, The Civill Warre, which was understandably suppressed in an England under the Cromwellian Protectorate. The first book appeared in pirated form in 1679, twelve years after his death. The two further books to which Cowley refers were presumed lost until they were discovered by Allan Pritchard among the papers of Lady Sarah Cowper, and published in 1973. The full text of this restored version describes events from the Bishops’ Wars of 1639 and 1640 to the first battle of Newbury in September 1643.

The fact that the poem now exists in three books, and the title ‘The Civill Warre’, which it possesses in manuscripts, have invited comparisons with Lucan’s De Bello Civili, or Pharsalia. It is suggested that Cowley, by preparing his poem in three books, intended to emulate Lucan’s separate publication of three books of his epic. Recently, Robert Wilcher,

---

<sup>1</sup>Abraham Cowley, ‘The Preface to the Poems 1656’, in A. B. Gough, ed., The Essays and Other Prose Writings (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915), p. 5.

<sup>2</sup>Thomas May, The History of the Parliament of England (London, 1647; Wing M1410), sig. [A4r].

surveying the bibliographical information that Pritchard supplies, has questioned the validity of this interpretation. He suggests that Cowley may not have begun his poem as an epic, and

the very fact that 'Book I' existed as a separate text in at least three manuscripts (two that survive and one that lay behind the 1679 edition) may indicate that Cowley originally conceived it as a self-contained poem and released it into circulation as soon as it was finished.<sup>3</sup>

Wilcher ventures that the expansion of the poem beyond the first book was an 'afterthought', and points to the fact that nearly all of Cowley's significant epic borrowings occur in the subsequent books as evidence. Wilcher makes a compelling case for this theory of composition based on the bibliographical evidence, and it seems that Cowley did intend the first book of The Civill Warre to be complete in itself, and that subsequent events encouraged him to expand the poem, re-conceiving it as a three-book work following the Lucanian model. At the same time, however, there are a number of verbal and structural echoes of classical epic in the first book, and these would suggest that even at the outset Cowley aimed to combine an epic idiom with the contemporary language of warfare. The Civill Warre's apparently unfinished state may itself be another conscious allusion to Lucan, who may have deliberately left the Pharsalia as a fragment.

There is one fundamental difference between Lucan's epic and Cowley's poem, however, for, in expanding his work, Cowley set himself a more difficult task by writing about a war before its conclusion, when the ultimate outcome was still uncertain. A similar problem presented itself to Thomas May, who published his History of the Parliament of England in 1647. While the fighting had stopped when he began writing in 1646, the outcome and settlement of the conflict were unclear, and, unbeknownst to May, the cessation of arms was only to be temporary. May turned to previous historians of civil war as a model, in

---

<sup>3</sup>Wilcher, WR, p. 185.

particular Thucydides and Tacitus.<sup>4</sup> The History appeared in three books, and here we can confidently identify an echo of Lucan, as twenty-one years previously, May had issued three books of his translation of the Pharsalia before the publication of the full version. Perhaps unsurprisingly, May echoes the language of his translation of Lucan in his History; it will, he announces, describe ‘a Civill War, a war indeed as much *more then Ciuill*’, echoing the opening lines of the Pharsalia, and will relate ‘How much valour the English Nation have been guilty of in this unnaturall Warre’, recasting Lucan’s comment on the *aristeia* of Scæva.<sup>5</sup> May makes explicit the link between the war and the proliferation of print, noting that the conflict ‘has produced as much rage of Swords, as much bitternesse of Pens, both publike and private, as was ever knowne’,<sup>6</sup> and, as has been observed, he ‘reproduced the paper wars at the level of form in his own text. It is therefore fitting that he used newsbooks’.<sup>7</sup>

The result, May freely admits, is a partisan account:

that which of all other is most likely to be differently related ... is concerning the actions of Warre and Souldiery; and in the time of this Warre, it is a thing of extreme difficulty (I might say of impossibility) for those of one Party to be truly informed of all the Councels, or the very Performances and Actions of Commanders and Souldiers on the other side.<sup>8</sup>

Like Cowley, May takes his narrative only as far as the first battle of Newbury. For Cowley, this is a time of sadness that points to an uncertain future, for May ‘a providential delivery after near-disaster’.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>See J. G. A. Pocock, ‘Thomas May and the narrative of Civil War’ in Derek Hirst and Richard Strier, eds., Writing and political engagement in seventeenth-century England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999): 112-144, pp. 112-118.

<sup>5</sup>May (1647; M1410), sigs. [A3v], B2r; cf. Lucan, Pharsalia, I. 1, VI. 148.

<sup>6</sup>May (1647; M1410), sig. [A4r].

<sup>7</sup>Raymond, p. 287.

<sup>8</sup>May (1647; M1410), sigs. Bv-B2r.

<sup>9</sup>David Norbrook, ‘The English Revolution and English historiography’, in N. H. Keeble, ed., The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 233-250: p. 236.

The most expansive contemporary history of the English Civil War, The History of the Rebellion, by Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, makes for telling comparison with Cowley's The Civill Warre and May's History. This huge work did not begin to be published until 1702, eighteen years after its author's death, and even then only in an expurgated version. Clarendon's work reveals itself to be a partisan account, using, for example, 'we' to denote the Royalist forces, and 'the enemy' for those of Parliament. It differs from The Civill Warre in particular, not only in kind and length, but also in scope. While Clarendon was not hugely interested in military affairs, he possessed far greater practical experience of politics and affairs of state than Cowley, and even May. Furthermore, Clarendon was more qualified in his praise of Charles, and more lenient in his criticisms of Parliament; his is a significantly more moderate Royalist position than that of Cowley. As Pritchard points out,

while Hyde was actively opposing some of the king's policies in Parliament, Cowley was writing panegyrics of the monarch that stand out as extreme even in an age of extravagant panegyrics ... [Cowley] found his later place in the service of Jermyn and Henrietta Maria, leaders of a circle that Clarendon regarded as dangerously extreme and that he worked against.<sup>10</sup>

For obvious reasons, Cowley could not have referred to Clarendon's History, but it seems that, particularly when writing accounts of military action, Cowley, May and Clarendon may have used similar sources. Comparison of the three texts can reveal how each author manipulated the source material in order to construct an account of the conflict.

---

<sup>10</sup>CW, p. 367.

## ‘THE FIRST STORME OF THIS DIRE WINTER’: THE EDGEHILL CAMPAIGN 1642

In the 1720 work Memoirs Of A Cavalier, probably written by Daniel Defoe, the anonymous narrator continually protests the veracity of his accounts of the battles to which he is an eye-witness. For at least half a century after the first publication of this book, these claims to veracity were taken at face value, and the book assumed to be a genuine production of the seventeenth century. In his account of the battle of Edgehill, the Cavalier offers tremendous detail of hand-to-hand fighting, but he then admits ‘My Father’s Regiment, being in the Right with the Prince, I saw little of the Fight, but the Rout of the Enemy’s Left’.<sup>11</sup> The narrator betrays the fact that his account is a literary construct, based in many respects on the Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, itself in part based on more contemporary accounts. In certain respects, the ‘historians’ in our survey are not unlike the Cavalier, in that they were not witnesses to the event that they described, and aim to disguise their reliance on other accounts.

The event that effectively signalled the beginning of the Edgehill campaign was

Charles’ raising of his standard at Nottingham on 22 August 1642:

Not long after the kings comming to Towne the Standard was taken out of the Castle and carried into the field a little on the back side of the Castle wall ... on the top of it hangs a bloody Flag, the Kings Armes quartered, with a hand pointing to the Crowne which stands above, with his Motto: *Give Caesar his due* ... for that upon taking downe of the Standard there were not above thirty of the trained bands that offered to come in to his Majesty, which because their number were so inconsiderable, his Majesty refused to accept of.<sup>12</sup>

Similarly, in The True Informer, James Howell admits ‘that when he displayed his Royall Standard at Nottingham, his Forces were not anything considerable,’<sup>13</sup> but Howell writes from

---

<sup>11</sup>Daniel Defoe, Memoirs Of A Cavalier, ed. James T. Boulton (1972; repr. Oxford: Oxford World’s Classics, 1991), p. 161.

<sup>12</sup>A true and exact Relation of the manner of his Maiesties setting up of His Standard at Nottingham (London, 1642; Wing T2452) (received by Thomason 27 September), sigs. A3v-[A4r].

<sup>13</sup>Howell (1643; H3122), p. 40.

a position more favourable to the King, and his rhetorical tactic is to make the worst of the King's situation in order to make his subsequent achievements all the more remarkable.

Clarendon later writes of the general surprise that 'from that low despised condition the King was in at Nottingham after the setting up of his standard, he should be able to get men, money or arms'.<sup>14</sup> Pritchard notes that both Cowley and Clarendon regard Charles' ability to rally forces to his cause in adverse conditions as 'almost miraculous':<sup>15</sup>

When straight whole *Armies* meet in *Charles* his right,  
How noe man knowes; but here they are, and fight:  
A Man would sweare that saw his alter'd state,  
*Kings* were call'd *Gods* because they could create. (*The Civill Warre*, I. 169-72)

From Nottingham, Charles' army marched towards Derby, recruiting as they went, and from there went to Shrewsbury, arriving on 20 September 1642. May suggests that Charles drew forces to himself by

moving with those Forces which he had, but in a gentler and calmer way, for the reverence which the people bore to his Person, made him finde lesse resistance: as windes lose their fury when they meet no opposition; but howsoever, the King desired to go in such a way, as to be taken for a Father of his Country, and a Prince injur'd by the Parliament: ...<sup>16</sup>

At Shrewsbury, Charles was joined by three regiments raised in Cheshire, and another raised in Lincolnshire and Bedfordshire. Parliament had started to raise troops in early June, and before September, the Earl of Essex, commander-in-chief of the Parliament's army, had raised twenty regiments of Foot, mainly from London and the south-east. Essex marched on Worcester, where the cavalry of the Royalist Sir John Byron had arrived on 19 September. Charles sent a force under Prince Rupert to relieve Byron, arriving in 23 September. At the

---

<sup>14</sup>Clarendon, VI. 45.

<sup>15</sup>CW, p. 396n.

<sup>16</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, p. 3.

same time, a Parliamentary force of equal size under Colonel Brown arrived at Worcester, hoping to rendezvous with a troop from Gloucestershire who were advancing on the city.<sup>17</sup>

The first military engagement of the English Civil War occurred at Powick Bridge, near Worcester, on the 23 September 1642. Cowley could have discovered the essential details of this skirmish or combat, rather than battle, in one of the many printed accounts that appeared in the weeks following the incident. A reasonably accurate account, written from a Parliamentary perspective, is A Letter Purporting the true relation of the Skirmish at Worcester, by Captain Nathaniel Fiennes, at the time an officer in Colonel Brown's troop, and included in the pamphlet A most True and Exact Relation of Both the Battels fought by his Excellency and his forces against the bloody Cavaliers. According to Fiennes, Colonel Edwin Sandys announced that 'we must make haste to seize upon a bridge called Poike bridge lest the enemy should possess themselves of it, or break it down before we came, and so hinder our passage'.<sup>18</sup> Fiennes suggested that a small advance party be sent, but Sandys ignored this advice, and

before either the Dragoones could come to us, or the commanded men be drawne out, or some of the Troopes make an end of a Psalme which they were singing, he made over the Bridge up into the lane towards the Enemy<sup>19</sup>

with the result that the Parliamentary forces 'had no passage to the enemy but in a lane where they could not march five a brest'.<sup>20</sup> The Parliament's soldiers were surrounded by Prince Rupert's musketeers, who fired at them from point blank range. This was followed by

---

<sup>17</sup>See Peter Young and Richard Holmes, The English Civil War: A Military History of the Civil Wars 1642-1651 (London: 1974, repr. Wordsworth Military Library, 2000), pp. 67-9.

<sup>18</sup>Nathaniel Fiennes, A most True and Exact Relation of Both the Battels fought by his Excellency and his forces against the bloody Cavaliers (London, 1642; Wing F875), p. 8.

<sup>19</sup>Fiennes (1642; F875), p. 9.

<sup>20</sup>A True Relation of A famous victory obtained against Prince Robert, and twelve troopes of the Cavaliers at the City of Worcester (London, 1642; Wing T2876), p. 2.



a charge of the Royalist horse, which succeeded in breaking the Parliamentary troops, who ‘of a suddaine ... found all their Troopes on both sides of us melted away, and our reare being carried away with them’,<sup>21</sup> and so were routed. Most contemporary accounts of the skirmish agree that the casualty rate was not high, the lowest suggested figure being ‘equall, about 6. being slain in all’. Most Parliamentary accounts place the number of their dead between 25 and 30. Writing on the Royalist side, Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, states ‘I dare not tell you they lost more Hundreds, then we single men, least the former part of my letter gaine the lesse beleife’,<sup>22</sup> suggesting an awareness that, even at the outset of the conflict, reports of battles were to be read critically, and that elaborate claims of victory would be read with some scepticism.

At this point, Cowley shows his willingness to embellish the reported facts of the incident with more literary details. He compares the Parliamentary army to a supernatural force, writing ‘Here first the *Rebell windes* began to roare’ (CW, I. 185). As with his earlier description of the Bishops’ Wars as a sudden tempest (CW, I. 94), Cowley may resort to this image because he cannot comprehend the causes of opposition to the King. Alternatively, the introduction of images of winds and tempests early in the poem may be a conscious echo of the appearance of Aeolus in the first book of the *Aeneid*. The characterisation of the battle as ‘the first storme of this dire *Winter*’ (CW, I. 188) recalls Ward’s language in *Anima’s* *versions of Warre* conveying the natural and inevitable transition from peace to war. The elemental imagery also allows the episode to fit comfortably within the historical framework of *The Civill Warre*, as in his description of Worcester:

---

<sup>21</sup>Fiennes (1642; F875), p. 10.

<sup>22</sup>(1642; T2876), p. 3; Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, *A Letter Sent from the Lord Falkland, Principal Secretarie to His Majestie* ([Oxford], 1642; F321), sig. A3v.

*Worc'ester* first saw't, and trembled at the View,  
Too well the ills of *civill warr* she knew.  
Twise did the flames of old her towers invade,  
Twise cal'd she in vaine for her owne *Severnes* Ayd. (CW, I. 181-4)

In his commentary, Pritchard notes that Raphael Holinshed records several incidents when Worcester was damaged as a result of civil war 'including two when parts of the city were burned, in the reigns of William Rufus (1088) and Stephen (1150)'.<sup>23</sup> At the same time, Cowley emphasises the differences between the present conflict and previous ones. In the past, the River Severn came to the aid of Worcester against fire, whereas now it is metaphorical storm and flood that threaten the city.

The action ends with the death of Colonel Sandys, who was mortally wounded during the skirmish, and died a month later, making him the first officer to fall in the campaign:

Here *Sands* with tainted blood the fields did staine,  
By his owne *Sacriledge* and *Kents* Curses slaine.  
The first *Commander* did heavens Vengeance show,  
And led the Rebels *Van* to Shades below. (CW, I. 203-6)

This passage suggests something of Cowley's willingness for his poem to intervene in the pamphlet debates surrounding particular battles. After this fight, newsbooks of Parliamentary sympathy made bold claims on behalf of Sandys' bravery:

Colonell *Sandys* in this action fell not short of Sir *Rich: Greenvile* in Queene *Elizabeths* time, ... he performed with as much fortitude and resolution as could bee in man, and after much damage done the enemy, having received divers wounds, he was taken, but dyed, leaving behinde him the Fame of a most rash valiant man.<sup>24</sup>

Falkland, in his account, suggests that Sandys underwent a deathbed conversion and renounced his support of the Parliament's cause:

Prince *Robert* sent a Divine to Captain *Sands*, who told him the Prince was troubled so gallant a man should perish in so unworthy an action, he gave the Prince thanks and

---

<sup>23</sup>CW, p. 397n.

<sup>24</sup>*Speciall Passages*, 8 (27 September - 4 October 1642; 605.08), p. 60.

said, death did not so much trouble him as that he had endeavoured to defend so bad a cause, which he was drawne into as well by his owne ambition, as by perswasion of other men, ... desiring that they would all pray for him, and especially that God would forgive him this great sinne of rebellion.<sup>25</sup>

A subsequent pamphlet, received by Thomason on 3 November 1642, which purports to contain 'Some Notes of the Conference betwixt Colonell *Sandys*, and a Minister of Prince *Ruperts*', suggests why Sandys was viewed with such bitterness by Royalist commentators:

The *Minister* then added, Sir, I have one more sinne to presse your conscience with: Sir, you are descended from a Bishop, and your family has beene raised from the Church, therefore the spoyle and outrage committed by you in *Canterbury Church*, was more abominable in you then in another man.<sup>26</sup>

This is why Cowley shows him to be 'By his owne *Sacriledge* and *Kents Curses* slaine'. In response, two pamphlets were published in Sandys' name, the first stating that he was not yet dead, where he writes of 'a most scandalous aspersion of late rayseed and cast upon me, by the wicked and envious party,'<sup>27</sup> and the second refuting that he had renounced the Parliamentary cause:

There was indeed a Divine, who I thinke was the Dean of *Worcester*, ... he continually urged and pressed my conscience, how great a sin I was guilty of in taking up Arms against my Sovereign, I was not then in case to entertain him in discourse, only at last answered him, I never had, nor ever would take up Arms against my Sovereign, but ever should be ready to lay my life and whatsoever was dear unto me at his feet: ... of which I hope with Gods blessing upon my recovery, to give further testimony to the world, by the continued ingagement of my life and fortune, in this so just and honourable a cause.<sup>28</sup>

Cowley concludes this section of his poem with Sandys' death and his subsequent descent into the 'Shades below', at the head of 'the Rebels *Van*'. The introduction of epic machinery

---

<sup>25</sup>Falkland (1642; F321), sigs. A2v-A3r.

<sup>26</sup>A Vindication of Colonell Sandys His Honour and Loyalty (London, 1642; Wing S671), p. 8.

<sup>27</sup>Edwin Sandys, A Vindication from Colonell Sands (London, 1642; Wing S670), sig. [A3r].

<sup>28</sup>Edwin Sandys, The Declaration of Col: Edwin Sandys (London, 1642; Wing S688), pp. 6-8.

at this point may have been inspired by a detail reported by Fiennes, who recalls how during the skirmish ‘Collonell Sands his troop ... led the van’.<sup>29</sup>

After this engagement, Prince Rupert’s troop quit Worcester, which was subsequently occupied by the Parliamentary army under the Earl of Essex. The King, meanwhile, set out from Shrewsbury to march on London on 12 October, although his progress was slowed by adverse weather. Essex in turn left Worcester on 19 October with the aim of intercepting the King’s march. On Saturday 22 October, the King’s forces arrived at Edgecote, near Banbury, while the Parliament’s army marched into the nearby town of Kington after dark.<sup>30</sup> The ensuing confrontation between the two armies was the battle of Edgehill itself on 23 October 1642. It immediately becomes clear that literary responses to this battle owe as much to polemical demands as they do to documentary detail. Thomas May notes that ‘not farre from the foot of [Edgehill], was a broad Champian, called *The vale of the Red Horse*, a name suitable to the colour which that day was to bestow upon it’.<sup>31</sup> Cowley opens his description with a panoramic view of the forces assembled for battle:

On two faire *Hills* both Armies next are seene,  
Th’affrighted *Valley* sighes and sweats betweene. (CW, I. 207-8)

This image recalls the beginning of the siege of Dyrrachium in the *Pharsalia*, which May translated as:

When on neere hils both Generalls fierce of fight  
Had pitch’d their tents, and drawne their troopes in sight.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup>Fiennes (1642; F875), p. 12.

<sup>30</sup>See Young and Holmes, pp. 71-3, and P. R. Newman, *Atlas of the English Civil War* (1985; repr. London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 20-1.

<sup>31</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, p. 17.

<sup>32</sup>Lucan (1627; 16887), sig. K2r.

Cowley's main change to Lucan's image is to feminise it; the 'two faire *Hills*' are figuratively a woman's breasts, and the 'valley sighes and sweats' as if a heart beats beneath it. Cowley implies that the country has been violated by the war, as if it were a woman who has been raped. Cowley may also be attracted to this image because of its strong visual impact, for, as David Trotter explains, he was 'primarily concerned to mark the boundary between two equal and opposing forces'.<sup>33</sup> The two armies draw up facing each other across a physical divide as deep as the ideological one. There was in fact only one hill on the battlefield at Edgehill, occupied by the Royalists, although curiously two Parliamentary accounts in some way accord with Cowley's description; Fiennes writes that 'for our Army, it was drawn up upon a little rising ground',<sup>34</sup> and another author, who may have been Lieutenant Thomas Compton, writes that the Parliamentarians were 'cast into three Brigades, the two wings being flanked with our Horse, and placed upon a little round rising hill betwixt them and *Keynton*'.<sup>35</sup> We detect the same tendency towards visualisation on the part of the Parliamentary authors, and the correspondence between classical epic and the reported facts obviously impressed May, as he follows Fiennes and has the Parliament army 'put into *Battalia* upon a little rising ground'.<sup>36</sup>

Cowley maintains this rhetoric of division in the following description of the allegorical forces that take up positions on each side (*CW*, I. 209-34), and Trotter notes how 'the geographic line of division has become an act of discrimination ('Here ... There ...'), separating "us" from "them"'.<sup>37</sup> Cowley may be mocking the tendency of Puritan preachers

---

<sup>33</sup>David Trotter, *The Poetry of Abraham Cowley* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1979), p. 10.

<sup>34</sup>Fiennes (1642; F875), p. 5.

<sup>35</sup>T[homas] C[ompton?], *A More True and An Exacter Relation of the Battaille of Keynton* (London, 1642; C137), p. 3.

<sup>36</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, p. 17.

<sup>37</sup>Trotter, p. 11.

and writers to split the world into binary oppositions, although, as Patrick Collinson suggests, this was also a general characteristic of thought in the period.<sup>38</sup> Cowley's catalogue of the opposing forces draws explicitly on Royalist propaganda. For example:

There *Schisme*, old *Hag*, but seeming young appeares,  
As *snakes* by casting skin renew their yeares.  
Undecent rags of severall dies she wore  
And in her hands torne *Liturgies* she bore. (*CW*, I. 215-8)

Cowley's '*Schisme*' is similar to *The True Informer*'s portrait of Religion 'in torne ragged weeds'.<sup>39</sup> In placing Schism in opposition to Religion, Cowley emphasises the role of division in reducing the primacy of the established Church. The image of 'torne *Liturgies*', as Pritchard notes, may refer to an incident reported in *Mercurius Aulicus*, when some Parliamentary soldiers marched through London

first 4 in Buffe coates, next 4 in Surplices with the Book of Common Prayer in their hands, singing in derision thereof, and tearing it leafe by leafe, and putting every leafe to their Posteriors, with great scorne and laughter.<sup>40</sup>

There are other symbolic details of this passage that may have their origin in specifically military knowledge:

Here *Loyalty* an humble *Crosse* displaid,  
And still as *Charles* past by she bowd and prayd.  
*Sedition* there her crimson *Banner* spreads,  
Shakes all her Hands, and roares with all her Heads. (*CW*, I. 219-22)

Cowley may have known that the colours of most officers both sides would have displayed a cross of Saint George, and here he makes this detail specific to the Royalist side to emphasise that, in his view, they represent the nation rather than a faction.<sup>41</sup> The association of Charles

---

<sup>38</sup>Patrick Collinson, *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture* (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1989), pp. 13-14.

<sup>39</sup>Howell (1643; H3122), p. [44], sig. G2v.

<sup>40</sup>*Mercurius Aulicus*, (13 June 1643; NS 275. 124A), p. 312, and see *CW*, p. 398n.

<sup>41</sup>See Young and Holmes, p. 48.

with Saint George had long been a central element in royal propaganda, the most famous example being Rubens' Landscape With Saint George And The Dragon. Similarly, he makes Sedition, who lines up with the Parliamentarians, wave a 'crimson *Banner*', even though red standards were common to both sides, with Prince Maurice's regiment, for example, carrying red standards.<sup>42</sup> Cowley may wish to refute the allegation made by the Parliamentarian pamphlet that the royal standard was 'a bloody flag', and he may be trying to identify symbolically the Parliamentarian army with blood, in the same manner as an anonymous London royalist who writes in a newsletter that the Parliamentarians are all 'butchers and dyers'.<sup>43</sup> The portrait of Sedition continues:

Her knotty haire were with dire *Serpents* twist,  
And all her *Serpents* at each other hist. (CW, I. 223-4)

This again shows Cowley's preference for the Virgilian mode. It compares with the portrait of the Fury Alecto from the Aeneid, and we may note that his lines preserve the sibillancy of an earlier translation:

Such faces foule she shifte, so many mouthes she turning makes,  
So serpentfull she seemes, and all over begrowen with snakes.<sup>44</sup>

In the Aeneid, it is Alecto, roused by Juno, who provokes the 'civil war' between the Trojans and the Italians. Sedition thus anticipates the appearance of Alecto as the cause of the civil war in England in the second book of the poem (CW, II. 5-12).

Cowley even appears to place himself on the Royalist side in the guise of 'Learning and th' Arts':

What should they doe? unapt themselves to fight,

---

<sup>42</sup>See Peter Young, Edgehill 1642: The Campaign and the Battle (1967; repr. Moreton-in-Marsh: The Windrush Press, 1995), p. 202.

<sup>43</sup>BL Harl. MS. 3783, f. 61.

<sup>44</sup>Phaer and Twyne, The Aeneid, VII. 342-3.

They promised noble pens the Acts to write. (CW, I. 229, 231-2)

Cowley's rhetoric in the 'Preface' to the 1656 edition of his Poems echoes this image of

Learning:

Now, though in all *Civil Dissensions*, when they break into open hostilities, the *War* of the *Pen* is allowed to accompany that of the *Sword*, and every one is in a manner obliged with his *Tongue* as well as *Hand* to serve and assist the side which he engages in.<sup>45</sup>

Cowley presents his poem as an act of war, and therefore figures himself as on one side of the conflict. Trotter claims that, in doing so, he risks forfeiting 'any claim to a transcendent point of view'.<sup>46</sup> At the same time, however, Cowley appears to elevate the King to a position of transcendence, where the opposing sides meet and 'Sad warre and joyfull *Triumph* mixt in one' (CW, I. 256). The idea that Charles occupies a position beyond that of faction reappears in another unpublished poem of the period, Clement Paman's 'The teares'. Charles is one

Whose Heavenly breast doth dayly entertaine  
More real visions then others feigne  
For here 'Tis true the feild is found agen,  
And his heart bleeds the blood was was squander'd then.<sup>47</sup>

Paman responds to Parliamentary allegations that Charles was haunted by visions of the slain at Edgehill by suggesting that this is more true than the King's opponents intend, and that Charles feels the pain of the whole nation. Paman's poem is a lament for the compassion that died at Edgehill, and Cowley similarly continues his list of allegorical figures:

Here *Mercy* waits with sad but gentle looke  
(Never, alas, had she her *Charles* forsooke).  
For *Mercy* on her *friends* to heaven she cries  
Whilst *Justice* pluckes downe *Justice* from the Skies. (CW, I. 237-40)

---

<sup>45</sup>Cowley, 'Preface' in Essays, p. 5.

<sup>46</sup>Trotter, p. 12.

<sup>47</sup>Clement Paman, 'The teares', ll. 13-16, in PR.



Pritchard notes that in several manuscripts this last line reads ‘Justice pulls down *Vengeance*’, but points to Mercy crying for Mercy in the preceding lines. The repetition may register what Peter Thomas identifies as ‘a profounder self-division ... a deep inward collision and split that have occurred’ in the minds of Englishmen.<sup>48</sup> The fragmented self was a characteristic feature of Civil War literature, and Cowley makes continual reference to themes of division throughout The Civill Warre.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, Paman sees the Parliamentarians as

Fighting with what should keep you quiett, and  
Suborning just Religion to stand  
A wittnes gainst herselfe, ... (‘The teares’, ll. 59-61)

When he turns to the action of the battle, Cowley continues to draw upon Royalist propaganda. He opens with a reference to the Royalist allegation that Parliamentarian troops fired directly at the King:

Now flew their *Canon* thicke through wounded Aire,  
Sent to defend and kill their *Sovereigne* there.  
More then *Hee* them, the *Bullets* fear’d his head,  
And at his feete lay innocently dead.  
They knew not what those men that shot them ment,  
And acted their *pretence*, not their *intent*. (CW, I. 245-50)

Cowley, as Pritchard points out, draws upon the vein of Royalist satire that attacks the Parliamentarian forces for claiming to ‘defend’ the King while trying to ‘kill’ him. In falling harmlessly before the King, the bullets enact the Parliamentarian’s ‘pretence’, and attempt to appear to be defending the King, when their real ‘intent’ is to kill him. In The True Informer, Howell suggests that

these men by a new kind of Metaphysick have found out a way to abstract the Person of the King from his Office, to make his Soveraigntie a kind of Platonick Idea

---

<sup>48</sup>CW, p. 398n.; Peter Thomas, ‘The Impact on Literature’, in John Morrill, ed., The Impact of the English Civil War (London: Collis and Brown, 1991), 123-142: p. 129.

<sup>49</sup>See Jonathan Sawday, “‘Mysteriously divided’: Civil War, madness and the divided self”, in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday, eds., Literature and the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 127-143: p. 139.

hovering in the aire, while they visibly attempt to assaile and destroy his Person (and Progeny) by small and great shot, and seek him out amongst his Life-Gard with fire and sword.<sup>50</sup>

The behaviour of the bullets in this passage is most likely a pointed response to the claim made in England's Memorable Accidents

that through the special guidance of the God of Battells, the bullets of the Kings great Ordinance, either fell short of them flew over them or passed between their Files and intervall, without touching or killing very few or none of them, whereas their great shot made passages through the Kings Army as broad as streets.<sup>51</sup>

Paman presents the firing at the King as a suicidal act on the part of the Parliamentarians, as they strive 'To kill that life which keepeth them alive' ('The teares', l. 30). Cowley also alludes to the Parliamentary attempts at the King in The Puritan and the Papist, where he states 'you dare to shoot at Kings, to save their life'.<sup>52</sup> This idea becomes a commonplace in Royalist writings, repeated, for example, in The Round-Heads Remembrancer, an account of the battle of Stratton, which refers to 'that desperate impudence to shoot at the King, and say that it is to save his life'.<sup>53</sup> The origin of the assertion may lie in Charles refutation of the Parliamentary claims published after the battle at Edgehill:

In a word, as who ever knowes in what danger Our person was in on Sunday the 23. of *October*, can never believe that the Army which gave us Battle was raised for Our defence, and preservation; ... they will easily find the pretences of care of the Protestant Religion, the liberty of the Subject, and of the priviledge of Parliament to

---

<sup>50</sup>Howell (1643; H3122), p. [41], sig. Gr, and see CW, p. 398n.

<sup>51</sup>England's Memorable Accidents (7-14 November 1642; 579.10), pp. 77-8.

<sup>52</sup>The Puritan and the Papist, in Cowley, Vol. I, p. 155.

<sup>53</sup>The Round-Heads Remembrancer ([Oxford], 1643; Wing R2009), p. 1. Cf. Samuel Butler, Hudibras, ed. John Wilders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), I. ii. 513-6:

For as we make War *for the King*  
*Against himself*, the self-same thing  
Some will not stick to swear we doe  
For *God*, and for *Religion* too.

be as vain and pretended, as those which refer to the safety of our person, and preservation of our posterity.<sup>54</sup>

This last pamphlet, published in Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, is quite possibly Cowley's chief source for his description of the battle, as it also reprints the 'official' Royalist account, possibly by Sir William Dugdale, a herald in the royal entourage. The Parliament issued a response which denies any attempt on the King's life, writing of the King's claim that their army did not exist for his protection

We confesse we understand not the Logique thereof, no more then if the Kings Person should be chased, apprehended and possessed by Theeves and Robbers, and the Kings good subjects should raise an Army to pursue these Robbers, and by Battell dispossesse them of him, and rescue him from their Power and Tyranny, That therefore this was an army raised to murder and destroy the King.<sup>55</sup>

Paman makes play with the notion that the Parliamentarians fought for the King when he imagines the souls of their army called to account on the Day of Judgement:

theirs who but for you  
Had beene as loath to fight as they'le be now  
To rise, and 'fore the dreadfull bench appeare  
When they'le now run away as you did here ('The teares', ll. 67-70)

He suggests that whether the Parliamentarians fought for the King or not, they displayed a reluctance to fight at all. Parliamentarians were later to admit firing at the King. Major Edmund Ludlow writes in his Memoirs that ‘our general having commanded to fire upon the enemy, it was done twice upon that part of the enemy wherein, as it was reported, the King was.’<sup>56</sup>

<sup>54</sup>His Majesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects after His late Victory against the Rebels (London, 1642; Wing C2223), sig. A2v.

<sup>55</sup> A Declaration of The Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. In Answer to His Majesties Declaration (London, 1642; Wing E1422), p. 10.

<sup>56</sup>Edmund Ludlow, The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, ed. C. H. Firth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), Vol. 1, p. 42.

Cowley's description follows the events of the battle quite closely. It begins with a Royalist cavalry charge, which 'Great *Rupert* this, that wing brave *Wilmot* leads' (CW, I. 259), and which causes the Parliamentary cavalry to fly:

They follow close, and hast into the fight,  
As swiftly as the *Rebells* make their flight. (CW, I. 263-4)

For much of this information, however, Cowley seems to have relied upon the 'official' Royalist account, A Relation of the Battaille fought between Keynton and Edgehill, which describes how 'the charge began between the two wings of horse, those of the Rebells not standing our charge, a quarter of an hower before they fled'.<sup>57</sup> Cowley's couplet captures the paradox that the success of the charge almost spelt defeat for the Royalists:

Pursue noe more, yee noble *Victors* stay,  
Least too much Conquest loose so brave a day. (CW, I. 271-2)

The cry here echoes the 'official' Royalist account of the battle, which states that 'Our reserve of Horse, ... contrary to order, thinking the day was surely wonne, had followed the execution of the Rebells so farre'.<sup>58</sup> The True Informer observes that Rupert 'pursued the Enemies Horse like a whirl-wind', and adds that 'had there been day enough, when hee came back to the Infanterie, in all probabilitie a totall defeat had been given them'. Instead the Informer compares Charles' fortune to that of Henry III at the battle of Lewes, who was left to be taken prisoner while his son 'went so far (by excesse of courage) from the body of Army in pursuance of the Londoners', and Clarendon makes the same observation.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup>[William Dugdale?], A Relation of the Battaille lately fought between Keynton and Edgehill (Oxford, 1642; Wing R815), p. 3.

<sup>58</sup>[Dugdale?] (1642; R815), p. 4.

<sup>59</sup>Howell (1643; H3122), pp. 40-[41], sigs. [F4v]-Gr; Clarendon, VI. 85-6.

The partiality of Cowley's account of the battle becomes clear in his observations on the engagement's conclusion. The division that he perceives at the outset of the fighting continues at the end:

Streames of blacke tainted blood the fields besmeare,  
But pure wel-colour'd Drops shine here and there.  
They scorne to mixe with floods of baser veines,  
Just as th'ignobler Moistures *Oyle* disdaines. (*CW*, I. 277-80)

Cowley's intention here contrasts with that of Paman, who imagines the King's heart itself shedding the blood of the fallen on both sides:

Compassion dide there gasping in a wound  
And stretched out in a sinew, where she found  
Death and a grave, while the cold gore relents  
And weeps ageal'd into her Monument. ('The teares', ll. 7-10)

The blood of the compassion that died on both sides mixes together and hardens into a monument, echoing the hardening of attitudes among the opposing factions following Edgehill. Cowley's battle ends with the fall of night:

Thus many sav'd themselves, and *Night* the rest,  
*Night* that agrees with their blacke Actions best. (*CW*, I. 295-6)

A Parliamentary account, jointly signed by six officers, reports that 'it grew so late and dark, and to say the truth, our Ammunition at this present was all spent, that we contented ourselves to make good the Field'.<sup>60</sup> In fact, the Parliament's forces did leave the field during the night, prompting Cowley's view that night 'saved' their soldiers. This contrasts with Clarendon's description of night as 'the common friend to wearied and dismayed armies'.<sup>61</sup> There is a Homeric quality to Clarendon's words, recalling the sentiment of the divine heralds that part the combat between Hector and Ajax, which Chapman translates as

---

<sup>60</sup>An Exact and True Relation of The Dangerous and Bloody Fight Between His Majesties Army, and the Parliaments Forces, near Kyneton (London, 1642; Wing E3617), p. 5.

<sup>61</sup>Clarendon, VI. 87.

‘Now no more, my sonnes: the Sovereigne of the skies  
Doth love you both: both souldiers are, all witnesse with good right.  
But now night layes here mace on earth; tis good t’obey the night.’  
(Chapman, Homer’s Iliads, VII. 245-7)

Cowley’s view is closer to the description in the ‘official’ account, which holds that ‘if We had had light enough but to have given one charge more We had totally routed all their Army.’<sup>62</sup>

The account of the battle in The Civill Warre generally accords with Royalist perceptions of the engagement, but not entirely. The True Informer, for example, suggests that Charles

comported himselfe like another *Caesar* all the while, by riding about and encouraging the Souldiers, by exposing his person often to the reach of a Musket-bullet, and lying in the field all that bleake night in his coach.<sup>63</sup>

The anonymous author of the London newsletter separately observes that ‘the king was master of the field where he dined *the next day* upon a drum head and stayed within 4 miles till the dead were buried’.<sup>64</sup> Both authors appear to have in mind Lucan’s Caesar, as all the actions that they describe have parallels with Caesar’s behaviour during the battle of Pharsalia; he even remains on the field all night, eating breakfast among the slaughtered the following morning (Lucan, Pharsalia, VII. 786-824). Cowley’s reticence to make this comparison is even more surprising because in a poem celebrating Charles’ return from Scotland written as a schoolboy, Cowley explicitly compares the King to Caesar at Pharsalia.<sup>65</sup> His resistance to repeat this parallel suggests that when this section of The Civill Warre was written, Cowley did not intend his poem to be an epic along the lines of Lucan.

---

<sup>62</sup>[Dugdale?] (1642; R815), p. 4.

<sup>63</sup>Howell (1643; H3122), p. [41], sig. Gr.

<sup>64</sup>BL Harl. MS 3783, f. 61.

<sup>65</sup>BL Royal MS 12A58, f. 3.

In other areas, Cowley's version of events is marked by a similar restraint, as when he celebrates the Royalist fallen:

Thus fearelesse *Lindsey*, thus bold *Aubigny*  
Amidst the Corps of slaughtered *Rebells* lie, ...  
Your soaring Soules they meete in triumph all,  
Led by great *Stephen* their old *Generall*. (*CW*, I. 281-2, 289-90)

These fallen aristocrats follow St. Stephen to martyrdom. Similarly, Paman imagines that in the King's mind '*Lindsey*, *Varney* fall anew and lye' and looks forward to their ascendance to 'A constellation of Martyrs' ('The teares', ll. 17, 79). The chief difference is that Cowley makes no mention of the second nobleman that Paman names, Sir Edmund Verney, who died defending the King's standard, nor of the exploits of John Smith, who singlehandedly recaptured it, and was knighted on the field the following day,<sup>66</sup> despite virtually every other Royalist commentator making some reference to it. Cowley may wish to preserve a rigid class hierarchy, as almost all of the Royalists mentioned in *The Civill Warre* are noblemen, although Smith was the younger son of a noble family. It seems more likely that Cowley overlooks this incident because to narrate the recovery of the standard would involve admitting its loss. We might make a comparison with May, who several times mentions the capture of the standard, but after its delivery to Essex' secretary comments only that he 'carried it some time in his hand, suffered it to be taken from him by an unknowne person, and so privately it was conveyed away'.<sup>67</sup>

Cowley's only excessive claim is for the ratio of dead on each side:

Too deare a rate she sets, and we must pay,  
One honest man for ten such slaves as they. (*CW*, I. 275-6)

---

<sup>66</sup>See Young and Holmes, p. 79.

<sup>67</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, p. 20.

This is bold, even by the standards of propaganda, and even the 'official' Royalist account puts the figure at only 'five for one'.<sup>68</sup> In effect, Cowley reverses some of the wilder claims made by those on the Parliamentary side. Fiennes writes that 'it is thought that they lost 2000: ... [while] ... ten men are of opinion that vve lost not 200 Souldiers', and Nehemiah Wharton, who brought news of the battle to London, speaks of 'about 3000 of theirs slain: and we cannot beleeeve, nor we cannot have any information, to give us reason to beleeeve that there was above 300 of ours slain'.<sup>69</sup> The genuine figure is probably somewhere between the many estimates; Clarendon suggests that the number of the dead 'amounted to about five thousand; whereof two parts were conceived to be of those of the Parliament party, and not above a third of the King's.' He is also more realistic about the outcome of the battle, writing that the victory could scarce be imputed to the one or the other.<sup>70</sup> Perhaps the last word on the subject can go to May, who writes that 'there is no consent at all concerning the number of men slain, but so great a discrepancy, as it is almost a shame to insert into an History'.<sup>71</sup>

Different interpretations of the battle began to be propounded almost as soon as the fighting stopped. Neither army could be said to have won the battle outright, yet, as May writes,

the King, no lesse then the Parliament, pretended to be victorious in that Battell; and so farre ascribed the Victory to his owne side, that a Prayer of thanksgiving to God was made at *Oxford* for it. A thanksgiving was also on the Parliament side for the Victory of that day.<sup>72</sup>

After the battle, Nehemiah Wharton becomes a particular butt of Royalist satire:

---

<sup>68</sup>[Dugdale?] (1642; R815), p. 4.

<sup>69</sup>Fiennes (1642; F875), p. 8; Eight Speeches Spoken in Guild-Hall, Upon Thursday night, Octob. 27, 1642 (London, 1642; Wing E262), sig. Br.

<sup>70</sup>Clarendon, VI. 89.

<sup>71</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, p. 23.

<sup>72</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, pp. 22-3.



Goe *Wharton* now, prefer thy flourishing state,  
Above these murther'd *Heroes* dolefull fate.  
Enjoy that life which thou durst basely save,  
And thought a *Sawpit* nobler than a *Grave*. (CW, I. 291-4)

During the battle, Wharton apparently sought refuge in a saw-pit. The printed text of Thomas Case's sermon, Gods Rising, His Enemies Scattering, delivered on 26 October 1642, contains a marginal note which reads

At this moment the *Lord Wharton*, sent up to me in the pulpit the first relation of the victory at Edge Hill which then I read, to the great satisfaction and admiration of the whole Congregation; abundance of teares being shed for joy.<sup>73</sup>

In the immediate aftermath of the battle, several hastily produced pamphlets appeared reporting a Parliamentary victory and announcing the death of Prince Rupert. The 'authorised' Parliamentary account was not available until five days after the battle.<sup>74</sup>

Cowley pours scorn on this Parliamentary thanksgiving:

Still they Rebellions end remember well,  
Since *Lucifer* the *Great*, that shining *Captaine* fell.  
For this the *Bells* they ring, and not in vaine,  
Well might they all ring out, for Thousands slaine:  
For this the *Bonfires* their glad brightnes spread,  
When *funerall flames* might more befitt their Dead:  
For this with solemne *thanks* they vex their *God*,  
And whilst they *feelee* it, mock th' *Almighties* Rod. (CW, I. 307-14)<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup>Thomas Case, Gods Rising, His Enemies Scattering (London, 1644; Wing C380), p. 49n.

<sup>74</sup>See S. J. Greenberg, 'Dating Civil War Pamphlets, 1641-1644', Albion 20:3 (Fall 1988): 387-401, pp. 396-7.

<sup>75</sup>Cf. Butler, Hudibras, III. iii. 281-8:  
*Disperse the News, the Pulpit tells,*  
*Confirm'd with Fire-works, and with Bells,*  
*And though reduc'd to that extream,*  
*They have been forc'd to sing Te Deum,*  
*Yet with Religious Blasphemy*  
*By flattering Heaven, with a Lie,*  
*And for their Beating, giving thanks,*  
*Th' have rais'd recruits, and fill'd their Banks.*

Cowley suggests that the Parliamentary thanksgiving ‘vex’ God, and so paradoxically it is when they most feel God’s ire (in the defeat at Edgehill) that they offer him the most praise.

After Edgehill, both armies were slow to resume their march towards the capital. It was the Royalists who moved first, taking Banbury on 27 October. While Essex’s army was dispersed, returning to London in small groups, Charles occupied Oxford, which was the strategic centre for the Royalist cause for nearly four years. The King and his army entered Reading on 4 November, by which time London had a greater resolve to withstand Charles, as well as greater means, the main bulk of Essex’ army entering the city on 8 November. Rupert attempted to seize Windsor Castle on 7 November, but was rebuffed by the garrison under John Venn, and Charles subsequently entered Colnbrook on 11 November.<sup>76</sup> News of this Royalist advance brought with it fear of looting and pillaging. In response, as England’s

Memorable Accidents reports

the Committee for the *Militia of London*, have given order, that Trenches and Ramparts shall be raised neere all the Roads and highwaies that come to the City, as about *St. Iames*, *St. Gyles* in the fields, beyond *Islington*, and about *Pancras* Church in the fields, and they are now busily at worke about them, and the Saylors are raysing of a Mount and Trenches at *Mile end green* neare *Stepney*, where women of good fashion, and others, as also Children, labour hard at the worke.<sup>77</sup>

The Royalist advance continued to Brentford, and on 12 November 1642, allegedly in violation of a treaty agreement between the two sides, Prince Rupert’s forces surprised the regiment of Colonel Denzil Holles, but were ultimately held off by Sir John Hampden’s regiment. There is a reasonably accurate Parliamentary account of the events by ‘one Master Brown an Officer under Colonel Hollis’:

On Saturday the 12. of November, Prince *Robert* using the advantages of the Mist, which was that morning extreemly thick, brought up his Forces to *Brainford*, where

---

<sup>76</sup>See Young and Holmes, p. 81.

<sup>77</sup>England’s Memorable Accidents (24-31 October 1642; 579.08), p. 59.

he was most valiantly opposed by my Lord *Roberts* Regiment on the Bridge, who beat them off, and with great resolution maintained the Bridge till they had spent all their powder and shot, at which time it pleased God that Colonell *Hampden* and Colonell *Hollis* Regiments came in, who very manfully set upon them, and slew many of them, with the losse of very few on our side.<sup>78</sup>

In his account, Cowley singles out Holles' regiment, 'called the Red Coates', for special opprobrium:<sup>79</sup>

Witnesse, the *Red Coates* weltring in their gore,  
And dyed anew into the Name they bore. (CW, I. 323-4)

There are two reasons for this. He can again symbolically identify the soldiers with the colour of their uniform; having chosen blood as their colour, they are doomed to die bloodily.

Furthermore, Cowley writes in response to Parliamentary propaganda. Newsbook accounts of this incident, all of which at this time have a Parliamentary bias, remind the reader of the status of Holles' regiment. To the writer of Speciall Passages, they are 'those honest religious souldiers, that to their great honour and fame, had fought so courageously and valiantly in the late battle at Keneton',<sup>80</sup> and in England's Memorable Accidents they are 'the *London Apprentices*, and those that so valiantly furthered the Victory at *Kyneton* in *Warwickshire*'.<sup>81</sup>

A True Relation of the chiefe passages in Middlesex writes of the 'red regiment or red coats, ... those couragious and valiant London Prentises' showing themselves 'to bee no boyes, (as the other in contempt termed them) but resolute and able Souldiers'.<sup>82</sup> A pamphlet published before the outbreak of hostilities celebrates them as 'brave spirited young men' who 'are with much alacritie and cheerfulness resolved, to the utmost hazard of their lives, to oppose and

---

<sup>78</sup> An Exact and True Relation of the Battell Fought on Saturday last at Acton (London, 1642; Wing E3614), p. 7.

<sup>79</sup> A Continuation of Certaine speciall and remarkable Passages (12-18 November 1642; 57.2), sig. Bv.

<sup>80</sup> Speciall Passages (8-15 November 1642; 605.14), p. 119.

<sup>81</sup> England's Memorable Accidents (14-21 November 1642; 579.11), p. 82.

<sup>82</sup> A True Relation of the chiefe passages in Middlesex (London, 1642; Wing T2552), p. 5.

resist the Malignant Parties Armie'.<sup>83</sup> Cowley does not miss the opportunity to gloat at the defeat of so revered a regiment.

A description of soldiers drowning in the Thames follows the attack on the Red Coats:

Witnesse, those men blown high into the Aire,  
All *Elements* their ruin Joy'd to share.  
In the wide *Aire* quick *flames* their bodies tore,  
Then drown'd in *Waves* they're tost by *Waves* to *Shore*.  
Witnesse, thow *Thames* who wast amaz'd to see  
Men madly runne to save their lives in thee,  
In vain; for Rebells lives thow wouldst not save,  
And downe they sunke beneath thy conquering wave. (CW, I. 325-32)

In his commentary, Pritchard states that this passage refers to an incident in the aftermath of the battle at Brentford, when Royalist artillery blew up some Parliamentary barges on the Thames near Sion House, adding that 'Cowley follows Royalist news reports in much exaggerating the scale and significance of the action.'<sup>84</sup> According to one Parliamentary account, the

Cavalliers wanting their opportunity suddenly gave them a great shower of Musket shot from the top of that House, but it pleased God that they killed but one man that was in the Barges ... between Old Braineferd and Kew, the Cavalliers had planted Ordnance that commanded the River, so when the said Captain *Ellice* perceived that there was no remedy ... the men got to Land on the other side of the River, and by blowing up the powder sunke all the Barges.<sup>85</sup>

Pritchard suggests that Cowley was misled by his sources 'in the inflation of a trivial incident on the river near Brentford into an important engagement.'<sup>86</sup> As no-one died in this engagement, however, it seems to me, that Pritchard is mistaken, and that, rather than inflate

---

<sup>83</sup> A Declaration or The valiant Resolution of the Famous Prentices of London (London, 1642; Wing D774) (received by Thomason 4 August 1642), p. 3.

<sup>84</sup> CW, p.401n.

<sup>85</sup> (57.2), sig. B3v.

<sup>86</sup> CW, p. 365.

the incident, Cowley conflates it with a separate event. England's Memorable Accidents

describes how, at the conclusion of Prince Rupert's advance on Brentford, Holles' regiment

were forced to retreat, but having no place to flee to, they were driven into the River of Thames, where many of them in Boats and Barges got over the River into *Surrey*, some of them were drowned, and about forty of them slain in the fight.<sup>87</sup>

Another account alleges that 'when divers of Master *Hollis* his Souldiers fled into the river of THAMES, for safeguard of their lives, they shot at them as they were swimming, and so divers of them were drowned',<sup>88</sup> and another still states that Rupert's troops tied 'others of them by the hands with cords, casting them into the River, where they drowned.'<sup>89</sup> William Cartwright, in November, an invented Royalist rubric for the month, celebrates the same victory as Cowley:

But hearke! What Thunder's that? and who those men  
Flying tow'rds Heav'n, but falling downe agen?  
Whose those Blacke Corps cast on the Guilty Shore?  
'Tis sin that swimmes to its own Dore.  
'Tis the Third scourge of Rebels, which allow'd  
Our Army, like the Prophets Cloud  
Did from an Handfull rise, Untill at last  
Their Sky was by it Overcast.  
But (as Snakes Hisse after th'have lost their Sting)  
The Traytor call'd This Treachery in the King.<sup>90</sup>

Cartwright's marginal note dates this event on 12 November, and he seems similarly to conflate Rupert's advance with the destruction of the barges on the Thames on 14 November.

---

<sup>87</sup>(579.11), p. 82.

<sup>88</sup>A True and Perfect Relation of the Barbarous and Cruell Passages of the Kings Army, at Old Braineford (London, 1642; Wing T2551), p. 10.

<sup>89</sup>Speciall Passages, 15 (15-22 November 1642; 605.15A), p. 126.

<sup>90</sup>William Cartwright, November, ll. 41-50, in PR.

Cowley chooses to celebrate the victory over this regiment as a significant boost to morale, and also because the image of ‘rebel’ soldiers swallowed by the river suits his idea of the Thames as ‘emblematic of the proper state of society’:<sup>91</sup>

Good, reverend *Thames*, the best belov’d of all  
Those Noble *floods* that meete at *Neptunes* Hall, ...  
How do’es thy peacefull backe disdaine to beare,  
The rebells busie Pride from *Westminster*?  
Thow who thy Selfe, dost without murmur pay  
*Eternall Tributes* to thy *Prince*, the *Sea*! (CW, I. 333-4, 341-4)

Cowley’s representation of the Thames is similar to that in John Denham’s Cooper’s Hill:

Thames the most lov’d of all the Oceans sonnes,  
By his old sire to his imbraces runnes  
Hasting to pay his tribute to the Sea,  
Like mortall life to meet Eternity:  
Nor with a furious and unruly wave,  
Like profuse Kings, resumes the wealth he gave.<sup>92</sup>

These lines are from an earlier manuscript version of the poem, which differs from that which was published in London in 1642, and was reprinted in Oxford in 1643. The passage as a whole recalls the language and imagery of the naval battle described in the Pharsalia (III. 680-90), as well as in May’s translations of the episode. Cowley’s version is notable for the pleasure that it takes in the soldier’s fates, but one does not find the same gloating tone in either Lucan or May. Instead, there is a stark appreciation of the claustrophobia of drowning. May writes that ‘nothing wrought so much destruction / At Sea as Seas opposed Element’. He

---

<sup>91</sup>Trotter, p. 13.

<sup>92</sup>John Denham, Cooper’s Hill, Draft III, ll. 187-90, 197-8, in Expans’d Hieroglyphicks, ed. Brendon O’Hehir (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), pp. 122-3. Cf. John Taylor, A Very Merry Wherry-Ferry-Voyage (1622):

Old Neptune had his daughter Thames supplide,  
With ample measure of a flowing tide,  
But Thames supposde it was but borrowed goods,  
And with her ebbes, payd Neptune backe his floods.

(John Chandler (ed.), Travels Through Stuart Britain: The Adventures of John Taylor, the Water Poet (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), p. 66.

succinctly captures the irony of fire spreading so quickly at sea when ‘the ships apt fuell were’. The sailors are trapped with the choice of one horrific death or another:

In the sea to quench the fire one skips,  
For feare of drowning to the burning ships  
Another cleaues: that death that was most neare  
Among a thousand deaths, they most did feare.<sup>93</sup>

Cowley’s episode also responds to the clotted syntax of May’s translation, and the sense of confusion that it creates. A pause interrupts the run-on of the lines ‘Men madly runne to save their lives in thee / In vain; for Rebells lives thow wouldst not save,’ suggesting the sudden death of the soldiers. The soldiers fall into the river on top of one another, and the repetition here of ‘In...’ seems to enact this crowding in the verse. The regular iambic pentameter returns in the final line of the passage ‘And downe they sunke beneath thy conquering wave.’ If Cowley perceives a Lucanian parallel in this incident, it seems that he was not the only one.

A Continuation of Certaine speciall and remarkable Passages reports the interception of a letter from ‘a great Papist in his Majesties Army’ which details, among other things, the

same Premisnesse in the cause telling him that the best Regiment which the Parliament had were distressed at Brainford, and that they had fire and water enough and from the fury of one Element they plunged themselves into the mercy of another.<sup>94</sup>

The city’s response to the action at Brentford was impressive, and as May writes

all that night the City of *London* powred out men toward *Brainford*, who every houre marched thither, and all the Lords and Gentlemen that belonged to the Army were there ready on that Sunday morning, being the 14. of *November*, a force great enough to have swallowed up a farre greater Army then the King had.<sup>95</sup>

The Royalist army, hungry, weary, and very short of supplies, withdrew in the face of this army to Kingston, and then retreated to Oxford for the winter, arriving on 19 November 1642.

---

<sup>93</sup>Lucan (1627; 16887), sig. E8v.

<sup>94</sup>A Continuation of Certaine speciall and remarkable Passages (17-24 November; 58.1), pp. 3-4.

<sup>95</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, p. 34.

Here, according to Speciall Passages, ‘they kept two dayes of thanksgiving for the Kings great victories (1.) For his Victory over a great Litter, wherein some Seamen imployed by the Parliament upon the Thames. (2.) For his Victory over Colonel *Hollis* his Regiment’:<sup>96</sup>

To *Oxford* next great *Charles* triumphant came,  
*Oxford* the *British Muses* second Fame.  
Here Learning with some state and reverence looks,  
And dwells in *Buildings* lasting as her *Bookes*. (CW, I. 345-8)

Cowley once again figures himself in his poem; after describing the desecration of Oxford’s libraries and churches by Puritan troops, he proudly writes how ‘In vaine they silence every Age before; / For *Pens* of times to come will wound them more’ (CW, I. 353-4), including one supposes his own. Clarendon’s account of the King’s entry is similar to that of Cowley:

Oxford, which was the only city of England that he could say was entirely at his devotion, where he was received by the university, (to whom the integrity and fidelity of that place is to be imputed), with that joy and acclamation as Apollo should be by the Muses.<sup>97</sup>

Clarendon’s account is of the entry into Oxford on the march from Edgehill, prior to the action at Brentford. Cowley’s poetic sleight of hand makes the King’s retreat to Oxford from Brentford appear more triumphant than it was in fact.

With the King back in Oxford, the campaign and this section of Cowley’s poem reach a dead end. London’s resistance of the King forced Royalist and Parliamentarian alike to give up the ‘hope that one quick blow might cleare the doubt’.<sup>98</sup> The task fell to the commentator, or, in Cowley’s case, the poet, to look for signs of a likely outcome in the battles already fought. This is why Cowley’s The Civill Warre appears less as the first steps towards an epic than as a polemical piece that draws upon, and enters into a dialogue with, both Royalist and

---

<sup>96</sup>(605.15A), p. 126.

<sup>97</sup>Clarendon, VI. 99.

<sup>98</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, pp. 29-30.



Parliamentarian accounts of the campaign. It is why he makes so much of possible propaganda victories, such as the defeat at Powick Bridge and the routing of Holles' regiment. Both sides issued medals commemorating Edgehill, each making use of the same image of an armed knight mounted on a rearing horse, identified on one as the Prince of Wales, on the other as the Earl of Essex, 'revealing an aesthetic rivalry in each side's attempts to fix what had been an indecisive battle with definitive symbols'.<sup>99</sup> Cowley, who, as a poet, was a maker of images in another sense, hopes that in providing a definitive 'literary' interpretation of the campaign he will help win a war that so far remained undecided in the field.

---

<sup>99</sup>John Peacock, 'The visual image of Charles I' in The Royal Image, p. 195.

## WESTERN WONDERS: THE CAMPAIGN IN THE WEST 1643

After the Royalist army reaches its 'dead end' at Brentford, and so denies a thus far linear narrative its anticipated conclusion, Cowley shifts his attention to other theatres of war, treating the war regionally while keeping one eye on an overarching chronological structure. In taking this approach, he anticipates the design that Clarendon employs on a larger scale in his *History*, which itself provides the model for many subsequent historians. It is likely that Cowley himself follows the example of the authors of newsbooks, who each week would fashion a short narrative from divergent sources. Cowley first turns his attention to the Royalist army's campaign in the west of England. Because this is one of the most successful Royalist campaigns of the conflict, it reveals the closest interplay between poetic and journalistic accounts of warfare.

The shift in scene to the west country allows Cowley another opportunity to identify the Stuart cause in the conflict with the history of the nation. He ascribes the bravery of the Cornish in their defiance of the 'cruell' and 'Barbarous' Parliamentarians (*CW*, I. 400) to their historical resistance to invasion by the Saxons (*CW*, I. 395-8), calling on them to

Show now that Spirit, till all men thinke by you,  
The doubtfull tales of your great *Arthur* true. (*CW*, I. 405-6)

The river Tamar, separating Cornwall and Devon, assumes a symbolic importance:

Againe did *Tamar* your dread Armes behold,  
As just and as successfull, as of old.  
Hee kist the *Cornish* Banks and vow'd to bring,  
His richest waves to feed th'ensuing Spring.  
But murmur'd sadly and almost denide,  
All fruitfull Moisture to the *Devon* side. (*CW*, I. 409-14)

The Tamar emphasises division between Royalist and Parliamentarian in much the same way as the valley at the beginning of the battle at Edgehill; it is a mental, as well as geographical boundary. Cowley aligns the Royalist army with transcendence by showing how it attracts the

life-giving source of water, in contrast with Michael Drayton's emphasis on the river's 'equal sides' in the first song in Poly-Olbion.<sup>100</sup>

A striking feature of this passage is Cowley's use of poetic licence to disguise truths that are unfavourable to the Royalist cause. Sir Ralph Hopton, who, from his arrival in the county until his serious injury, was commander of the Royalist forces in Cornwall, was forced to stand trial at Truro Assizes for leading what was regarded as an invasion force, although he was acquitted and thanked by the court. Hopton, having successfully raised the *posse comitatus*, a force of able-bodied private citizens, found that the Cornish trained bands refused to cross the Tamar into Devon, although Cowley tries to avoid dwelling on this fact:<sup>101</sup>

Ye *Sonnes of Warre*, by whose bold Acts we see,  
How great a thing *exalted man* may be.  
The *world* remains your debter that as yet,  
Ye have not all gone forth and conquer'd it. (CW, I. 415-18)

The Cornish '*Sonnes of Warre*' and the world remain distinct, each the subject of separate sentences. Subsequently, Hopton raised a Cornish volunteer force to cross the Tamar, and tried to supplement the army with a Devonian *posse comitatus*, but this force was dispersed after it failed to take either Plymouth or Exeter. The Parliamentary forces under General Ruthin pursued Hopton back into Cornwall, but suffered a repulse at Braddock Down on 19 January 1643.<sup>102</sup> It was in the weeks following this battle, at a skirmish near Chagford on 8 February, that the poet Sidney Godolphin, who had served as a volunteer throughout the campaign, was killed. Cowley commemorates him in a passage notable for its use of the Virgilian *hæmistich*, or half-line:

---

<sup>100</sup>See CW, p. 404n.

<sup>101</sup>See Young and Holmes, p. 89.

<sup>102</sup>See Young and Holmes, pp. 90-1.

Should *Barkley*, *Slaning*, *Digby* presse to fame.  
*Godolphin* thee, thee *Greenvill* I'de rehearse,  
But *teares* breake off my verse. (CW, I. 428-30)<sup>103</sup>

It fell to another Royalist pen, that of Sir John Denham, to commemorate in verse the earliest events of the western campaign. Denham's poem, 'A Western Wonder', appears to have been written in the weeks following the battle of Stratton, fought on 16 May, and, like Cowley's, interacts with the printed accounts of the campaign in circulation. 'A western Wonder' begins with a reference to the battle of Sourton Down, on 25 April:

Do you not know, not a fortnight ago,  
How they brag'd of a Western wonder?  
When a hundred and ten, slew five thousand men,  
With the help of Lightning and Thunder.<sup>104</sup>

Denham's vigorous use of the ballad metre has the effect of deflating the pretensions of the Parliamentary newsbooks, who claim their victory as a 'western wonder'. Hopton's army, however, was put to flight by a detachment of cavalry under Major-General James Chudleigh, and the fact that the usually accurate *Mercurius Aulicus* erroneously reports this event as a victory is a measure of the extent of Royalist embarrassment.<sup>105</sup> Theodore Banks notes that the numbers that Denham relates are those given in the title of a contemporary pamphlet:

A Most Miraculous and Happy Victory obtained by James Chidleigh Serjeant Major Generall of the forces under the E. of Stamford, against Sir Ralph Hopton and his Forces. Who with 108 Horse did rout and put to flight 5000 Foot and 500 horse, tooke divers prisoners, arms, ensignes, their standard, with a Portmantell of Letters, Warrants and privy Seales, with many remarkable Passages concerning the same.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup>Pritchard identifies the soldiers named here as Sir Bevil Grenville, Sir John Berkeley, Sir Nicholas Slanning, and either Colonel John Digby, or Sir John Digby (CW, p. 404n.). In a list of the commanders who fought at Stratton, Clarendon names Grenville, Berkeley, Slanning, Colonel Digby and Colonel William Godolphin (Clarendon, VII. 88).

<sup>104</sup>Sir John Denham, 'A Western Wonder', stanza 1, in Theodore Howard Banks, Jr., ed., *The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1928).

<sup>105</sup>See *Mercurius Aulicus*, (5 May 1643; 275. 118), pp. 129-30.

<sup>106</sup>See Denham, p. 130n.

These figures are also to be found in other newsbooks, with one noting that

Serjeant-Major *Ghudleigh* being at *Okehampton* with only a hundred and eight men, ... [there] was not lost one man in this service, although the Enemies Forces consisted of about five thousand fighting men, this overthrow was so wonderfull and miraculous[.]

The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer is even closer to Denham's words:

As God hath blest us in the taking of *Redding* ... so he hath in a more miraculous manner shewed his hand in prospering our Forces in the West, where 108 horse routed about 5000. horse and foote, tooke about 800. Armes, eighteene Drummes, three Colours, one Cornet, and divers other weapons, ...<sup>107</sup>

These are perhaps more probable sources for Denham's figures, as A Most Miraculous and Happy Victory is the only Parliamentary pamphlet not to mention the role played by 'Lightning and Thunder'. Some Parliamentary accounts of this incident are straightforward; one speaks of Hopton's force's amazement as 'it grew darke and it thundered and lightned in a very terrible manner, and the thunderclap brake just over their heads, and then raine extraordinary,' and there is a more graphic account in Joyfull Newes From Plimouth:

during the rout and flight of the Cornubians an extraordinary storme of lightning and thunder fell upon them, which lightning singed and burnt the haire of their heads, and fired the gunpowder in the musket pans and bandeliers, which so lamentably scorched and burnt many of their bodies, that they sent for 12 Chyrurgians from *Launceston*.<sup>108</sup>

Other accounts are more providential, and it is these that raise Denham's ire; A most true Relation of divers notable Passages of Divine Providence tells of how

the Lord sent the most hideous claps of thunder, lightning and haile downe that hath beene heard this long time: these improbabilities stricke terroure and amazement into the guilty conscience of Sir *Ralph Hopton*, and this traitorous spoiling robbing crue.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament, (1 May 1643; 511. 48B), sigs. 3Av-3A2r; The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer, (25 April - 2 May 1643; 214.017), p. 114.

<sup>108</sup> A Full Relation of the great defeat given to the Cornish Cavalliers (London, 1643; Wing N81), p. 6; Joyfull Newes From Plimouth (London, 1643; Wing J1141) (received by Thomason 18 May), sig. [A4v] (this latter account is the same as that in Certaine Informations, cited in Denham, p. 130n.).

<sup>109</sup> A most true Relation of divers notable Passages of Divine Providence (London, 1643; Wing M2928), pp. 5-6.

Exploits Discovered concludes with a declaration that the weather ‘stroke much terrour into them, that some among them had better dispositions then the rest, betook themselves to Prayer, and said, That now they saw that the Lord did fight against them.’<sup>110</sup> Denham’s references in the following stanza to ‘*Hopton ... slain, again and again*’ and ‘*Thanksgiving*’ (‘A Western Wonder’, stanza 2) seem to refer generally to incorrect Parliamentary reports of the deaths of Royalist officers, and of giving thanks in Church for victories, rather than to Sourton Down specifically, as there was no printed report of Hopton’s death after this engagement. Denham introduces these details to contrast the ‘Miracle’ of Sourton Down with another apparent ‘miracle’, Hopton’s resurrection:

But now on which side was this Miracle try’d,  
I hope we at last are even;  
For Sir *Ralph* and his Knaves, are risen from their Graves,  
To Cudgel the Clowns of *Devon*. (‘A Western Wonder’, stanza 3)

The unusual use of the word ‘Cudgel’ here can perhaps be explained with reference to a contemporary report in The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer of the capture of General George Goring, a Royalist officer, outside Wakefield. The report describes a letter found on his person from his father, which concludes ‘with a prime peece of club Rhetorick, *Cudgell them to a Treaty, and let us alone with the rest*: which is the reason they are so desirous to resume the Treaty’.<sup>111</sup> ‘Club Rhetorick’ is the language of the clubmen, hastily raised infantry armed with clubs, and the newsbook’s report implies the poor quality of provincial Royalist armies. It seems Denham aims to turn this Parliamentary rhetoric back on its authors.

If Sourton Down was the Parliament’s ‘Western Wonder’, then Stratton was the Royalist one. Cowley echoes Denham’s view of the battle as a ‘Miracle’ in his epithet for

---

<sup>110</sup>H. R., Exploits Discovered (London, 1643; Wing R21), p. 6.

<sup>111</sup>The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer (23-30 May 1643; 214. 021), p. 168.

Hopton, ‘Mirac’ulous man!’ (CW, I. 425). Cowley’s description of the battle, and to a lesser extent Denham’s, owe most to the account in The Round-Heads Remembrancer. It is a measure of how striking this victory was that Cowley’s relation of events is not hyperbolic; even the usually more temperate Clarendon uses a similar vocabulary to report this battle. Cowley writes of ‘the *Cornish* Powers, / *Few* and scarce armd’ (CW, I. 445-6), agreeing with both Clarendon, who claims that they were ‘not half the number, and unsupplied with every useful thing’, and the Remembrancer, which portrays Hopton’s ‘whole body of foot being not full 3000, and his Ammunition not sufficient for those men hee had’.<sup>112</sup> Conversely, the Remembrancer claims that the Parliamentary forces were ‘exactly at the highest ... for men, Ordnance, Ammunition, place, Armes, and all other Accommodation never so strong before, but strongest of all in the weaknesse of their enemy’;<sup>113</sup> this full complement of arms may have inspired Cowley’s comparison of the Parliamentarians with Briareus, ‘him with the hundred hands’ who aided Zeus in his war against the other gods (Homer’s Iliads, I. 396-7). The strength of the Parliament forces’ camp was apparently formidable:

Soe strong their *Campe* it did almost appeere  
Secure, had neither *Armes* nor *men* bin there. (CW, I. 443-4)

The Remembrancer concurs that at Stratton ‘they intrenched in as strong a Camp, as (themselves confesse) they ever yet beheld.’<sup>114</sup> The assault on the camp itself becomes a battle between competing weaponry, with victory going to the sword rather than the firearm:

The violent *Sword* outdid their *Muskets* ire,  
It strucke the bones, and there gave dreadfull Fire,  
Wee scorn’d their *Thunder*, and the reeking *Blade*  
A thicker Smoake then all their *Canon* made. (CW, I. 449-52)

---

<sup>112</sup>Clarendon, VII. 87; The Round-Heads Remembrancer ([Oxford], 1643; Wing R2009) (received by Thomason 7 June), p. 3.

<sup>113</sup>(1643; R2009), p. 3.

<sup>114</sup>(1643; R2009), p. 3.

This accords with the facts of the battle as witnesses reported; the Remembrancer states that ‘these loyall gentlemen had spent their Ammunition, and had not powder left for one houre longer, they then (with unexpressible valour) fell upon the Rebels with their swords and pikes’.<sup>115</sup> Clarendon approximates Cowley’s expression of this achievement, writing that ‘they outfaced their shot with their swords’.<sup>116</sup> Clarendon’s choice of verb implies the honour and valour associated with the sword, the bearer of which is able to face down opposition at close range.

Cowley links the flight of the Parliamentary commander with his slaughtered soldiers:

How oft has vanquisht *Stamford* backwards fled,  
Swift as the parted Soules of those hee led. (CW, I. 431-2)

The newsbook Speciall Passages commends Stamford’s valour, reporting that ‘(being deserted by men unaccustomed to fight) he was constrained to leave the Feild, but (to his honour) was the last man that retreated’.<sup>117</sup> Cowley’s stance here accords with Denham’s:

For now he out-runs his Arms and his Guns,  
And leaves all his money behind him;  
But they follow after, unless he take water  
At *Plymouth* again, they will find him. (‘A Western Wonder’, stanza 5)

Denham’s lines accurately convey the immense material benefit brought by the Royalist victory, and Cowley too perceives this advantage:

The *Armes* we gain’d, *Wealth*, *Bodies* of the Foe,  
All that a full fraught Victory could bestow. (CW, I. 455-6)

Clarendon catalogues the booty of the victory, as do the contemporary Royalist accounts. The Remembrancer sees this capture of goods as reversing Hopton’s army’s initial disadvantage,

---

<sup>115</sup>(1643; R2009), p. 3.

<sup>116</sup>Clarendon, VII. 89.

<sup>117</sup>Speciall Passages (23-30 May 1643; 605. 42), p. 340.



listing '57 barrels of powder, with a like proportionable quantity of bullet, shot, match, and betwixt 2 and 3000 armes, besides 3000 l. in ready money'.<sup>118</sup> Parliamentary pamphlets aim generally to make the best of this defeat, and the scale of the material loss can be glimpsed in one pamphlet's protest that they 'had foure thousand pounds there in Money, which was all preserved to a small matter.'<sup>119</sup>

Denham perceives two direct consequences of the action at Stratton. He suggests a parallel between what '*Stamford* hath lost' and 'What *Reading* hath cost', that is, the '15000. pound sent to *Reading*' by the Parliament to pay Essex' army after its successful siege of the town.<sup>120</sup> The implication is that each is a material loss as well as a loss of prestige to the Parliamentary cause. Furthermore, he ridicules the panic in London at a renewed assault on the city:

Now *Peters* and *Case*, in your Prayer and Grace  
Remember the new Thanksgiving;  
*Isaac* and his *Wife*, now dig for your life,  
Or shortly you'l dig for your living. ('A Western Wonder, stanza 7)

The fact that many of these labourers were female disconcerted some Royalist observers, and Alexander Brome sneers:

Has *Isaac* our L. *Maïor*, L. *Maïor*,  
With Tradesmen and his Wenches,  
Spent so much time, and Cakes and Beer,  
To edifie these Trenches!  
All trades did shew their skill in this,  
Each Wife an Engineer;  
The *Mairess* took the tool in hand,

---

<sup>118</sup>(1643; R2009), p. 4.

<sup>119</sup>N. E., The Truth of our bad Newes from Exeter (London, 1643; Wing E22) (received by Thomason 24 May), p. 3.

<sup>120</sup>(1643; J1141), sig. [A3r].

The maids the stones did bear.<sup>121</sup>

While in each of these passages ‘*Isaac*’ is evidently Sir Isaac Pennington, the staunch Puritan who became Lord Mayor of London in 1642, ‘his *Wife*’ seems to have a more general application, meaning the wives of London collectively, and it is to them that the coarse sexual puns in Denham’s lines refer. This reference may be inspired by the rhetoric of the pamphlet A True Declaration of the care of Rt. Hon. Isaac Pennington, Lord Major of London, in promoting the Fortifications about the City and Suburbs, which states how ‘men, women and children shall and are glad to see such fortifications’.<sup>122</sup> It goes on to speculate, probably recalling the experience of Brentford in the previous autumn, that had the earthworks not been erected and should the enemy gain entrance to London, ‘there would be nothing but ruine and desolation in the streets thereof, while men, women and children were sacrificed to the fury of the sword’, reminding Londoners that ‘if they regard their children, wives or any thing that is deare unto them, they must blesse your Lordship’.<sup>123</sup> As they had in the November of 1642, women played an important part in the erecting of earthworks, and Mercurius Civicus supplies a colourful description of their efforts:

There went out to that purpose ... about 440. Women who imitating those ancient Brittish viragos of their Sex, appointed Commanders and Officers among themselves,

---

<sup>121</sup>Alexander Brome, ‘On the demolishing the Forts’, in Poems, ed. Roman R. Dubinski (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982). Cf. Butler, Hudibras, II. ii. 801-8:

March’d, rank and file, with *Drum* and *Ensign*,  
T’entrench the *City*, for defence in;  
Rais’d *Rampiers*, with their own soft hands,  
To put the enemy to stands;  
From *Ladies* down to *Oyster-wenches*,  
Labour’d like *Pioners* in *Trenches*,  
Fell to their *Pick-axes*, and *Tools*,  
And help’d the men to dig like *moles*?

<sup>122</sup>W. S., A True Declaration of the care of the Rt. Hon. Isaac Pennington (London, 1643; Wing S207) (received by Thomason 27 April), p. 7.

<sup>123</sup>W. S. (1643; S207), p. 10.

and went in complexe Rancke and File, one of them (like a stout *Amazonian*) triumphantly carried a black Ensigne.<sup>124</sup>

In the pamphlet praising Penington, there is a constant shifting in the meaning of the word ‘work’ between its literal meaning in the context, referring to the earthworks, and more religious connotations, in the sense of ‘good works’. ‘Every Fortification,’ announces the pamphleteer, ‘is strong by the weight and worth of the work’, and addresses Penington directly, stating ‘these works proceed from the mighty working of Gods spirit in your heart’.<sup>125</sup> Elsewhere, it suggests that as ‘man is fortified by his inward vertues and spirituall graces,’ so accordingly London ‘is by your Lordships care and vigilancy fortified with warlike workes’.<sup>126</sup> The pamphlet emphasises that the ‘works’ follow on from the justifying faith of Penington and the citizens of London. In The Civill Warre, Cowley laments both the physical and spiritual barriers that the earthworks represent:

But if that still their stubborne *Hearts* they fence,  
With new *Earth-workes* that shut thee out from thence,  
Goe on, great *God*, and fight as thou has fought.  
Teach them, or let the *world* by them be taught. (CW, I. 573-6)

Cowley’s own response to Stratton reflects his confidence in the Royalist army, as he makes a comparison with the situation in Germany:

Sad *Germany* can no such Trophy boast,  
For all the Blood these twenty yeares she’has lost. (CW, I. 439-40)

In the 1640s, the destruction caused by the Thirty Years’ War still terrified Royalist and Parliamentarian propagandists alike; in The True Informer, Howell reminds his readers that they ‘know well with what fearefull fits of a high burning fever poore *Germany* hath beene

---

<sup>124</sup>Mercurius Civicus, Londons Intelligencer (25 May-1 June 1643; 298. 004), p. 28.

<sup>125</sup>W. S, (1643; S207), p. 5.

<sup>126</sup>W. S, (1643; S207), p. 9.

long shaken'.<sup>127</sup> Cowley can invoke Germany here because Stratton strengthens his belief that England will not go down the same road.

Following this success, Hopton's army proceeded to meet with those of the Marquis of Hertford and Prince Maurice (CW, I. 457-9). Cowley concentrates on this onward march, as it conveniently obscures the Royalist reverse at Lansdown that was the immediate fruit of the meeting. He does not even name the engagement at this point in the poem, where Hopton was defeated by Sir William Waller, who here earned himself the soubriquet 'the Conqueror'. Denham also avoids mentioning Lansdown by name in his poem 'A Second Western Wonder'. This poem relates to the earlier one in both its title and its similar structure, as each poem contrasts a Parliamentary 'wonder' with a greater Royalist one. Cowley and Denham each focus on a different aspect of the battle. Denham, with a retrospective glance at the Parliament's earlier 'wonder', begins with a relation of 'that Miracles Brother, / Which was done with a *Firkin of powder*':

Oh what a damp, it struck through the Camp!  
But as for honest Sir *Ralph*,  
It blew him to the *Vies*, without beard, or eyes,  
But at least three heads and a half.<sup>128</sup>

During the retreat from Lansdown, a fire spread through the Royalist magazine, causing an explosion, and among the injured was Hopton itself. Denham's lines mimic accurately the tone of several Parliamentary accounts; The Copie of a Letter Sent From the Maior of Bristoll describes how, after the accident, he

---

<sup>127</sup>Howell (1643; H3122), p. 3.

<sup>128</sup>Denham, 'A Second Western Wonder', in Poetical Works.

was yesterday carried in his bed to a Caroach, a miserable spectacle, his head being as big as three, and both his eyes blinded, besides which he was shot in his arme a day before.<sup>129</sup>

The '*Vies*' is the town of Devizes to which the Royalist army retreated. Cowley's treatment focusses instead on the death of Sir Bevil Grenville at the moment of victory (*CW*, I. 463-70), and this passage is examined in detail in the next chapter.

Cowley shares, with some of the contributors to a volume of elegies on Grenville, a perception of the link between the loss of Grenville and the subsequent victory for the Royalists at the battle of Roundway Down on 13 July 1643:

Yet, let them boast their Conquest if they can,  
Wee have gained an Army, and have lost a Man.  
And let them preach Thee slaine, since from thy Death  
A Thousand almost-*Grenvilles* gather breath.<sup>130</sup>

Cartwright emphasises the singularity of Grenville, as his fellow Cornishmen become 'almost-*Grenvilles*', and while Cowley expresses a similar idea, his treatment is more hyperbolic:

On *Roundway Downe*, our rage for thy great fall,  
Whet all our Spirits, and made us *Greenvills* all. (*CW*, I. 471-2)

Even Clarendon concedes that there was on the day a Royalist desire for revenge, writing of how their army 'lost no time in falling upon the foot, to revenge what they had suffered, and sacrificed too many to the memory of their beloved Greenevill'.<sup>131</sup> As at Brentford, Cowley singles out a particular regiment for special condemnation, in this case, Sir Arthur Haslerigg's heavily armoured troops, nicknamed the 'Lobsters'. Their resilience made them greatly feared

---

<sup>129</sup>Richard Aldworth, *The Copie of a Letter Sent From the Maior of Bristoll* (London, 1643; Wing A901A) (received by Thomason 12 July), p. 3.

<sup>130</sup>*Verses on the death of the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenvill, Knight* (Oxford, 1643; Wing O990) (received by Thomason 12 August), sig. [D2r].

<sup>131</sup>Clarendon, VII. 101n.

by Royalists; to Clarendon, they are ‘that impenetrable regiment’,<sup>132</sup> and to another contributor to the commemorative volume they possess an almost mythic power:

[Grenville] like a Bullwarke, stopt the full Careere  
Of Men more Iron, then those Armes they weare;  
And Bankt the Breaches of those Sons of Steele,  
*Achilles* like All Prooffe, but in the Heele.<sup>133</sup>

The idea of these ‘Iron Men, and men of Steele’ may combine elements from the Titan Talos from the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes with echoes of Prince John’s address of the rebel Archbishop of York in *Henry IV Part Two* as an ‘iron man’, implying both his armour and his hardheartedness.<sup>134</sup> Cowley relishes the fact that though these ‘*Iron Regiments*’ (*CW*, I. 477) seem impervious to cannon-fire, mines and siege equipment, they were routed by the small Royalist cavalry because they were ‘too slow for *flight*’ (*CW*, I. 482), particularly as Parliamentary reports commended their courage at Roundway Down, writing that ‘onely Sir *Arthur Haslerigs* Regiment fought valiantly, and bravely charged through their whole body’.<sup>135</sup>

Also singled out for attack is the Parliamentary general, Sir William Waller:

Blesse me! and where was then their *Conquerour*!  
*Coward of Fame*! he flies in hast away,  
*Men, Armes* and *Name* leaves as the victors prey. (*CW*, I. 474-6)

Earlier, Cowley makes another reference to ‘that *flying Conquerours* empty name’ (*CW*, I. 462). This repeats the sneer of the Royalist commander, Sir John Byron, that ‘this was the

---

<sup>132</sup>Clarendon, VII. 118.

<sup>133</sup>H. E., (1643; O990), sig. [D4r].

<sup>134</sup>I. M., in (1643; O990), sig. [A4v]; William Shakespeare, *Henry IV Part Two* (ed. René Weis), The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), IV. i. 234.

<sup>135</sup>*Wednesday’s Mercury* (19 July 1643; 669. 1), p. 3.

successes of their great Conquerer'.<sup>136</sup> Cowley's lines also share with Denham's the conceit of Waller's flight being so swift that half of his title is left on the field:

But now without lying, you may paint him flying,  
At *Bristol* they say you may find him  
Great *William* the *Con* so fast he did run,  
That he left half his name behind him. ('A Second Western Wonder', stanza 4)

Waller is left with the title of 'Con', that is a rabbit, an animal that runs for cover rather than stays and fights. Denham's verse seems inspired by Parliamentary responses to Lansdown, and he delights in using their own rhetorical imagery against them:

When out came the book, which the *News-Monger* took  
From the *Preaching Ladies* Letter,  
Where in the first place, stood the *Conquerours* face,  
Which made it shew much the better. ('A Second Western Wonder', stanza 3)<sup>137</sup>

The 'preaching lady' is Waller's Puritan wife, and the 'book' is the seventh issue of Mercurius Civicus London's Intelligencer, dated 6 July to 13 July 1643, which reports the battle of Lansdown, and features a portrait of Waller on the title page, that is, 'in the first place'. The portrait bears the legend 'WILLIAM a Conquerour'; this is the title that has fragmented, especially as the subsequent issue, reporting Roundway Down, replaces his portrait with those of Charles and Henrietta Maria. Waller's abandonment of his title leaves it open to be reclaimed as a Royalist term, and this section of The Civill Warre concludes with 'Bright *Conquest*' walking 'the fields in all her Dresse' (CW, I. 490).

The day of this battle saw the Royalist cause at its zenith, as it also saw the reuniting of Charles and Henrietta Maria at Kington, on the field where the battle of Edgehill had been

---

<sup>136</sup> Sir John Byron, Sir John Byrons Relation (York, 1643; Wing B6409A), p. 6.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. Cleveland, The Character of a London-Diurnall: 'This is the *William*, whose Lady is the *Conquerour*; This is the *Cities Champion*, and the *Diurnalls delight*; hee that Cuckolds the Generall in his Commission: for he stalkes with *Essex*, and shoots under his belly, because his Oxcellency himselfe is not charged there. Yet in all his triumph there is a whip and a Bell: Translate but the Scene to *Roundway-downe*: There *Hasleriggs* Lobsters were turned into Crabs, and crawl'd backwards; there poor Sir *William* ran to his Lady for a use of consolation' (1646; C4662), p. 5.

fought. Cowley marks this meeting of the King and Queen by using the language of the masque (CW, I. 491-508), mainly because of the form's capacity to celebrate the associations of the place where it was performed. The masque replays the events of the previous year, turning the 'almost-*Victory*' (CW, II. 42) of Edgehill into a 'victory' (CW, I. 494), as 'ten thousand *Cupids*' chase 'the wandring *Spirits of Rebels* dead' (CW, I. 497-8), perhaps a reference to the various reports of the appearance of phantom armies at the site.<sup>138</sup> Some critics express disquiet about this abrupt shift from the martial to the marital, but it is probably meant to be indicative of Cowley's contribution to the established imagery of Royalist victory, such as one finds in the volume of verse commemorating the event. Trotter writes that 'the function of Stuart masque was to enact the dispelling of Chaos by order, and elements from it could easily be adapted to Cowley's purpose here'.<sup>139</sup> The Kington masque unites '*War and Love*' (CW, I. 496) in a similar fashion to some contributions to the commemorative volume, for example, 'with *Mars, Venus* keeps mutuall awe, / Making the sword rule milder then the Law'<sup>140</sup> or 'May this your safe returne to your *Charles* prove / A pledge as well of Victory as Love'.<sup>141</sup> Cowley symbolically links the meeting at Kington to the war; Roundway Down ends with Conquest walking the field, and Conquest returns to conclude the masque:

At her *returne* well might she a Conquest have,  
Whose very *absence* so much Conquest gave. (CW, I. 507-8)

---

<sup>138</sup>For example, A Great Wonder in Heaven, shewing the Late Apparitions seene on Edge-Hill (London, 1642[3]; Wing G1787), and The New Yeares Wonder Being a relation of the disturbed inhabitants at Keinton and other villages neere unto Edge-Hil, in which place is heard & seene fearfull and strange apparitions of spirits (London, [1643]; Wing N281). The same point is made in Harry Rusche, 'Abraham Cowley's "Wandring *Spirits of Rebels* Dead"', American Notes and Queries, 21: 7-8 (March / April 1983), 99-101.

<sup>139</sup>Trotter, p. 13.

<sup>140</sup>H. Berkned, in Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria (Oxford, 1643; Wing O903) (received 31 July), sig. Br.

<sup>141</sup>Richard Stevenson, (1643; O903), sig. [C4r].



This is the connection that John Berkenhead makes explicit in the Kinton volume:

When once the *Members* shrunk to *four*,  
When *Hopton* brought his *Cornish* o're,  
When as Eternall *Grenvill* stood  
And stopt the gap up with his blood,  
When their slye *Conqu'rour* durst not stand,  
We knew the *Queene* was nigh at hand.<sup>142</sup>

Cowley adds to the celebratory tone of this event by concluding the first book of the poem with an account of the Marquis of Newcastle's victory at Adwalton Moor:

I see the gallant *Earle* break through his foes,  
In *dust* and *sweat* how gloriously he shows!  
I see him lead the *Pikes*! what will he doe?  
Defend him *God*! Ah whether will he goe?  
Up to the *Canon* mouth he leads; in vaine,  
They speak lowd *Death*, and threaten till they're t'ane. (CW, I. 529-34)

There seems to be an awareness on Cowley's part that any relation of the Earl's exploits at this battle will seem so extraordinary as to be unbelievable, so he is particularly concerned to follow closely a documentary report, which appears to have been that in *Mercurius Aulicus*:

he presently alighted from his Horse, went himselfe to his Foot, and taking a Pike into his hand, bid them *follow him* ... the Noble Earle so animated the whole Army that they charged with unexpressible courage, and so amazed the Rebels with the bravery of their coming on, that the Rebels soon fell into confusion, and were not brought agin into rank and order, till the Earle made himself master of the Rebels Canon, which he presently turned against the Rebels.<sup>143</sup>

Cowley restricts himself to the events in *Aulicus*' narrative, such as the charge of pikes and the capture of the cannon; even the comparison of Newcastle with 'Capaneus', struck down by Jove's thunder in Statius' *Thebaid* for his pretended emulation of the deity, who leaves his enemies 'Thunder-strooke' (CW, I. 535, 538), accords with *Aulicus*' account of the

---

<sup>142</sup>Jo[h]n Berkenhead, (1643; O903), sig. Aav.

<sup>143</sup>*Mercurius Aulicus*, (3 July 1643; 275. 127), p. 351.

‘astonishment’ of the Parliamentary troops. The capture of the cannon assumes a special significance in the final couplet:

Heaven will let nought be by their Canon donne  
Since at Edg-hill they sinn’d and Burlington. (CW, I. 541-2)

The reference here is to the Parliamentary ships that allegedly fired at the Queen after her landing at Burlington in Yorkshire. Peter Heylyn connects this event with the fire aimed at the King at Edgehill:

Compare the danger which His Majestie was in at the battell of *Edge-hill*, when the undistinguishing bullets fell so thicke about Him; with this wherein the *Cannon* bent against the QUEENE, shot through the house in which She was, killed a man that stood so neare, and covered Her with earth even before Her buriall.<sup>144</sup>

John Fell’s contribution to the Kinton volume also connects the events at Burlington with those at Edgehill:

Let *Edge-hill* witnesse that, and alwayes be  
Next to Your *Burlington*, in history  
Delivered unto each succeeding age,  
A monument o’th Rebels bloody rage.<sup>145</sup>

The reference to Edgehill reminds us of the meeting at Kinton, which Cowley in turn links with the battle of Roundway Down, so connecting the three episodes with which the book ends.

There are two further observations that I want to make about the conclusion of this book. The first concerns the relation of Cowley’s text to his sources. The juxtaposition of the battle of Roundway Down and the meeting at Kinton, the pairing of the war with the marriage, resembles the generic mix one encounters in newsbooks. We may recall that the portraits of Charles and Henrietta Maria succeeded that of Waller on the first page of

---

<sup>144</sup>[Peter Heylyn], *A Briefe Relation of the Remarkable occurrences in the Northerne parts* (Oxford, 1643; Wing H6186), p. 7.

<sup>145</sup>John Fell, (1643; O903), sig. [A4v].

Mercurius Civicus, and it is also significant that the issue of Mercurius Aulicus that reports the victory at Roundway Down also carries the news of the meeting of the royal couple. As Royalist fortunes are at their height, Cowley's poem approximates most closely the form of that new organ of fact the newsbook. He feels no need to embellish the newsbook's accounts, seeing that at this point in the war the truth serves as the greatest propaganda tool. The second point concerns the composition and overall form of the poem. The conclusion of the first book offers compelling evidence of Wilcher's theory that Cowley intended it as a self-sufficient poem. The first book ends with descriptions of three events linked as if in a triptych, with the Kington meeting at its centre. The episode symbolically refights and wins the battle of Edgehill, which was the first major battle in the book. The Western army is triumphant, the King's army has scored a significant victory in the North, and the King and Queen are reunited. It is highly probable that Cowley decided to begin work at this point, when Royalist confidence is at its strongest, and the Parliament is in retreat on every front. Cowley's confidence is such that he feels able to conclude his book with a complete rebuke to Parliamentary propaganda.

It is possible to mark a difference in style as Cowley follows the progress of the western campaign in his continuation of his poem. In his description of the siege of Bristol, which took place in the July of 1643, he again attacks the Parliamentary defenders of the city for their belief that their 'works' are justified by faith:

In vaine, alas, they trust the workes they have made,  
And thinke our *Sword* less powerfull then the *Spade*. (CW, II. 227-8)

The literal meaning of 'workes' in these lines is explained by the account of the initial Royalist attack given by Bristol's Parliamentary governor, Nathaniel Fiennes:

they made use of all those in a most desperate way, driving their wains of faggots into the ditches, and climbing up with their Firepikes and granadoes in their hands, to the

very portalls of our great Ordnance, yet they were beaten back in 8 or 9 places together, and entred only in one place where the works were not perfected.<sup>146</sup>

Cowley emphasises that it is the citizens of Bristol who have made the works, not God, and

he goes on to taunt the people of the city for being misled, asking

Whom did theise *sencelesse Sinners* choose to obey,  
Whom but th'unworthy seed of factious *Say*? (*CW*, II. 221-2)

'Say' in this context refers to Fiennes, the son of Viscount Say. Cowley prefaces his account of this siege with a relation of Bristol's historical prominence as a maritime and commercial centre. The emphasis on the past is perhaps intended to obscure more recent events, in particular Charles' alienation of commercial interests in the city, as a result of the forced loan in 1626 and the levying of Ship Money in 1634,<sup>147</sup> which pushed the '*sencelesse Sinners*' towards the Parliament. This deliberately partial view of the siege extends to Cowley's distortion of the reported facts of the battle for propaganda purposes; his reference to the city's 'strong-built *Castle*' makes the Royalist victory seem more impressive. Fiennes however reports that 'the Castle it selfe, the works not being finished, was not tenable above a day or two,'<sup>148</sup> making Cowley's view closer to that of Wednesday's Mercury, which aimed to improve the morale of its readers prior to the siege by asserting that the army 'hath lately strongly fortified the Castle in that City, and placed as a garrison in it 600 able and expert souldiers'.<sup>149</sup> The accounts part company when they assess the cause of the castle's fall; Cowley implies that it is the result of the bravery of the Royalist besiegers, while the Mercury

---

<sup>146</sup>Nathaniel Fiennes, Colonell Fiennes Letter to my Lord Generall concerning Bristoll (London, 1643; Wing F874) (received by Thomason 22 August), p. 2.

<sup>147</sup>See *CW*, p. 417n.

<sup>148</sup>Fiennes (1643; F874), p. 3.

<sup>149</sup>Speciall Passages Continued, (25-28 July 1643; NS 669. 3), p. 23.

ascribes it to the 'base ignoble and degenerate vices of trechery and cowardise' among the defenders.<sup>150</sup>

Cowley's account seems to capture some of the confusion of siege warfare as he continues. The attack was led by the Princes Rupert and Maurice, with the latter leading the Cornish army whose progress Cowley has followed:

They scorne the grimmet dangers of the place;  
Still *Lansdowne*, *Stratton* still's before their face.  
They joy to *kill* their foes, they joy to *Dy*;  
In the deepe *Trenches* proud and *gasping* ly (CW, II. 241-4)

It is important that Cowley finally names the battle of Lansdown here, on the verge of a victory, as the bravery of the Cornish expunges the memory of that engagement as a defeat. At the same time, Cowley's lines reveal that many of the Cornish veterans perished in the assault. In doing so, he achieves a starker appreciation of the bloodshed than many of his sources, and approaches the language of Sir Richard Atkyns, who fought with the Cornish regiments, and recalled that 'as gallant men as ever drew Sword (pardon the Comparison) lay upon the ground like rotten Sheep'.<sup>151</sup> The siege claimed the lives of several Royalist officers, among them '*Slaning*, and *Trevanion*':

Both hit, as if they'de both a mind to spare;  
Both in the *Thigh*; but, oh, *Death* crept in *there*!  
Both matchlesse men! and *Freinds* soe neerely growne,  
That each felt least that wound that was his owne. (CW, II. 251-4)

Sir Nicholas Slanning and Colonel John Trevanion both fell in the assault led by prince Maurice, and Cowley's linking of their deaths is repeated by Clarendon:

they were both hurt almost in the same minute and in the same place; both shot in the thigh with a musket bullet, their bones broken, the one dying presently, the other some

---

<sup>150</sup> *Wednesday's Mercury*, (2 August 1643; NS 669. 4), p. 26.

<sup>151</sup> Richard Atkyns, *The vindication of Richard Atkyns* (London, 1669; Wing V489), p. 43.

few days after; and both had the royal sacrifice of their sovereign's very particular sorrow.<sup>152</sup>

It is the particular emphases of these accounts that differ; Clarendon focusses on their dying on behalf of the king, as if he felt their deaths, while Cowley emphasises their friendship, suggesting that they felt each other's death wounds. Colonel Henry Lunsford was another victim, fighting in prince Rupert's army, and was shot and killed as Rupert was securing victory (CW, II. 259-64). The fighting became very confused as Rupert's army entered the city:

Meanwhile great *Rupert* by maine force possest  
Their blood-dyed *workes*, and on to Vict'ory prest.  
Into the streets they breake; and all around  
The groanes of men, and shreikes of woemen sound. (CW, II. 255-8)

Fiennes' account describes how 'our Souldiers sallied out both Horse and Foot upon them, as they lay in the suburbs, and beat them back from street to street an hour and halfe together' and expresses his fear that the Royalists would fall 'into the Town by force, and used their pleasure both upon the Souldiers and upon the Citizens.'<sup>153</sup> Fiennes finally agreed to surrender on favourable terms, stipulating that '*Officers ... may march out tomorrow morning ... with their full Arms, Horses, bagge and baggage, provided it be their owne goods, and that the Common Foot Souldiers March out without Armes*'.<sup>154</sup>

They march unarm'ed away; the *Conqu'erours* give  
A *Pardon*, but *Fate* onely a *Repreive*. (CW, II. 265-6)

---

<sup>152</sup>Clarendon, VII. 132.

<sup>153</sup>Fiennes (1643; F874), pp. 2, 3.

<sup>154</sup>A Copie of the Articles Agreed upon at the surrender of the City of Bristol (London, 1643; Wing C6203) (received by Thomason 3 August), pp. 3-4.

Cowley's lines conceal the fact that Royalist troops violated the treaty by looting some of Fiennes' soldiers. Cowley is less forgiving to Fiennes himself, reminding him of his alleged crimes:

Still on each side his *Murthers* vex his sight,  
*Bourchier* on th' *left*, and *Yeomans* on the *right*. (CW, II. 271-2)

Robert Yeomans and George Bourchier were tried and executed in March 1643 for their complicity in a plot to betray Bristol to a besieging Royalist army. Royalists held Fiennes culpable for this decision, mainly because of his statement that

the Conspirators of this City must both in life and death carry perpetually with them the brand of Treachery and Conspiracy ... the Law of Nature among all men, and the Law of Arms amongst all Souldiers, maketh a difference between open Enemies, and secret Spies and Conspirators: And if you shall not make the like distinction, we do signifie unto you, That we shall not onely proceed to the execution of the persons already condemned, but also of divers others of the Conspirators.<sup>155</sup>

While Cowley was still to describe the successful siege of Exeter by Prince Maurice, there is a sense that in the trenches around Bristol, Cowley, along with the Cornish regiments, reaches another dead end. While in focussing upon the campaigns in the West he is able to describe some of the Royalist army's most striking victories, he is forced by the slaughter involved in the capture of Bristol to recognise the cost of the war in human terms. When the western campaign is successful, Cowley most closely follows the language and, at some points the appearance, of the newsbook. However, as the campaign, and with it the poem, continues, there appears to be a realisation on Cowley's part that the war will be a prolonged struggle. In these later books, Cowley introduces a more explicitly epic framework, partly because his project is becoming more expansive and so demands a grander design, but

---

<sup>155</sup>Clement Walker, The Severall Examinations and Confessions of The Treacherous Conspirators (London, 1643; Wing W336), p. 15.

perhaps also because he becomes more desperate to see the hand of Providence in events.

This is most apparent when he turns his attention to the fighting in the Midlands.



## VALOUR CROWNED: THE WAR IN THE MIDLANDS 1643

After the triumphant conclusion of the first section of The Civill Warre, it would appear that Cowley felt the need to excuse his continuation of the poem into 'The second Booke'. His solution is to introduce a more explicit epic machinery to Book Two. The war continues, and with it the poem, because the Parliamentary forces receive aid from a supernatural agency:

For dire *Alecto*, ris'en from *Stygian* strand,  
Had scatterd *Strife* and *Armes* through all the Land.  
In a black hollow Clowd, by ill Windes driven,  
Shee sat; oreshadow'ed *Earth* and frighted *Heaven*. (CW, II. 5-8)

We notice again that Cowley chooses to borrow his epic framework from Virgil rather than Lucan:

From darke infernall dampes, *Alecto* mournfull vp she calles.  
*Alecto* foulest fende, in dolefull warres that doth delite,  
And wrathes, and treasons vile, and sinnes, and slaunders, and despite.  
A dampned monster grim, whom all her sisters deadly hates,  
Her father *Pluto* lothes, and euermore she breeds debates.<sup>156</sup>

It is significant that Cowley turns to this Fury, because, in the Aeneid she is summoned by Juno to rouse hostility to the Trojans in Queen Amata and in Turnus, provoking what amounts to a kind of civil war between the Trojans and the Latins. In Phaer's translation, *Alecto* delights in slanders and 'breeds debates', relating Cowley's allusion to a stream of Royalist propaganda that blames the war on dissembling lay preachers:

there are *evill Spirits* that come into the world, and which many times are by God permitted to seduce men, and that they may doe so the better, they constantly pretend to come from God, and assume divine Authority to recommend and authorize their delusions; (a thing so ordinary in all Ages, that the Poet that would express the Imbroyling of a Kingdome, thinks he cannot doe it better then by bringing in *Alecto*, a *Fury*, with a Message from Heaven, to avenge such and such an injury).<sup>157</sup>

---

<sup>156</sup>Phaer and Twyne, The Aeneid, VII. 337-41. See Sawday, pp. 139-40.

<sup>157</sup>Hammond (1649; H607), p. 2; see Smith, LR, p. 42.

The Parliamentary forces seem to gain new vigour as ‘The nightborne *Virgin* stopt on *Hopton* heath’ (CW, II. 19). The battle of Hopton Heath was fought on 19 March 1643. As the battle, though inconclusive, ended with the Royalists holding the field, Cowley reintroduces the figure of ‘*Conquest*’ (CW, II. 35) from Roundway Down, but the Parliamentary commanders, Sir John Gell and Sir William Brereton, escaped, and the Royalist commander, the Earl of Northampton, was killed. Cowley ascribes the escape of Gell and Brereton to their protection by Alecto:

Men whom shee lov’ed, and twice had sav’ed before,  
 From *Hastings* sword, when thousand fates it bore  
 On the keene point; when from his dropping blade  
 Warne *Soules* reek’d out, and *mists* around him made.  
 Just as the Sword rais’d it selfe up to’his pray,  
 In a blind Clowd shee snatcht them both away. (CW, II. 23-8)

Cowley combines the mythological material with information similar to that provided by The Battaile on Hopton-Heath, where Cowley could have found out about ‘Ashby-de-la-Zouch, and other places where they shamefully have been worsted by that noble couragious Colonell Hastings’.<sup>158</sup> The rescue of Gell and Brereton, ‘Men whom shee lov’ed’, also introduces elements of the incident in the *Iliad* where Aphrodite saves Paris from Menelaus, and ‘hid him in a cloud of gold, and never made him known’ (*Homer’s Iliads*, III. 399). For Cowley, just as for Virgil, the figure of Alecto is a travesty of the goddess Aphrodite.

While in this episode Cowley introduces an epic framework, we still see him resisting Lucanian parallels. At the same time, this episode reveals some of the subtleties in Cowley’s use of newsbooks. After the battle of Edgehill, the Parliamentary Lord Wharton allegedly sought refuge in a saw-pit, and Cowley refers to this incident in his account of that battle. Thereafter, the word ‘sawpit’ enters the Royalist lexicon as shorthand for coward, and The

---

<sup>158</sup>The Battaile on Hopton-Heath (Oxford, 1643; Wing B1162) (received by Thomason 25 April), p. 1.

Battaile on Hopton-Heath uses the term twice: Gell and Brereton are ‘as notorious Cowards as any in the saw-pit’, and Parliamentarians are ‘driven by their guilt into ditches, and saw-pits’.<sup>159</sup> Alongside this retrospective glance to Edgehill, the Battaile’s observation that ‘our men [followed] the Execution beyond command’,<sup>160</sup> as had happened at the earlier battle, may have suggested to Cowley the comparison that he perceives between the two encounters, referring to Hopton Heath as a renewal of ‘*Edgehills almost-Victory*’ (CW, II. 42). Furthermore, the pamphlet refers to Parliamentary attempts to ‘murder both King and Queene’, which Cowley includes in his account of Edgehill, and contains a list of values which Royalists fight to defend, like ‘Religion, Honour, Learning, Lawes, Nobility, Gentry, Honesty’, many of which line up on the Royalist side at Edgehill.<sup>161</sup>

Cowley’s accounts of the sieges of Birmingham and Lichfield show the poet drawing more distinct parallels between the contemporary and documentary material and literary precedent. Prince Rupert captured Birmingham on 3 April 1643 after a short siege. The town was famous for its metal industry, and both Cowley and Clarendon play on these associations in their accounts of the engagement. Clarendon, for example, claims that the Puritan defenders of the town ‘from their little works, with mettle equal to their malice, they discharged their shot’ upon Prince Rupert.<sup>162</sup> Cowley writes of ‘black *Vulcans* noysy *Towne*’:

Old *Bremigham*? lowd Fame to thee affords  
A title from the *Make*, not *Use of Swords*. (CW, II. 73-4)

This attack on the military prowess of the town’s defenders may have been prompted by Royalist bitterness at the fact that the town’s inhabitants

---

<sup>159</sup>(1643; B1162), pp.1, 8.

<sup>160</sup>(1643; B1162), p.2.

<sup>161</sup>(1643; B1162), p.8.

<sup>162</sup>Clarendon, VII.32.

sent 15000 Swords, for the Earle of *Essex* his Forces and the ayd of that Party, and not only refused to supply the King's Forces with swords for their money, but imprisoned diverse who bought swords, upon suspicion that they intended to supply the King's Forces with them.<sup>163</sup>

The Royalist Earl of Denbigh was killed during the siege, and Parliamentary pamphlets, like Speciall Passages, allege that Prince Rupert 'in revenge, set fire to the Town, and burned fourscore houses'.<sup>164</sup> This assertion was denied by the Royalist side; Mercurius Aulicus, while accepting that 'the Town was set on fire,' suggests that the action was 'not onely contrary to the command, but much to the displeasure of the *Prince*'.<sup>165</sup> What is most striking about Cowley's version of events is that, not only does he not refute the allegations, he finds himself in the position of agreeing with the Parliamentary accounts, wearing Rupert's responsibility as a badge of honour. He even makes Rupert give the order, 'Goe burne the wicked *Towne*' (CW, II. 85), which Parliamentarians allege came from his mouth: one writer holds that 'their full intention was, and that by command (let them pretend what excuses they can) to burne down the whole Towne to the ground',<sup>166</sup> and another states that the Royalists started the fires 'intending nothing lesse than utterly to destroy the Towne'.<sup>167</sup> In keeping with his idea of Birmingham as '*Vulcans*' town, Cowley shows the streets of the town become 'one glowing *Forge* ... Soe *Ætna, Vulcans* other *Shop*, does burne.' (CW, II. 87-8) He views the burning of the town as just deserts for its people refusing to submit peacefully, and for their previous insult of his cause, so accordingly he portrays the burning as a spectacle to rank

---

<sup>163</sup> A Letter Written from Walshall (London, 1643; Wing L1764) (received by Thomason 14 April)), p. 2.

<sup>164</sup> Speciall Passages, (4-11 April 1643; NS 605. 35), p. 290.

<sup>165</sup> Mercurius Aulicus, (2-9 April 1643; NS 275. 114), p. 176.

<sup>166</sup> Prince Rvperts Burning love to England (London, 1643; Wing P3489) (received by Thomason 1 May)), p. 6.

<sup>167</sup> Robert Porter, A True Relation of Prince Ruperts Barbarous Cruelty against the Towne of Brumingham (London, 1643; Wing P2987A), p. 5.

alongside the Greeks' burning of Troy (CW, II. 89-90); this is unique among Royalist commentators, and in direct contrast to the Parliamentarians' view of Rupert's 'eternall honour, by conquering so mighty an enemy as 100. Musketers, with so small an Army as 2000. Men.'<sup>168</sup>

The siege of Lichfield demands a different response again. There are two sieges of Lichfield that Cowley describes, the first being the Parliamentary siege in March 1643, during which their commander, Robert Greville, Lord Brooke, was killed. Later in the year, after his success at Birmingham, prince Rupert entered Lichfield on 10 April 1643, and after besieging the cathedral close, captured the town on 21 April 1643. On both occasions the defenders held out within the cathedral precinct, and it was from the cathedral that Brooke was shot:

*Chad* and his *Church* saw where their *enemy* lay,  
And with just *Red* new markt their *Holiday*,  
Fond man! this blow the injur'd *Crozier* strooke;  
Nought was more fitt to perish , but thy *Booke*. (CW, I. 373-6)

The fact that Brooke was shot from the cathedral of Saint Chad, on 2 March, or Saint Chad's Day, led to Royalist speculation on the providential circumstances of his death. Mercurius Aulicus claims that his death 'in his assaulting the Church *Close*, by a shot in the forehead neare the eye, on S. *Chads* day, (the first Bishop of that Church) and by the hands of a Clergy-mans sonne'<sup>169</sup> suggests the workings of a higher force; not only that, the 'Clergy-mans sonne' was 'one "Dymb Dyott", a deaf mute since birth',<sup>170</sup> lending the fatal shot an almost miraculous quality. In an attempt to explain the puzzling reference to the '*Booke*', Pritchard provides the following note:

---

<sup>168</sup>(1643; P3489), p. 7.

<sup>169</sup>Mercurius Aulicus, (10 March 1643; NS 275. 110B), p. 127; and see CW, p. 402n.

<sup>170</sup>Carlton, p. 160.

The '*Booke*' is presumably Brooke's attack on the episcopacy, *A Discourse Opening the Nature of that Episcopacie, which is Exercised in England* (1641, enlarged 1642). It is just possible that the allusion may not be to Brooke's book but to Saint Chad's. The famous and venerated manuscript known as Saint Chad's Gospel was hidden during the Civil War to save it from Puritans intent on destroying popish objects and is still possessed by Lichfield Cathedral.<sup>171</sup>

It is the second of these suggestions that accords most closely with the contemporary references to Brooke's death. *Mercurius Aulicus* states that one effect of Brooke's death was a Parliamentary retreat, 'as if with him they had entombed all thought of defacing Churches, or *breaking downe the carved workes thereof with Axes and Hammers*'.<sup>172</sup> John Vicars states baldly that *Aulicus*' fears were realised, for while the Parliamentary soldiers 'were mercifull to the men, yet they were void of all pittie toward the Organ-pipes, Capes, Surpluces, and such like *Popish* trumperies found in the Minster'.<sup>173</sup> In Cowley's lines, it is the '*Booke*', along with '*Chad* and his *Church*', that take an active role in killing Brooke, again curiously agreeing with Parliamentary propaganda:

And for my *Lord Brooks* dying by a bullet from a Minster, it is rather an argument against *Cathedralls*, then against my Lord, it must needs be a wicked Church where there are such *bloody Anthems*, and such murdering *Organ Pipes*, and such desperate Deans and Prebends.<sup>174</sup>

In Nigel Smith's words, this passage from *Mercurius Britannicus* shows 'the objects of puritan complaint', like the manuscript, 'become the agents of unjustified cruelty',<sup>175</sup> and, like the puns on good 'works' and London's 'earthworks', shows the closeness of the rhetoric of siege warfare and religious debate.

---

<sup>171</sup> *CW*, p. 402n.

<sup>172</sup> *Mercurius Aulicus*, (1643; NS 275. 109), pp. 115-6.

<sup>173</sup> John Vicars, *Jehovah-Jireh, God in the Movnt, or, Englands Parliamentarie-Chronicle* (London, 1644; Wing V616), p. 273.

<sup>174</sup> *Mercurius Britannicus*, (14-21 December 1643; NS 286. 017), p. 133.

<sup>175</sup> Smith, *LR*, p. 64.

In both sieges, '*Lichfeilds strong Close*' (CW, II. 95) proved remarkably resilient; eye-witnesses agree that it was 'a very defensible Fort'.<sup>176</sup> At first, prince Rupert's army assaulted the close 'with Scaling Ladders, but they were beaten off, many of them slaine'.<sup>177</sup> Cowley requires a heightened language to describe this scene:

Some whilst the walls (bold men!) they attempt to scale,  
Drop downe by a leaden storme of deadly haile.  
Some with huge stones are crusht to dust beneath,  
And from their hasty *Tombes* receive their *Death*.  
Some leave their parted hands on th' highest wall,  
The joynts hold fast for a while, then quake and fall. (CW, II. 107-12)

Cowley's language compares the siege of Lichfield with the siege of Dyrrachium in Book VI of the *Pharsalia*. May's translation contains all the grotesque elements to be found in Lucan, and several seem to have inspired Cowley's account. The most prominent is the image of severed hands left holding the battlements while other soldiers are crushed to death with stones. May renders this passage as

And with his sword cutts off his hand that takes  
Hold on the bulwarkes topp; and with vast stones  
Pashes their heads in pieces, breakes their bones,  
And dashes out their weakly fenced-braines.<sup>178</sup>

It is possible that Cowley makes this comparison because it was encouraged by the language of some of the contemporary reports; one tells how the defenders 'beat the Enemy down so fast in the ... Breach, that they made a brest-work about a yard high of dead and wounded bodies'.<sup>179</sup> However, it is equally possible that Cowley invokes this Lucanian grotesque because the emphasis on corporeality suggests that the spectacle of civil war is analogous to

---

<sup>176</sup>John Randolph, *Honour Advanced* (London, 1643; Wing R329) (received by Thomason 29 April), p. 1.

<sup>177</sup>*Valour Crowned* (London, 1643; Wing R2339), p. 3.

<sup>178</sup>(1627; 16887), sig. [K5]r.

<sup>179</sup>(1643; R2339), p. 1.

that of a body ripping itself apart. Lichfield is an example of Cowley requiring a new idiom to describe a hitherto unseen event; the breach was made by a mine, and this was ‘the first time that gunpowder had been used for this purpose in England’.<sup>180</sup>

With a dire noyse the earth and wall is rent,  
High into aire th’unwilling Stones are sent.  
Twice all about, the ground did tremble there,  
First with the violent *shock*, and next with *Feare*.  
The wicked *Guards* thought t’had some *Earthquake* binne, ... (CW, II. 117-21)

Royalists held that the town surrendered because of the mine but the defenders claim it was because they had run out of powder and were reduced to fighting with ‘their Butt ends of their Muskets, their Swords, and Holbeards’,<sup>181</sup> or, as Cowley calls it, ‘their despairing Steele’ (CW, II. 127). Prince Rupert paid tribute to the courage of the defenders, and Cowley echoes Lucan (VI. 229) in his ironic comment on them:

Unhappy men! who can your curses tell?  
Damn’d, and infam’ed for fighting *ill soe well*! (CW, II. 135-6)

Cowley focuses on the campaigns in the West and the Midlands because they were two of the most successful Royalist campaigns of the conflict, and so reflect Cowley’s continued confidence in the Royalist armies. This confidence is in turn reflected in Cowley’s use of newsbook and other ‘factual’ accounts as a source of imagery and language. His accounts of the battles in the West and the Midlands rely far more on journalistic writing than do his accounts of those in the Edgehill campaign. These sections of The Civill Warre depend on newsbooks in order to offer rebukes to Parliamentary propaganda, as much as satires and polemical writing intended for immediate circulation either in manuscript or print, perhaps confirming that the first book of Cowley’s poem was written with a similar intention. At the

---

<sup>180</sup>See Young and Holmes, p. 119.

<sup>181</sup>(1643; R239), p. 6.



same time, the campaign in the Midlands also introduces a trend towards the self-conscious mythologising of events, using classical and historical figures and tropes, and the full significance of this strategy becomes clear when we turn our attentions to the battle of Newbury.

### ‘AN EQUAL GAME TO PLAY’: THE NEWBURY CAMPAIGN 1643

As The Civill Warre progresses into ‘The third Booke’, Cowley begins to show less concern with the actual business of fighting. The latter half of Book Two describes a Council in Hell in which numerous mythological and historical seditionaries resolve to aid the Parliamentarians. The beginning of Book Three sees the Furies descend on London, inciting hatred and sectarianism among the inhabitants, and drawing on the stream of anti-metropolitan Royalist satire.<sup>182</sup> When Cowley returns to the campaigns of the Royalist army, he appears to do so with a heavy heart, presumably because he began writing in full knowledge of the outcome of the Newbury campaign, disappointing for the King, and fatal for his friend, Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland.

In July 1643, the Royalists, basking in the glow of the victories in the West and the Midlands that Cowley had celebrated, resolved to capture Gloucester, the remaining obstacle between the King and complete control of the country west of Oxford. Colonel Massey, the pugnacious governor of Gloucester, refused to yield the city, raising the Parliament’s spirits. The Earl of Essex led an expeditionary force to relieve the city, strengthened by five regiments of the London Trained bands, arriving within ten miles of Gloucester on 5 September. Charles now found his army at risk of being trapped between Gloucester and Essex’s army, and aimed to prevent Essex’s return to London. The two armies raced back east, each aiming to outflank the other.<sup>183</sup>

Cowley still tries to portray the King’s manoeuvres in the most favourable light. He correctly suggests that Charles’ intention in lifting the siege of Gloucester was to secure more advantageous ground on which to fight Essex:

---

<sup>182</sup>For example, A Letter From Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus ([London], 1643; Wing L1489B).

<sup>183</sup>See Young and Holmes, pp. 142-3.

The matchlesse King to meet this wicked rout  
Quits Gloc'ester hopes, and drawes his Army out. (CW, III. 199-200)

Pritchard is perhaps unfair in suggesting that Cowley passes silently over a series of Royalist blunders which gave Essex an advantage; in fact, Charles did not swallow Essex's subterfuges, and Rupert prevented the Parliamentarians from reaching Newbury first by engaging them at Aldbourne Chase on 18 September:<sup>184</sup>

At Auburne with sad eyes they veiwe our Horse;  
The valiant Jermin stops their hasty course, ... (CW, III. 215-6)

It is possible that these lines reflect Cowley's acquaintance with an important account of the campaign, A True and exact Relation of the Marchings of the ... Red & blew Regiments by Sergeant Henry Foster, an officer in the Parliament's army, who reports that while standing on top of a hill, 'there appeared a great body of their horse'.<sup>185</sup> Alternatively, he almost certainly knew the account A True and Impartiall Relation of the Battaile ... neare Newbery, believed to be the work of George Digby, Earl of Bristol, who commanded a regiment of horse in the campaign, who observes that Rupert harried Essex into open ground to maintain 'the great advantage hee had above him in strength of horse'.<sup>186</sup> 'Jermin' in this passage is Henry, Lord Jermyn, in whose service Cowley was soon to find employment:

What was an Host to him? hee charg'd it through;  
With unfeard noyse the bullets round him flew. (CW, III. 223-4)

The report in Mercurius Aulicus states that during the battle Jermyn saw 'that there remained no way of returning to the Prince, but by charging through their Foot, which accordingly was

---

<sup>184</sup>CW, p. 43 ln.; see Young and Holmes, pp. 142-3.

<sup>185</sup>Henry Foster, A True Relation of the Marchings of the ... Red & blew Regiments (London, 1643; Wing F1625A), sig. B2r.

<sup>186</sup>George Digby, Earl of Bristol, A True and Impartiall Relation of the Battaile ... neare Newbery (Oxford, 1643; Wing B4778), sig. Av.

done with so much judgement, courage, and good successe'.<sup>187</sup> Jermyn led from the front during the engagement, at one point stabbing one of the enemy aiming 'to discharge his Pistoll as it were by Election at the Lord *Digbyes* head', leaving Jermyn 'as much beholding to his Armes there, as the L. *Digby* to his *headpeece*'. Cowley follows Digby, who emphasises Jermyn's calmness under fire, noting that 'his Lordship performed with much Gallantry, being received very steadily, by a strong body of the Enemies Horse, and with a Composednesse in the Officer that commended them very remarkably'.<sup>188</sup> His subordinates matched his valour:

With him charg'd in the matchlesse Digby too;  
And Viveville, but with fates of different hew. (*CW*, III. 227-8)

Digby notes that Jermyn advanced 'with the Marquesse *de la Vieuville* on the one hand, and the Lord *Digby* on the other'.<sup>189</sup> Cowley suggests that Digby saw as many men 'By's Sword struck dead' as were 'astonisht by his Pen', which may refer to Digby's reputation as a poet, but seems more likely to celebrate his dual role in the defeat of the Parliamentarians, fighting in the battle and then writing a definitive account.<sup>190</sup> The Marquis de la Vieuville, a French nobleman on a diplomatic mission to England who subsequently joined the King's army, was less fortunate, Cowley suggesting that he was 'in coole Malice slaine' (*CW*, III. 238). Cowley repeats the allegation made in *Mercurius Aulicus* that he was 'first taken Prisoner, and afterward inhumanely slain in cold blood'.<sup>191</sup> Parliamentary accounts were to protest that he was killed attempting to escape, and Foster simply registers his shock at seeing a dead body:

---

<sup>187</sup>*Mercurius Aulicus* (17-23 September 1643; 275. 138B), p. 526.

<sup>188</sup>Bristol (1643; B4778), sig. A2v.

<sup>189</sup>Bristol (1643; B4778), sig. A2v.

<sup>190</sup>While none of Digby's poetry survives, some of the other products of his pen do, including his journalism for *Mercurius Aulicus* and defences of his involvement in various intrigues. See Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 54-7.

<sup>191</sup>(275. 138B), p. 526.

‘I viewed his wounds, he received three shot in his body from us, one in his right pap, another in the shoulder, and a third in the face’.<sup>192</sup> There is nothing in his account to suggest Cowley’s comparison of the Parliamentarians with cannibals who ‘bait it first before they kill their prey’ (CW, III. 244).

The success of the skirmish at Aldbourne Chase allowed the main Royalist army to make up ground, and to reach Newbury at the same time . Seeing ‘the royall Host ... his Troopes to Hills and Hedges Essex drawes’ (CW, III. 252-3). Cowley follows Mercurius Aulicus most closely, which claims that in the morning ‘their Foot, Horses & Cannon’ were found ‘for their own preservation, and annoyance to His Majesty, upon a Hill among Hedges’.<sup>193</sup> Clarendon holds that Essex ‘ordered his men in all places to the best advantage’, although Foster claims that the Royalists ‘gained the hills where they intended to give us battell’.<sup>194</sup> Cowley emphasises the importance to the Royalist cause of Charles’ presence on the field, and, as he had done at Edgehill, identifies the cause of Charles with that of God:

Charles rides about with wise and comely care,  
And like his God seemes almost ev’ery where,  
Præpares all helpes that Conquest could require,  
And as hee rides to all adds Soule and Fire.  
The gallant Beast knew well his sacred load,  
And much disdain’d the ground ore which hee troad. (CW, III. 261-6)

The exact nature of Charles’ role at Newbury was disputed, although Foster relates ‘the King himself brought up a Regiment of Foot and another of horse into the field, and gave fire to two peeces of Ordnance, riding up and down all that day in a souldiers gray coat.’<sup>195</sup> It seems that Cowley’s portrait of Charles at the battle owes more to visual representations of the

---

<sup>192</sup>(1643; F1625A), sig. B2v.

<sup>193</sup>(275. 138B), p. 527.

<sup>194</sup>Clarendon, VII. 210; (1643; F1625A), sig. B2v.

<sup>195</sup> (1643; F1625A), sig. [B4r].

King, and in particular Van Dyck's King Charles on Horseback with Monsieur de St. Antoine, painted in 1633. This huge canvas shows Charles in triumph, in armour and carrying a marshal's baton, mounted on a grey horse. We infer the horse's spirited nature from the turn of its head and the flick of its mane, and Charles masters his steed with a calm authority. Cowley's following reference to the myth of Saturn's transformation into a horse (CW, III.267-70), implies the qualities of the ideal horse, in particular his high and light step and his grey colour, which further relates this passage to Van Dyck's painting. Mention has been made of Van Dyck's use of religious iconography in this equestrian portrait, and, in particular, Tintoretto's 1575 interpretation of the Flight into Egypt. The arch through which Charles passes in the painting appears to frame the sky behind like a halo around the King's head, in much the same way as the trees frame the light behind the Virgin's head in Tintoretto's painting. Van Dyck was responding to the Stuart propaganda which identified the monarchy with the divine, and the same sources suggested Cowley's alignment of Charles' cause with that of Christ.<sup>196</sup>

Cowley turns to a source in another medium for his portrait of Charles, and again looks beyond the reported facts of the battle in his relation of Charles' speech to his soldiers. There is in fact no record of Charles making such a speech before Newbury, and Cowley may intend a structural parallel with Pompey's speech to his troops before the battle of Pharsalia (Lucan, Pharsalia, VII. 250-382). This implies that Cowley may view Newbury as Charles' Pharsalia, and suggest why he did not continue his poem further. The content of Cowley's invented speech for Charles draws on some themes in Royalist satire on which Cowley had already drawn in his poem. The speech accuses that the enemy soldiers have no more

---

<sup>196</sup>See Howarth, Images of Rule, pp. 143-4.

‘warrant for their Swords then Clubs before’, recalling the nickname of the ‘clubmen’, rural vigilante groups who defended localities with makeshift weapons. As many soldiers in Essex’ army were apprentices in the London Trained Bands, Cowley wishes to imply their unreadiness for battle. Cowley extends this point as Charles’ speech continues:

Men that in Finsb’ury with much terror heare  
The noyse of their owne Muskets once a yeare.  
‘Tis not their Cause, their Courage or their Might,  
That keeps them now from pale distrust and Flight. (CW, III. 303-6)

Cowley here makes a derisive reference to the men of the Artillery Garden at Finsbury, near the City of London. He disregards the fundamental role that the Trained Bands played in the engagement, and, in common with other Royalists, holds a low opinion of regiments of auxiliaries. Clarendon claims that, of the militia’s ‘inexperience of danger, or any kind of service beyond the easy practice of their postures in the Artillery Garden, men had till then too cheap an estimation’.<sup>197</sup> Cowley has Charles repeat that ‘Hedges and Hills defend them yet’, just as Mercurius Aulicus repeats that, during the battle, the Parliamentarians were found ‘in the interim lying among Bushes and behind Hedges (their old chosen security)’.<sup>198</sup>

Following Cowley’s report of Essex’ speech, the battle begins with an exchange of cannon fire:

The Canon next their Message ‘gan to say;  
On came the dreadfull bus’ines of the Day. (CW, III. 339-40)

Cowley does not make clear which side began the fight; he may have in mind Digby’s assertion that ‘the Kings person was exposed all day to much more hazard of the Cannon than was fitting, the Rebels employing it very freely wherever by any signes they could discover

---

<sup>197</sup>Clarendon, VII. 211.

<sup>198</sup>(275. 138B), p. 527.

his presence'.<sup>199</sup> On the Parliamentary side, Foster holds that 'they began their battery against us with their great Guns, above halfe an houre before we could get any of our Guns up to us'.<sup>200</sup> Cowley may leave this detail obscure in order to conceal the possibility that, by failing to secure a decisive victory, the Royalists squandered an advantage. The ensuing narrative of the battle contains Cowley's only extended description of hand-to-hand fighting:

Death in all shapes, and in all habits drest  
(Such was his sportfull rage) the feild possest. ...  
Uncertaine Fate o're all the feild did range;  
Heere strange Deaths seene, and there Eschapes as strange. (III. 351-2, 357-8)

Soldiers' accounts of the fighting at Newbury emphasise the horror of fighting 'at so neer a distance ... that we could not lightly misse one another'; Foster recalls that when cannon fired upon the regiments of the Trained Bands 'they did some execution amongst us at the first, and were somewhat dreadfull when mens bowels and brains flew in our faces'.<sup>201</sup> As the battle continues, the Furies, following their descent on London, arrive at the battlefield to aid their Parliamentary 'allies':

Some brought the Nation's Sinnes forth into veiwe,  
Blacke Sinnes, and blacke the aire around them grew.  
Some from all parts drove thether clouds apace;  
With them they hid the Sunns and Vict'rys Face. (CW, III. 369-72)

In this passage, it is possible to detect an echo of Foster's pamphlet, when he writes that

If I should speak anything in the praise and commendations of these two regiments of the trained Bands, I should rather obscure and darken the glory of that courage and valour God gave unto them this day, ...<sup>202</sup>

Foster's disinclination to embellish his account suggests that God gave the Trained Bands valour enough, so that their exploits speak for themselves; Cowley reverses this figure by

---

<sup>199</sup>Bristol (1643; B4778), sig. [A3v].

<sup>200</sup>(1643; F1625A), sig. B3r.

<sup>201</sup>(1643; F1625A), sig. B3r.

<sup>202</sup>(1643; F1625A), sig. B3v.



having the Furies encourage clouds which obscure a victory that properly belongs to both God and the Royalists. The effect of Foster's pamphlet is analogous to the actions of Cowley's Furies, in that both blasphemously aim to obscure God's providence. Cowley is in no doubt that 'God some Conquest to his Host did send' and that he 'did our Cause approve' (CW, III. 377, 380), agreeing with Digby, who sees 'Gods blessing upon the justice of His Majesties Armies that day', and refuting Foster, who believes that 'the right hand of the Lord became glorious in that day, to get himselfe a glorious home'.<sup>203</sup>

One of the chief actions of the battle was the securing by Royalist forces of a hill commanding the common:

Wee forc'ed th'Enclosures, and the Hill wee wonne;  
Ah, how much Sweat and Blood did downe it runne! (III.363-4)

Mercurius Aulicus claims in its report of the battle that the Royalist forces 'beat them from their ground and gain'd the Hill',<sup>204</sup> and, a few weeks after the battle, attacks Parliamentary newsbooks for

alleading that His Majesty on the Tuesday night had his Cannon planted on the Hill ... the little enclosed Hill commanding the Towne of Newbury and the Plane where His Majesty in person was drawn up ... was then prepossest by a great body of their Foot, till our advance to it, ours beat them off into the hedge-rows.<sup>205</sup>

This perhaps explains why Cowley places such emphasis on the struggle involved in taking it.

Much of the rest of his account of the battle is taken up with accounts of the deaths of fictional Parliamentary soldiers:

What should I here their Great ones Names rehearse?  
Low, wretched Names, unfit for noble Verse? (III.383-4)

---

<sup>203</sup>Bristol (1643; B4778), sig. [A4r]; (1643; F1625A), sig. B2v.

<sup>204</sup>(275. 138B), p. 527.

<sup>205</sup>Mercurius Aulicus, (14 October 1643; NS 275. 141B), p.561.

This is almost a parody of Lucan's rhetorical tactic after the battle of Pharsalia, where he refuses to name the individual dead because of the sheer scale and horror of the slaughter (Lucan, *Pharsalia*, VII. 617-46). These lines were perhaps inspired by *Mercurius Aulicus*' taunt of 'if you will show me what Lords and Gentlemen were in the Rebels Army, I shall tell you how many of them are slain'.<sup>206</sup> Digby too writes that his reader 'doth not expect that I should tell you of noble men killed on the other side, nor much of Gentry, but of such things as they cal Officers'.<sup>207</sup> The low style of Cowley descriptions of the various artisans killed on the Parliamentary side accords with *Aulicus*' view that 'the Rebels Forces' consist 'of such cattell as were never thought fit to dye by the Sword'.<sup>208</sup> While the many deaths that Cowley describes for the Parliamentary side are mainly exercises in grotesque invention, some of the details may have their origin in documentary accounts. The 'banisht Dutchman' Colonel Swart, for example, is struck by a cannonball:

Noe part of him was left to curse the place;  
His very Death the Canon did deface. (*CW*, III. 385, 389-90)

In Foster's account we read of a Colonel Tucker, who 'fired one peece of Ordnance against the enemy, and aiming to give the fire the second time, was shot in the head with a Cannon bullet from the enemy'.<sup>209</sup> In contrast, the accounts of the Royalist fallen assume an elegiac tone, and will be examined in detail in the following chapter. Cowley follows the imagined flight of Falkland's soul away from the battlefield, and with it takes leave of the war himself. In doing so, he may follow Lucan in leaving his poem as a deliberate fragment, which, in Falkland's death, looks forward to a renewal of peace and order without reaching it.

---

<sup>206</sup>(275. 138B), p.529.

<sup>207</sup>Bristol (1643; B4778), sig. [A4v].

<sup>208</sup>(275. 138B), p.529.

<sup>209</sup>(1643; F1625A), sig. B3r.

Alternatively, many critics have tried to explain why Cowley did not continue his epic. For Trotter, the poem 'had moved into conflict with itself, *before* history started to provide the wrong plot'. He suggests that Cowley uses a variety of conflicting modes 'which cannot be included within a single epic' leaving the work 'deeply fissured, at cross purposes with itself ... its rhetorics even more intractable than its subject matter'.<sup>210</sup> Raymond A. Anselment suggests that 'as the carnage mounts and the royalist victory falters, themes of divine wrath and vindication no longer seem appropriate', while Gerald MacLean believes that the problem 'was not that of an irreconcilable conflict of modes caused by generic variety, but the need to reconcile partisan interests with the formal requirements of an epic design'.<sup>211</sup> It may be that for Cowley, rather than history, it was the newsbook that started to provide the wrong plot. A fruitful contrast may be made with May who, writing after the conclusion of the conflict, takes his narrative only as far as Newbury, because he had 'found nothing written of it by those of the Kings Party';<sup>212</sup> his account of Newbury repeats almost exactly the words of the contemporary Parliamentarian account, A True Relation of the late Expedition of His Excellency, Robert earle of Essex.<sup>213</sup> Cowley's abandonment of his poem, like his more elaborate inventions in his account of Newbury, may be a symptom of his disillusionment with his chief sources; following Newbury, Royalist newsbooks began to print less and less that could serve as material for an epic, to the point where Mercurius Aulicus did not appear in the winter after that battle of Marston Moor, between 24 November

---

<sup>210</sup>Trotter, pp. 7, 18, 21.

<sup>211</sup>Raymond A. Anselment, Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), p. 164; MacLean, p. 208.

<sup>212</sup>May (1647; M1410), Book 3, p. 108.

<sup>213</sup>A True Relation of the late Expedition of His Excellency, Robert earle of Essex (London, 1643; Wing T2979), pp. 13-21.

and 28 December 1644, as a 'way of attempting to disguise royalist losses'.<sup>214</sup> Cowley's epic grew out of the war of the press that accompanied the civil war, and out of the new media that the war helped create. Loxley writes of the poem's 'distinctive innovation' in the way 'it seeks to raise the self-consciously ephemeral and contingent textual volleys of civil war into the substance of historical epic'.<sup>215</sup> Not only did Cowley make the epic serve a similar purpose to the newsbook, he also exalted the newsbook to the level of epic.

---

<sup>214</sup>Smith, LR, p. 60.

<sup>215</sup>Loxley, RP, p.86.

**‘RISEN STARS’:**

**SOLDIERS IN THE POETRY OF THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR, 1642-1648**

## ‘LIBELLS ARE COMMENDATIONS’: PRINCE RUPERT IN PANEGRIC AND SATIRE

The first Royalist military hero of the English Civil War was Prince Rupert, Charles’ nephew, whose appearance in support of his uncle’s cause is taken by some Royalist commentators as a miracle. Rupert, despite being described by Thomas May as, along with his brother Maurice, ‘an addition rather of Gallantry then strength to the Kings side, being both young and unexperienced Souldiers’,<sup>1</sup> was a soldier of some expertise. He had upon his arrival in England at the age of 22 already seen action in the Thirty Years’ War, fighting in Westphalia against the French. During this campaign, he had been captured and imprisoned, and had spent much of the time of his incarceration studying tactics and military history. The author of ‘The History of Prince Rupert’ writes in retrospect of his effect on Royalist morale:

the most timorous weere ashamed to show feare, under such a Generall, whose valour was increased by the great esteeme was had of him, & hee prepares to support his new dignity, by acting new miracles.<sup>2</sup>

A Royalist pamphlet, Joyfull Nevves From Sea: Or good tidings, celebrates Rupert’s determination and courage by relating an anecdote in which, riding towards the King at York, he falls from his horse and dislocates his shoulder, ‘but a Surgeon was quickly sent for, and a bonesetter, who by their vigilant industry soon made whole all those grieved parts, the Prince in such eagernessee to see his uncle, tooke no more respite than three or foure days’.<sup>3</sup>

Cowley similarly recognises the intervention of the brothers in the war as a miraculous event, writing of their first engagement at Powick Bridge on 23 September 1642:

But when the two great *Bretheren* once appear’d,  
And their bright heads like *Leda’s offspring* rear’d,  
When those sea-calming *Sonnes* of *Jove* were spi’d,  
The *Windes* all fled, the *Waves* all sunke, and dy’d. (CW, I. 189-92)

---

<sup>1</sup>May (1647; M1410), III, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>BL MS Lansdowne 817, f. 166r.

<sup>3</sup>Joyfull Nevves From Sea: Or good tidings (London, 1642; Wing J1144), p. 5.

Cowley explicitly compares the princes with Castor and Polydeuces, the sons of Leda after her rape by Zeus, chosen to represent the princes not only because of their brotherhood, but also because of their role as protectors of sailors, appearing as the lights now known as St. Elmo's fire to calm storms. A literally supernatural power thus comes to the King's aid against the natural strength of the Parliament's forces. Cowley's relation of the action at Powick Bridge focuses particularly on Rupert, as leader of the Royalist forces during the engagement:

Comely young man! and yet his dreadfull sight,  
The *Rebells* blood to their faint hearts does fright.  
In vaine alas it seeks soe weake defence;  
For his keene sword brings it againe from thence. (CW, I. 195-8)

An important aspect of this conceit is the emphasis on Rupert's 'sword', as it also features prominently in Clarendon's relation of the same incident:

by reason they expected not an encounter, there was not on the prince's side a piece of armour worn that day, and but few pistols; so that most of the hurt was done by the sword.<sup>4</sup>

Cowley and Clarendon seem to have been equally aware of the Royalists' unpreparedness to counter the impetuous advance of Colonel Edwin Sandys, the Parliamentary officer. A possible source for this information may have been the account of another Parliamentary officer, Nathaniel Fiennes, as he notes that soldiers 'fell in with their Swords pell mell into the midst of their Enemies'.<sup>5</sup> At the same time, Cowley's portrait accords in some measure with the popular perception of the prince as a *beau sabreur*. The mention of 'swords' is common in much of the rhetoric that surrounds Rupert. 'The History of Prince Rupert' reports the prince's advice to the King before the outbreak of the war as

---

<sup>4</sup>Clarendon, VI. 45.

<sup>5</sup>Fiennes (1642; F875), p. 8.

to put him selfe with all the speed hee could into a Posture of defence, when the sword was in his hand, the rebells would better understand his reasons ... hee advised to take armes and resist force with force.<sup>6</sup>

In a letter to the Earl of Essex that was subsequently printed, Rupert writes that it should not be considered strange '*that a Forraigne should take footing upon your English shore with intention to draw the Sword, when the Law of Armes prompts him on to that Resolution*'.<sup>7</sup> A Parliamentary attack on Rupert's character, The Parliaments Vindication, received by Thomason on 6 December 1642, suggests that the prince 'will with his sword make proof that there is nothing but falsehood and forgery in his Declaration'.<sup>8</sup> The emphasis on the sword in this rhetoric suggests something of its importance in a Royalist conception of soldiering. Ian Gentles suggests that a 'sense of honour' was a motivating force in the conflict, and that 'the ideas of medieval chivalry ... still exercised a powerful grip on the imagination of fighting men in the seventeenth century'.<sup>9</sup> It is in deference to this kind of tradition that hand-to-hand combat, essentially fighting with the sword, assumes a greater prestige in Royalist rhetoric. Rupert writes to Essex offering to settle the conflict between the King and the Parliament '*by a single Duell, which proffer if you please to accept, you shall not find me backward in performing what I have said or promised*',<sup>10</sup> although this challenge was perhaps less than chivalrous, bearing in mind that Essex was fifty-one at the time.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>MS Lansdowne 817, f. 165v.

<sup>7</sup>Prince Roberts Message to my Lord of: Essex (London, 1642; Wing R2304), p. 5.

<sup>8</sup>S. W., The Parliaments Vindication in Answer To Prince Ruperts Declaration (London, 1642; Wing W110).

<sup>9</sup>Ian Gentles, 'The Civil Wars in England', in John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer, edd., The Civil Wars of England: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland 1638-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 116.

<sup>10</sup>(1642; R2304), pp. 4-5.

<sup>11</sup>Essex, for his part, wished for the war to be determined by a single, set-piece battle, as long as the king absented himself from the field. See Adamson, 'The Baronial Context of the English Civil War', p. 103.



The victory was an important one for the Royalist cause, psychologically as well as militarily, and Rupert in particular grew in reputation, as Clarendon notes:

it gave his troops great courage, and rendered the name of prince Rupert very terrible, and exceedingly appalled the adversary ... [who] for their own excuse in all places talked aloud of the incredible and irresistible courage of prince Rupert and the King's Horse.<sup>12</sup>

Contemporaries on both sides agreed with this assessment; Fiennes, for example suggests that 'our rash and unadvised going on made us come off with great hast and disorder, whereby we suffer something in reputation'.<sup>13</sup> Cowley has a strikingly similar view of the consequences of the action:

Yet greives he at the *lawrell* thence he bore,  
Alas, poore *Prince*, they'le fight with him noe more,  
His *Vertue* will bee'ecclipst with too much *fame*,  
Hencefoorth not *he* will conquer but his *name*. (CW, I. 199-202)

In this passage, the sentence stretches over four lines, and the idea of Rupert as '*Prince*' vanishes in the last line, with the '*he*' swallowed by the definite, end-stopped '*name*' that he has become. Subsequently, Parliamentary propaganda aims to invert this idea of Rupert's reputation preceding him; The Parliaments Vindication suggests that even 'Prince Rupert may blush to steale a victory by his own report, which the Kings Army never obtained', and turns the Royalist rhetoric back on itself, writing 'the barbarous inhumanity of Prince *Ruperts* troopers might give a sharp edge to the swords and courages of our men'.<sup>14</sup> May similarly observes that Rupert's earliest interventions in the conflict occur at the level of language, noting that at the time of his arrival 'first was the word plunder used in *England*, being borne

---

<sup>12</sup>Clarendon, VI. 46.

<sup>13</sup>Fiennes (1642; F875), p. 10.

<sup>14</sup>S. W. (1642; W110).

in *Germany*, when that stately Country was so miserably wasted and pillaged by forraigne Armies'.<sup>15</sup>

May singles out for special criticism the qualities in Rupert that Royalists most celebrate, in particular his valour and forwardness. He writes that Rupert and Maurice 'shewed themselves very forward and active ... more hot and furious then the tender beginnings of a Civill Warre would seeme to require'.<sup>16</sup> There is a faint echo here of Lucan's comment that the centurion Scaeva 'knew not how great a crime is valour in a civil war' (*Pharsalia*, VI. 147-8). Parliamentary pamphlets scorn Rupert's repeated claim that 'I will never fight in an unrighteous quarrell', with *The Parliaments Vindication* identifying him as 'an abettor in this war, that doth unnaturally put the King up on these violent courses'.<sup>17</sup> The Royalist view of Rupert's involvement in the conflict is of a prince defending the true religion, Rupert himself writing that 'the vworld knows how deeply I have smarted, and what perils I have undergone for the Protestant cause',<sup>18</sup> referring to his service in the Thirty Years' War. Parliamentary reports distrust the prince, perceiving him to be bent on restoring Catholicism. One pamphlet asks whether he be 'ashamed of being seene in the Head of so many Popish Recusants, not onely of this Nation, but fetcht from *Ireland, Wales* and *Denmarke*',<sup>19</sup> Rupert having already suggested in response to this kind of accusation that 'I wish there were no more Papists in their Army than vve have in ours'.<sup>20</sup> It is essentially Rupert's foreignness that breeds this distrust, with many commentators equating his

---

<sup>15</sup>May (1647; M1410), III, p. 3. All citations for 'plunder' in the OED that occur before 1642 are made with reference to the Thirty Years' War.

<sup>16</sup>May (1647; M1410), III, p. 3.

<sup>17</sup>*Prince Rupert His Reply To A Pamphlet Entituled The Parliaments Vindication* (Oxford, 1642) (Wing R2306), p. 7; S. W. (1642; W110).

<sup>18</sup>*Prince Rvper His Declaration* (Oxford, 1642; Wing R2290), p. 5.

<sup>19</sup>*An Answer To Prince Rvper's Declaration* (n. p., 1643; Wing, A3373), p. 3.

<sup>20</sup>(1642; R2290), p. 5.

continental origin with being a Catholic. There is little to distinguish the sentiments of the editor of Prince Roberts Message when he writes ‘I shall greatly doubt whether I speak of a Christian or no’, from the words of the governor of Lichfield, Colonel Russell, who later declares that Rupert was not ‘a gentleman, a Christian, or an Englishman, much less a prince’.<sup>21</sup> May explains that the popular perception of the non-native status of the princes was as much a hindrance to the King as their military prowess was a benefit:

Neither indeed, though they were neere in birth to the crowne of *England*, were they neere enough to adde any security to the King, by purchasing the Peoples hatred to themselves ...

May criticises the princes for their forwardness, a quality that he imputes to their coming to England as military leaders, seeing them ‘as being no more then Souldiers of fortune’.<sup>22</sup>

It was perhaps Rupert’s outsider status that caused Parliamentary satires and attacks upon his character to go to such outrageous extremes. In early 1643, a pamphlet appeared entitled Observations vpon Prince RUPERTS WHITE DOG, called BOY: Carefully taken by T. B.. The title page offers no clue as to the identity of ‘T. B.’, nor does it reveal much about the pamphlet’s origin: the place of publication and the printer’s name are both absent. The author offers a portrait of this ‘neer Malignant Cavalier-Dog’, describing how it is able to speak in a language reportedly between Hebrew and High Dutch, to resist the blows of swords and daggers, and to catch musket bullets between its teeth. Furthermore, the pamphlet asserts that Rupert trains his canine companion to perform various unspecified sexual acts.<sup>23</sup> The same month also saw the publication of An exact description of Prince Ruperts Malignant She-Monkey, a great Delinquent. This pamphlet repeats the allegations of sexual

---

<sup>21</sup>(1642; R2304), p. 1; Russell, cited in Carlton, p. 189.

<sup>22</sup>May (1647; M1410), III, pp. 2, 3.

<sup>23</sup>T. B., Observations vpon Prince Ruperts White Dog, Called Boy (n. p., 1643; Wing B195) (received by Thomason 2 February 1642), n. pa.

deviancy on Rupert's part. The anonymous author takes great pleasure in listing the primate's 'malignant tricks and qualities', stating that if she were to enter a study or bookshop, 'she would teare and rend all the papers and letters that shee could find, and all the books'. He adds that 'she is a cunning jugler', fooling soldiers into believing that they have received their pay when their hands have 'nothing in them but a rusty musket or a pike'. The author expresses his fear that the ape will raise 'an Army of Malignant Monkeys' which 'would come and plunder all the Coster-mongers-houses in London', and observes her love for 'Crosses, Images, Beads, Surplices, Hoods, Coaps, and all Kind of Popish Ceremonies'.<sup>24</sup> As the litany of obscenities continues, it becomes clear to the reader that the perpetrator of these crimes is not the monkey, but Rupert himself.

That these pamphlets were vehicles for oblique attacks upon Rupert was understood by John Cleveland in his poem 'To Prince Rupert', known in some manuscripts as 'Rupertismus'. Cleveland's verses turn the Parliamentary rhetoric against Rupert back on its authors, and appear to have been written in response to these last two pamphlets. The poem announces its engagement from the outset:

O that I could but vote my selfe a Poet!  
Or had the Legislative knacke to do it!  
Or, like the Doctors Militant, could get  
Dub'd at adventures Verser Banneret!<sup>25</sup>

A Knight-Banneret was honoured for martial valour in the presence of the king. Cleveland moves from a slighting reference to the Parliament's framing of legislation for its own convenience to his own desire to follow the 'Doctors Militant', referring both to the members of the universities that had taken up arms for the king, and to the scholars who had turned

---

<sup>24</sup> An exact description of Prince Ruperts Malignant She-Monkey, a great Delinquent ([London], 1642; Wing E3639) (received by Thomason 25 February), sigs. A3v-[A4]r.

<sup>25</sup> John Cleveland, 'To Prince Rupert', ll. 1-4, in Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington, ed., The Poems of John Cleveland (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 33-8.

their hands to propaganda work on the king's behalf. In doing so, he presents his poem as a similarly partisan act of war. Cleveland's engagement in the royal service leads to the militarisation of his verse:

*Faces about*, saies the Remonstrant Spirit;  
Allegiance is Malignant, Treason Merit: (ll. 7-8)

The spirit of the times orders Cleveland's 'Rimes' to face about as they drill across the page. This change of direction reflects the reversals of words' meanings in the present print war. Study of 'the Language of the dayes' makes Cleveland's verse approximate the music of 'Bells which ring backward in this great Combustion' (ll. 15, 18), that is, bells that sound out fire alarms rather than celebration. In a world turned upside down, Cleveland finds that the most suitable language for the praise of the prince is that of satire.

Cleveland's makes explicit his reversal of Parliamentary rhetoric when his poem describes the mock-trial of his dog Boy:

They feare the Giblets of his traine; they fear  
Even his Dog, that four-legg'd *Cavalier*:  
He that devoures the scraps, which *Lundsford* makes, ... (ll. 121-3)

The idea that the dog devours the remains of children killed by the feared Thomas Lunsford perhaps stems from the Parliamentary pamphlet's characterisation of the dog's undue influence, whereby he sits next to the King at dinner, and is fed continually 'with Rumps and Sidesmen of Capons, and such Christianlike Morcells'.<sup>26</sup> Cleveland continues by mentioning the Parliament's charge against the dog's 'ceremonious wag o'th taile' (l. 131). Here, the word 'ceremonious' suggests that Cleveland recasts the attack on Rupert's alleged Catholicism that the pamphlet directs towards the dog, stating that Boy 'carries himself most Popishly and Cathedrally' and is 'much taken with their Cope, and Surplices, and singing

---

<sup>26</sup>T. B., (1643; B195), n. pa.

Books, and ... with the singing men too'.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, Cleveland's invented charge that Boy 'smells Intelligence' (l. 135) accords with the pamphlet's assertion that the dog, for which read Rupert, 'hath the art of finding out Concealed goods' and 'can goe invisibly himselfe' between Oxford and London, springing Royalist prisoners from their gaols and spreading dissent against the Parliament's authority.<sup>28</sup> The conclusion of Cleveland's fictitious charge-sheet accusing Boy of witchcraft and of being 'a Devill without doubt' (l. 139) repeats the phrasing of the question asked at the end of the pamphlet: 'Is this a Dog that is no Dog, but a Witch, a Sorceresse, an Enemy to Parliament, ... that hath something of *Divel* in or about him?'<sup>29</sup> Even the warning to Rupert to use the Muses with care, lest Colonel Wharton reports in London 'That you kill women too' (l. 43), as well as adapting the commonplace of Royalist satire that attacks Wharton for the spreading of false news after Edgehill, recalls the pamphlet's assertion 'that most of the Gentlemen that were killed at *Edgehill* had injured the Doggs reputation some way or other'.<sup>30</sup>

Just as the pamphlet demands that the reader sees that it refers simultaneously to the dog and to its master Rupert, so Cleveland asks his reader to maintain an awareness of his poem's doubling of meaning. He reasserts the militarisation of verse that the war encourages by translating real bullets into paper ones:

But you're enchanted, Sir; you're doubly free  
 From the great Guns and squibbing Poetrie:  
 Whom neither Bilbo nor Invention pierces,  
 Proove even 'gainst th' Artillerie of verses. (ll. 29-32)

---

<sup>27</sup>T. B., (1643; B195), n. pa.

<sup>28</sup>T. B., (1643; B195), n. pa.

<sup>29</sup>T. B., (1643; B195), n. pa.

<sup>30</sup>T. B., (1643; B195), n. pa.

Cleveland adapts the suggestion in the pamphlet that Boy is a witch because ‘He is weapon-prooffe himselfe’ so that the strike of a dagger ‘slided off his skin as if it it had beene Armour of Prooffe painted over with Quick-silver’, and, when fired upon, ‘some bullets he blows by others hee breakes the force of, so that they either no more touch him, then if they were aimed at the edge of a Pen-knife’.<sup>31</sup> Cleveland can adapt this slur to his own purposes because Rupert, untouched in battle, did appear ‘weapon-prooffe’. His own verse becomes a suitable weapon in this war of the pen because of the manner in which it turns the Parliamentarians’ textual volleys back on their authors. It is Cleveland’s adaptation of the Parliament’s rhetoric, alongside Rupert’s military prowess, that makes the prince ‘doubly free’ from real weapons and Parliamentary slander. There is a similar impulse behind Cleveland’s invitation to Rupert to read his poem:

This were my Dialect, would your Highnesse please  
To read mee but with Hebrew Spectacles; ... (ll. 23–4)

From the pamphlet, the reader will already be aware that Boy is able to speak ‘a mixt language, somewhat *Hebrew & High dutch*’.<sup>32</sup> In transferring this quality to the pamphlet’s intended target, Rupert, Cleveland is once again able to subvert the author’s intention. Hebrew is written from right to left, and to a European must be read back to front, like Cleveland’s poem. Rupert’s alleged facility with Hebrew allows him to read Cleveland’s verse correctly; far from being a sign of witchcraft, the slander becomes the mark of superior insight.

Rupert’s immunity to the wounding paper bullets places him in a position above these written exchanges, and in an elaborate conceit, Cleveland exalts him to the level of a Muse:

---

<sup>31</sup>T. B., (1643; B195), n. pa.

<sup>32</sup>T. B., (1643; B195), sig. A2r.

Give *RUPERT* an alarum, *RUPERT!* one  
Whose name is wit's Superfoetation,  
Makes fancy, like eternitie's round wombe,  
Unite all Valour; present, past, to come. (ll. 55-8)

This passage shares with Cowley and Clarendon an emphasis on Rupert's name. It is significant that Cleveland sounds Rupert's name twice, as this naming alerts the reader to the 'doubleness' of meaning in Cleveland's portrait. Similarly, Rupert's 'name' causes 'Superfoetation', adding a second fetus to the already pregnant womb of Cleveland's fancy; the issue of this conception will be 'double'. As Rupert's actions unite valour 'present, past, to come', Cleveland recalls earlier measures of martial valour:

Thread the Beads  
Of *Cæsar*'s Acts, great *Pompey*'s and the Sweds:  
And 'tis a bracelet fit for Rupert's hand,  
By which the vast *Triumvirate* is spann'd. (ll. 67-70)

This passage appears to echo certain elegies on Gustavus Adolphus, to whom Cleveland here alludes. The 'bracelet fit for Rupert's hand' is not unlike the 'gauntlett' awaiting hands 'fitt for a monarchie' in Townshend's elegy, while Rupert's spanning of the '*Triumvirate*' compares with Henry King's view of Adolphus' outspanning of Caesar before his subsequent spanning by death. The implication is that a fit successor for Adolphus has been found in the House of Stuart. The concluding vision of '*England*'s a Paradise ... Since guarded by a Cherub's flaming sword' also recalls Townshend's imagined guard for Adolphus' tomb.

Rupert's name impregnates Cleveland's fancy, making Rupert the father of the poet's invention, and Cleveland extends this conceit to the conclusion of his poem:

He gags their guns, defeats their dire intent,  
The Cannons doe but lisp and complement.  
Sure *Love* descended in a leaden shower  
To get this *Perseus*: hence the fatall power  
Of shot is strangled: bullets thus allied,  
Feare to commit an act of Parricide. (ll. 159-64)



Jupiter descended to Perseus' mother Danaë in the form of a golden shower; Cleveland suggests that he may have fathered Rupert appearing as a shower of bullets, in effect making Rupert the sire of the bullets that aim to kill him. Cleveland anticipates Cowley's idea of bullets that refuse to hit their target; in The Civill Warre, they do so out of deference to Charles, the father of the nation, while here it is out of fear of the figurative father. Rupert's presence 'gags' the cannon so that they can only 'lisp', like children; this serves as further evidence of the victory of Rupert's actions against the metaphorical weapons of Parliamentary propaganda. Rupert's name is effectively the 'father' of this propaganda, as it is his name that forms the most common of Parliamentary curses (ll. 177-8). Cleveland concludes with a final assertion of the power of words in this conflict:

In fine, the name of *Rupert* thunders so,  
*Kimbolton's* but a rumbling Wheel-barrow. (ll. 179-80)

Cleveland plays with the onomatopoeic qualities of each name; the hard 't' and 'd' make the first line of the couplet thunder, in contrast to the softening effect of the 'mb' in the name of Kimbolton, the Earl of Manchester, one of the most vocal opponents of the king among the nobility. The conclusion of 'To Prince Rupert' reminds the reader of its subject, the double meaning of Rupert's name, signifying as it does both hope for the Royalists and terror for the Parliamentarians.

‘FATE ... TOO DEARE A RATE SHE SETS’: THE ROYALIST FALLEN AND ‘THE CIVILL WARRE’

In The Civill Warre, when a specific soldier is described, it is, with a few exceptions, at their death. As a result, the portrayal of soldiers in The Civill Warre has much in common with their descriptions in elegies. In the previous chapter, it was suggested that The Civill Warre was written in response to, and incorporates many aspects of the numerous newsbooks and pamphlets published during the conflict. Similarly, printed elegies for fallen soldiers on either side appeared with increasing regularity during the civil war, published in collections or issued singly as broadsides. Cowley’s commemoration of the Royalist fallen engages in particular with these printed elegies. Not only does Cowley incorporate this genre into an epic treatment of the civil war, but also his poetry reflects the range of elegiac writing on soldiers in circulation.

The English funeral elegy has its roots in the Reformation. As Dennis Kay observes, ‘crucial to the development of the funeral elegy was the example of the funeral sermon’.<sup>33</sup> The preacher of a funeral sermon had to fulfil two tasks. He first acted as a spokesman for the bereaved community; his sermon aims to console the mourners by enacting the process of coming to terms with death. His second task was to hold up the individual’s death as an example to others; the preacher had ‘to locate the exemplary matter in his subject and then to broadcast it for the edification of the survivors’.<sup>34</sup> In the sixteenth century, the growth of Protestant martyrology established a pattern of a good death. Those who had been persecuted and had died for their faith shone as an example of how to behave both in life, and at the point of death. During the Civil War, this aspect of the elegy becomes militarised. It is

---

<sup>33</sup>Dennis Kay, Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 5.

<sup>34</sup>Kay, p. 5.

through bravery on the battlefield and death for the cause that the soldier can provide the best example to the living. Elegies for the fallen become recruiting sergeants, beating a drum to attract others to the wars.

As an example of the ways in which the conventional features of the elegy were put to imaginative use during the Civil War, I will turn now to two responses to the death of Charles Cavendish, the second son of the earl of Devonshire, who was killed at the battle of Gainsborough on 28 July 1643. Cowley commemorates him in a passage of The Civill Warre, describing him as a '*Hector* in his *Hands*, and *Paris* in his *Face*' (CW, II. 139). Edmund Waller, in his 'Epitaph on Colonel Charles Cavendish', makes the similar claim that 'Beauty and Valour did his short life grace' (l. 3).<sup>35</sup> As Cavendish combines the attributes of the beautiful Paris and the warlike Hector, Waller sees his achievements 'at home' as the sum of 'great Alexander in the East' and 'Julius ... in the West' (ll. 7-10). Cowley plays with the conventional idea of a mourning nature in his description of Cavendish's death:

At last old *Gainesbrow* his sad fall beheld;  
And all along *Trents* mournfull waters swelld.  
Too few the teares of its owne *Spring* hee thought,  
Too few the waves that thirty *Rivers* brought.  
The sullen Streame crept silent by his shore,  
Mute as the *Fish* his populous current bore. (CW, II. 143-8)

In his report of the battle, the printed version of which is dated 3 August 1643, Oliver Cromwell, who commanded the Parliamentary forces on the day, writes of how he

immediately fell on [Cavendish's] reare with my three Troopes, ... I pressing on, forced them downe a hill, having good execution of them, and below the hill drove the General with some of his souldiers into a Quagmire, where my Captaine Lieutenant slew him, with a short thrust under his short ribs, ...<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>Edmund Waller, 'Epitaph on Colonel Charles Cavendish', in Poems, ed. G. Thorn Drury, 2 Vols. (London: Dent, 1905), l. 3.

<sup>36</sup>Oliver Cromwell, The Copy of a Letter Written by Colonel Cromvvell To the Committee at Cambridge (London, 1643; Wing C7051), p. 4.

Cowley locates his mourning nature in the specific location of the battle; the weeping of the town of Gainsborough in anticipation of Cavendish's fall swells the river Trent, creating the quagmire that traps the Royalist general, perhaps sidestepping the fact that for once a river worked against the King's forces. Similarly, Waller sees that 'The current of his victories found no stop, / Till Cromwell came, ...' (ll. 23-4); the quagmire blocks the flow of Cavendish continuous action. It is significant that Cromwell was the author of the Parliamentary report, as it is he who dominates the latter section of Waller's poem:

Cromwell, with odds of number and of fate,  
Removed this bulwark of the church and state;  
When the sad issue of the war declared,  
And made his task, to ruin both, less hard.  
So when the bank, neglected, is o'erthrown,  
The boundless torrent does the country drown. (ll. 29-34)

Waller identifies Cromwell with the river Trent that trapped Cavendish, and his victory at Gainsborough is a microcosm of his eventual victory in the war. Cavendish's fall precedes that of the entire country.

As well as engaging with contemporary verse reflections on the deaths of soldiers, the structure of The Civill Warre anticipates in this respect the design of another later epic treatment of the conflict, Clarendon's History of the Rebellion. Clarendon punctuates the massive narrative of his History with 'characters' of its protagonists, usually placed at their entrance into the story, or at their exit. David Norbrook suggests that Clarendon's character sketches fulfil a requirement of his particular view of historiography. Despite his assertion in the opening paragraphs of the History that the war was accidental, 'a universe governed entirely by accident was not something that Clarendon, as a pious Christian, could finally embrace.'<sup>37</sup> Clarendon comes to place a particular degree of responsibility for the

---

<sup>37</sup>David Norbrook, 'English historiography' in Keeble (ed.), p. 242.

deterioration of the political situation prior to the outbreak of war on a cabal of King Charles' advisers. His emphasis on character in part removes the possibility of chance from his history, and instead shows the war to be the result of the agency of flawed individuals.

#### I. SIR BEVILL GRENVILE (1596-1643)

Alongside Rupert, another Royalist hero emerged in the early years of the war in the person of Sir Bevill Grenvile, who was struck down during the battle of Lansdown on 5 July 1643 almost at the moment of his victory, when the Parliamentary forces began their withdrawal. Mary Coate describes him as 'not a soldier by profession but one by instinct.'<sup>38</sup> Grenvile served as Member of Parliament for Launceston from 1621, and besides having interests in horticulture and agriculture, he was a friend of the poet Sidney Godolphin, who fought alongside him in the Royalist army in Cornwall until his death in a skirmish in Chagford on 8 February 1643. Grenvile was also a correspondent of the Parliamentary general Sir William Waller, to whom he revealed his foreboding at the approach of war:

I wonder nothing at what the Divine Justice doth threaten the iniquity of the present times with, but I rather wonder it hath not sooner happened. Let others looke upon secondary causes; I contemplate the originalls and do believe the evils are deserved, but perchance silence is best.<sup>39</sup>

Despite the melancholy that he expresses here, which had been exacerbated by the deaths of his two eldest sons, Richard and Bevill, in 1641 and 1635 respectively, upon the arrival of war he threw himself into involvement with the Royalist war effort and revealed himself to be a military leader of rare ability. A measure of the profound effect that Grenvile's death had in Royalist circles is the speed with which the commemorative volume, Verses on the death of

---

<sup>38</sup>Mary Coate, Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum 1642-1660 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), p. 84.

<sup>39</sup>Sir Bevill Grenvile, letter to Sir William Waller, undated, in Roger Granville, The History of the Granville Family (Exeter: William Pollard, 1895), p. 236.

the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenvill, Knight, appeared; it was received in London by Thomason on 12 August 1643. Loxley correctly notes that ‘the volume contains no Latin verse, its contents are not arranged in keeping with the university orders of precedence which prevailed in other works, and contributors are identified solely by initials’, suggesting that it ‘participated instead in the broader polemical strategies of royalism’.<sup>40</sup> The volume is striking not only for the number and the quality of the contributions, but also for the range of different views of the soldier that it presents. Nonetheless, there is an underlying consistency among the poems in this volume, not only with each other, but also with documentary accounts of Grenvile’s death and later responses to the event.

Grenvile was celebrated as a martyr to the King’s cause almost immediately, and the circumstances of his death inspired hyperbole in contemporary accounts, such as the report printed in Mercurius Aulicus:

[The Parliamentarian army] forc’d us from the hill, which notwithstanding wee assaulted againe and againe three severall times, and the fourth time with unimaginable difficulty wee possessed the top of it, which Sir Bevill Greenville mayntayned with his stand of Cornish Pikes against all their power of Horse, Foot and Cannon, to the wonder and amazement of both friends and enemies, where this brave gentleman was most honourably, though unfortunately slayne in the front of his men, with his Serjeant Major and Captaine Lieutenant dead at his feet, ending his life with as much honour, as mortall flesh is capable of.<sup>41</sup>

We may notice several aspects of this account reemerge in the poetic versions of the battle, many of which repeat the overall tone of the newsbook report, as well as specific details. For example, the poem that opens the volume situates Grenvile’s posthumous reputation firmly on the battlefield:

So hovers Valour o’re that Brow; so yet  
(As, after Tempests, empty’d Clouds still Threat)

---

<sup>40</sup>Loxley, RP, pp. 79-80.

<sup>41</sup>Mercurius Aulicus, 8 July 1643 (NS 275.127), p. 360.

Terror leaps from those Eyes, and Rebels Run.  
The Souldier lives still, though the Man be gone.<sup>42</sup>

This poem concludes by monumentalising Grenvile's memory on the same site even as the battle takes place:

GRENVILL against an Army. He being one,  
Cannon, Horse, Foot Himself. So fixt, and grown  
Vnto the Hill H'had Gain'd, and now made-good.  
That like another Hill, or Rock He stood;  
Fort to Himselfe and Vs; Stronger then all. (sig. A2v.)

This image of Grenvile as a 'Rock' may have been powerful enough to influence two subsequent accounts of the battle written by soldiers who fought in the engagement on the Royalist side. There is a striking similarity with the vivid recollection offered by Sir Richard Atkyns, in his Vindications, published in 1669:

I saw Sir Bevill Grinvill's stand of pikes, which certainly preserved our army from a total rout, with the loss of his most precious life: they stood as upon the eaves of a house for steepness, but as unmovable as a rock; ... the air was so darkened by the smoke of the powder, that for a quarter of an hour together (I dare say) there was no light seen, but what of the volleys of shot gave ...<sup>43</sup>

There is a similar image in the manuscript account by Colonel Walter Slingsby, also present on the day; after the Parliamentarians had retreated, he describes the position of the Royalist army: 'we were then seated like a very heavy stone upon the very brow of the hill, which with one lusty charge might well have been rolled to the bottom'.<sup>44</sup> The elemental aspects of this image emerge elsewhere in the poem, where Grenvile appears as a more troubling, destructive force:

---

<sup>42</sup>T. M., in Verses on the death of the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenvill, Knight (Oxford, 1643; Wing O990), sig. A2v.

<sup>43</sup>Atkyns (1669; V489), p. 32.

<sup>44</sup>Walter Slingsby, in Ralph Lord Hopton, Bellum Civile, ed. C. E. H. Chadwyck-Healey (Taunton: Somerset Record Society, 1902), p. 96; Clarendon's endorsement of Slingsby's manuscript states that it was delivered to him on 20 April 1647.

Then, when, as a Destroying Angell, sent  
To Mow a Guilty Nation downe, He lent  
Blow's like to Whirl-winds. LANDS-DOWN saw Him Stand  
Not with a Pike, but Thunderbolt in's Hand. (sig. A2v)

These fantasies of revenge appear elsewhere in the volume; 'P. M.', for example, writes that

All accents of our grieffe are farre below  
His vaster merit; rather let my Steele  
Revenge his Death, and make their Conqueror feele  
The anger of his Ghost; ... (sig. C3r.)

This author becomes consumed with retributive ire, his language conveying darker notions of witchcraft and demonology, which becomes all the more disturbing when we consider that the 'Conqueror' is Sir William Waller, who had been Grenville's friend and correspondent.

Other contributors display a greater awareness of the more troubling implications of the imagery applied to Grenville. Jasper Mayne's poem has an elaborate opening in which the author imagines going into a rapture as he prepares to write, and addresses Grenville as a muse, who 'dost at once possesse, and hinder; still / Risest, and multipliest betweene my Quill'. The author compares his task to that of Homer, and fears that to commemorate Grenville properly would require the same massive effort:

So what at first He meant an Ode, and song,  
Swell'd to a Worke, and Story ten yeares long.  
And what at first was destin'd to one Shade,  
Spred in the Writing, and prov'd Iliade. (sig. A3r.)

On one level, this is an excuse for the length of Mayne's contribution, which covers five pages. At the same time, Mayne's Grenville is a figure of tremendous energy, who exceeds the confines of the printed page in the same way that he goes beyond the prescriptions of conventional military wisdom:

Had'st Thou, like Others, fought by Rule, and Line,  
Who call it valour Wisely to decline  
Assaults, and Dangers, ...  
We on thy Temples now had planted Bayes,



And Thou had'st liv'd to heare and feele thy Prayse. (sig. A3v.)

A distrust of the 'Arts' of soldiering pervades Mayne's poem, which suggests that Grenvile's bravery is the result of his rejection of military codes:

But Thou did'st scorne such Rules, and call'dst such Lawes,  
Arts how to blemish, and desert a Cause.

Applications of the 'science' of warfare 'Learnedly make Men Pusillanimous' so that they possess a 'Courage meerly Philosophicall,' while Mayne applauds Grenvile as 'Thy Arts were still t'encounter, not to'scape' (sigs. A3v-[A4]r). With these juxtapositions of learning and courage, philosophy and warfare, Mayne appears to be marking a border between the realms of the soldier and the scholar similar to that drawn by Cowley in his poem to Falkland.

However, as soon as this distinction is drawn it is immediately collapsed:

Me thinkes I see Thee shaking thy bold speare  
Against a numerous Host, without their feare  
Who did beset Thee, and the spacious plaine  
Before Thee strow'd with Slaine falne on thy slaine. ...  
When one encounter'd many, and descried  
A Siege on theirs, A Duell on our Side. (sig. [A4]r.)

Mayne imagines himself suddenly caught up in the action of the battle, although the scene he describes differs from the reports of the fight at Lansdown in that Grenvile's pike becomes a 'speare'. This archaism is deliberate, implying a parallel between Grenvile and a hero of classical antiquity. The emphasis on Grenvile's pike may reflect a debate that was current among military writers; in the previous year, Lupton's A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike had paraphrased the arguments advanced in favour of continued use of the pike, including the ideas that the pike is 'full of Necessity, because of it's Antiquity', and 'that the Pike is the most valorous kinde of fight, and the truest distinguisher of couragious Spirits ... and that now

there is little or no man-hood tryed in the Warres'.<sup>45</sup> Grenvile's pike therefore signifies not only his bravery, but also his honour, and this is why in Mayne's depiction of the combat, Grenvile's efforts appear to spectators as a 'Duell', with its chivalric implications. Mayne concludes by comparing Grenvile with Decius, who, in Roman legend, sacrificed himself in a charge to ensure victory:

whom Death  
Snatcht like a *Decius* hence; whose hallowed breath  
Flew from Thee like an Offering; who dyed'st twice,  
Our Souldier once, and once our Sacrifice. (sig. Br.)

The idea of 'Sacrifice' encourages the identification of Grenvile as a martyr, an idea that takes on a Christian connotation in John Berkenhead's description of how Grenvile 'Rear'd up like *Sampson* ... Then pull'd all downe, Himselfe, the *House* and Them' (sig. C2v).

The idea of Grenvile as a martyr also recurs in William Cartwright's elegy, which reads like a character of the dead officer, although at the outset the poem defines him by what he is not:

Not to be wrought by Malice, Gaine, or Pride,  
To a Compliance with the Thriving Side;  
Not to take Armes for love of Change, or Spight,  
But only to maintaine Afflicted Right; ...  
Is to Resolve, Fight, Dye, as Martyrs doe:  
And thus did He, Souldier, and Martyr too. (sig. Bv)

Cartwright sees in Grenvile's military career the perfect balance between bravery and a temperance governed by judicious caution:

Courage, and Iudgement had their equall part,  
Counsell was added to a Generous Heart; ... (sig. B2r.)

What is most apparent in Cartwright's poem is the idea that Grenvile is a more gallant soldier for having entered the war almost by accident; he does not fight for the sake of it, 'Not loving

---

<sup>45</sup>Lupton (1642; L3496), pp. 121, 128.

Arms as Arms', and is therefore superior to those 'who make the Warre their Trade' (sigs. Bv-B2r.). Cartwright, as an Oxford academic, displays a scholarly disdain for the professional soldier by emphasising Grenville's difference:

By no such Engines He His Souldiers drawes  
He knew no Arts, but Courage and the Cause; ... (sig. B2r.)

In the months before his death, Grenville himself wrote to his wife declaring 'I am satisfied I canot expire in a better cause', and following his death, Sir John Trelawney imagines God crowning Grenville 'with Immortall Glory for his noble Constancye in this Blessed Cause'.<sup>46</sup> Cartwright expands his distrust of 'Arts' to embrace not only applications of the 'science' of warfare but also the art of politics, according with Cowley's acerbic portrait of John Hampden:

*Hambden* a man that taught *Confusion, Art*;  
This *Treasons* restlesse, and yet noiselesse *Heart*.  
*Hambden* whose Braine like *Aetnas* Shop appear'd,  
Where *Thunder's* forg'd, yet noe sounds outward heard. (CW, I. 383-6)

Cartwright's poem aims to encourage others to follow Grenville's lead in a time when inaction has ceased to be an option, and he 'Who is not Active, Modestly Rebels' (sig. Bv.). Another contributor to the volume questions his own activity in writing an elegy on Grenville, stating that

He only Mournes That right, that Fights like Thee,  
And a fierce Charge is a good Elegie. (sig. B3v.)

Many of the contributors agree that poetry should be a spur to action, and in this last example the author uses the poem to suggest the displacement of poetry by military endeavour. It is as an influence to others that Grenville looks happily down upon the battlefield at the conclusion to Cartwright's elegy:

---

<sup>46</sup>Sir Bevil Grenville to Lady Grace Grenville, 20 February 1643, in *Granville*, p. 252; Sir John Trelawney to Lady Grace Granville, 20 July 1643, in *Granville*, p. 269.

And when Thou seest an happy Period sent  
To these Distractions, and the Storme quite spent;  
Look downe, and say: I have my share in All,  
Much Good grew from my Life, Much from my Fall. (sig. B3r.)

The Oxford volume concludes with the final lines of Martin Lluelyn's elegy, and this poem itself appeared in print in full in 1646, although the inclusion of an extract in the 1643 collection evidently suggests an earlier composition date. Lluelyn's verse points to Grenville's preparedness for the conflict:

He in the stocke and treasure of his minde  
Had heapes of Courage, and just heate combin'd.  
Where like the thrifty Ant he kept in store  
Enough for *Spring*, but for a *Winter* more.<sup>47</sup>

This image draws on Aesop's fable of the grasshopper and the ant, later employed by Lovelace. The fable is particularly apposite in relation to Grenville; Lluelyn's assertions that 'In Peace he did direct his thoughts on Warres', and that 'his quicke sight perceiv'd the Age would low'r, / And while the Day was *faire*, fore-saw the *Show'r*' (p. 116) accord with what survives of Grenville's correspondence, in particular the letter to Waller. In choosing sides, Lluelyn suggests that Grenville opts for '*Justice*' against the '*Multitude*' (p. 117). It is fitting therefore that Grenville's death occurred in an almost single-handed fight against the multitudinous enemy; Lluelyn emphasises Grenville's heroism by erasing the rest of the Cornish army: 'He did alone expose his single breast' (p. 117). Nor does Grenville shirk this destiny, as he will '*endure*' rather than '*hide*' from the storm of the war:

As valiant Seamen if the Vessell knocke  
Rather *sayle o're it*, then *avoid* the Rocke. (p. 117)

The relevance of the nautical simile emerges at the poem's conclusion, when Lluelyn places Grenville's exploits alongside those of his '*Valiant Ancestor*', his grandfather Sir Richard

---

<sup>47</sup>Martin Lluelyn, *Men-Miracles. With Other Poemes* (Oxford, 1646; Wing L2625) (received by Thomason 29 June), p. 116.

Grenville, who had died in a naval battle of similarly vain odds. Lluelyn suggests that Grenville's destiny was genealogical as well as ideological.

In *The Civill Warre*, Cowley links Grenville's death to that of the poet Sidney Godolphin (CW, I. 429-30). In the commemorative volume, John Berkenhead also pays tribute to the friendship of Grenville and Godolphin, and because of their loss, professes words unequal to the task of memorialising Grenville:

Had thy *Godolphin* stai'd to help us here,  
His Pen had now took thy measure of thy speare, ...  
We blind with teares, see nothing but thy fall,  
Which now doth bleed again, and doubly pierce,  
To loose both *Grenvills* sword, and *Sydneys* verse. (sig. C3r.)

The idea behind this is that in life, the friendship of Grenville and Godolphin creates a union between the 'pen' and the 'sword', and that this bond dissolves with their death. Cowley perhaps follows Berkenhead in breaking off his verse at Godolphin's death, anxious that his verse cannot express this double tragedy for the Royalist cause. Lluelyn states that, at the war's outset, Grenville 'saw all *Serpent* beneath that *specious skin*' of the Parliament's rhetoric; Cowley imagines the Parliamentary army at Lansdown as a serpent that

liv'd and would have stung us deeper yet,  
But that bold *Greenvill* its whole fury met.  
Hee sold like *Decius* his devoted breath,  
And left the *Commonwealth* Heyre to his *Death*.  
Haile, mighty *Ghost*, looke from on high and see,  
How much our Hands and Swords remembred thee. (CW, I. 465-70)

Cowley shares Mayne's perception of Grenville as a Decius, and Cartwright's vision of his ghost looking down on the successes of his Cornish army. However, Cowley avoids the Lucanian parallels perceived by other contributors to the Oxford volume, one of whom describes Grenville as a 'Scaeva' (sig. C3v.). There are two possible reasons for this absence. The first is that Cowley considers the grotesque elements of Scaeva's *aristeia* inappropriate to

mark the death of a figure that he holds in considerable esteem. The second is that in both Lucan's poem and May's translation, Scaeva is 'A common soldier of those legions';<sup>48</sup> Nicholas Rowe, in his 1719 translation, expands upon Lucan and names Scaeva as one who 'careless of the right, for hire his sword he drew',<sup>49</sup> suggesting a continuing interpretation of Scaeva as a mercenary. For Cowley to compare Grenville to Scaeva would be incongruous with the general perception of him, which suggests that Grenville is a gentlemanly amateur, rather than a soldier by trade. There is, as we have seen, a Royalist distrust of 'professional' soldiers, in addition to the fact that Scaeva does not share Grenville's honourable background.

## II. SPENCER COMPTON, EARL OF NORTHAMPTON (1601-1643)

Two of the poems in the commemorative volume mention Grenville's death alongside that of other Royalist casualties, John Berkenhead asking the reader to 'Behold great *Bortue, Stuart, Compton*, now,' (sig. C2r.) while 'P. M.' comments that

'tis fit his ashes lye  
When there is none but Valiant Company.  
Neere *Lindsey's, Denby's, or Northampton's* side  
(Who Conquer'd dying) raise his *Pyramide*. (sig. C3r.)

It is appropriate that both poets mention the earlier death of Spencer Compton, Earl of Northampton, as he too died almost at the moment of victory at the battle of Hopton Heath, on 19 March 1643. Compton was forty-one years old at the time of the battle, and, prior to the civil war, had had experience of action when he served in Breda and Lemgo during the Thirty Years' War. The pamphlet The Battaile on Hopton-Heath, received by Thomason on 25 April 1643, describes the circumstances of Compton's death, and the anonymous printed poem, An

---

<sup>48</sup>Lucan (1627; 16887), sig. K4v.

<sup>49</sup>Nicholas Rowe (trans.), Lucans Pharsalia (1719), eds. Sarah Annes Brown and Charles Martindale (London: Everyman, 1998), VI. 245.

Elegy on the death of the Right Honourable Spencer, Earle of Northampton was published in Oxford to commemorate his fall, and was received by Thomason on 23 May. Cowley, too, writes about his death in The Civil War, and a second elegy, 'Obsequies to the memory of the truly Noble, right Valiant and right Honourable Spencer Earle of Northampton' is included among the poems of Robert Fletcher, published alongside his translations of Martial in 1656.

The pamphlet describes Northampton as 'a most Loyall and hardly to be equalled Subject', and puts the number of the Parliamentary forces at 'about 3000 Horse and Foote' with the Royalists at 'about 900'.<sup>50</sup> Cowley follows the pamphlet account very closely:

Up marcht the loyall *Earle*, and joy'd to see  
Their *Numbers*, and vaine *Odds* for *Victoree*. (CW, II. 33-4)

The pamphlet notes that as a result of Compton's initial advance, 'their Musketeers ran from the hedges, ... and we forced them to quit their Cannon', and Cowley delights in these details, writing 'at first charge they flee. / Their proud-mouthd *Canon* all forsaken lay' (CW, II. 38-9). The pamphlet continues with a description of Northampton's death:

being engaged upon Execution neare their foot, his horse was shot, so that he was constrained to alight, and being encompassed with enemies he fought on foot a long time, killing (as they themselves confesse) a Colonel of foot, and striking another Captain into the brest with his Poleax, besides other common souldiers whom he wounded and slew, untill such time as he was overborne by multitudes<sup>51</sup>

Cowley's description includes several details that he may have gleaned from the pamphlet's report:

Whilst the brave *Earle* engaged with Enemies round,  
Still gives a *Death*, and still receives a *Wound*?  
O *God*! his Horse is shot; it falls and throwes  
The noble burden into'a Crowd of Foes. (CW, II. 43-6)

The account that the elegist gives suggests that he too was familiar with the pamphlet:

---

<sup>50</sup>(1643; B1162), pp. 3, 2.

<sup>51</sup>(1643; B1152), pp. 3-4.

He fell indeed (so nobly did he close  
His life) he fell with multitudes of Foes ...  
But (alas) the Rabble that he slew that day  
Was neither for his company nor way.<sup>52</sup>

Cowley also seems to have been aware of the elegy, as he seems to draw on the poem for several details in his account of Northampton's death, in particular the image of the earl surrounded by enemy soldiers:

At last hee groanes and reeles with many'a stroake;  
The *Brambles* round all dread the tottering *Oake*.  
They proffer *Life*, but hee to them disdaines  
To owe one drop in all his generous veines. (*CW*, II. 51-4)

This compares with the description of his death in the elegy:

So in faire *Beaumont* I have seen an Oake  
When mercenary hands by many a stroak  
Have made him nod, all tottering as he stood,  
Threaten a ruine to the underwood. (pp. 3-4)

This is an important allusion, as both poets must have been aware of Lucan's description of Pompey as 'an old lofty Oake' (*Pharsalia*, I. 136; May's translation). Similarly, an elegy on Grenville imagines his army as a 'stately wood / Of Pikes' with Grenville as 'a Captaine Oake / [Who] led that underwood'.<sup>53</sup> Whereas in Lucan and the Grenville elegy, the oak is venerated above the other trees because it commands greater respect, both Cowley and the elegist makes its fall terrify the 'Brambles' and 'underwood' because they are beneath contempt. The reason for this shift in emphasis becomes clear when we read in the pamphlet that when offered quarter, Northampton 'answered that he scorned to take quarter from such base rogues &

---

<sup>52</sup> *An elegy on the death of the right honourable Spencer, Earle of Northampton* (Oxford, 1643; Wing E407), pp. 3, 4.

<sup>53</sup> (1643; O990), sig. C2v.



Rebels as they were, and so fought it out a long while after'.<sup>54</sup> Cowley relates this detail of the incident:

Hee scornes to'accept the safety of his *Head*  
From *Villaines*, who their owne had forfeited. (*CW*, II. 55-6)

He seems to take these lines almost directly from the elegist, who writes:

he scorn'd breath as a Donative,  
And that from them; he blush'd to have it se'd  
They gave him life, who their own had forfeited. (p. 4)

The pamphlet moves towards a conclusion with the observation that 'the greatnesse of his example cannot but make all those that are desirous of honour to follow in his steps; though none can come nearer him then his brave sonnes, and especially the Lord *Compton*'.<sup>55</sup> Both Cowley and the elegist end with the soul of the dead Northampton looking down on his son still fighting in the battle. The elegist declares that Compton's widow

Beholds thy picture in her noble Sonne,  
Who after thee, being dead, made hast to runne,  
But that *Bellona* in love with him assay'd  
To wound his foot, and so his journey stay'd. (p. 6)

As the goddess of battle protects his son, Compton himself, in *The Civil War*, becomes aligned with Mars, the god of war, and Cowley implores him to 'veiw / Our just revenge set more in *red* then *Yow*' (*CW*, II. 66). Cowley's version in particular corresponds with several details in the pamphlet:

Looke back, great *Spirit*, as thou doest mounting goe;  
And see *thyselfe* againe i'the feild below.  
Midst the lowd Throng behold thy gallant *Sonne*,  
Cut out his way to *Fame* as *thow* hast donne.  
Like thee, in all but *Death*, the brave *Youth's* found,  
In that too, comes too neere *Thee* by a *Wound*. (*CW*, II. 59-64)

---

<sup>54</sup>(1643; B1152), p. 4.

<sup>55</sup>(1643; B1152), p. 4.

Both Cowley and the elegist share the conceit, possibly derived from the pamphlet, of the earl's son following his father on the path to the afterlife in receiving a wound, and accord with the pamphlet's account of James, Lord Compton, 'In whom we find much gallantry and valour in this last action (wherein he received a shot in the legge, but no waies dangerous, and his horse also shot under him)', and its reassurance that 'we have such excellent copies of him in his rare sonnes, and chiefly in the gallant young Earle himselfe'.<sup>56</sup>

The elegist places particular emphasis upon the confusion surrounding the dead earl's body in the aftermath of the battle:

But ah where is't? *Northampton* must not have  
(Such is their inhumanity) a Grave; ...  
Foolish and Cruell! in denying one  
Ye have bestowed on him a Million  
Each noble English breast is now become  
Recorder of his vertues, and his Tombe. (p. 2)

In the absence of a grave, it is his descendants and his exploits that will provide a lasting monument. The pamphlet appends a letter from Northampton's son to the earl's widow, who writes that the Parliamentary officers 'will neither send the body nor suffer our Chirurgeons to come to embalme it', and counsels his mother that 'no man could more honorably have ended his life ... We must certainly follow him'.<sup>57</sup> Where Cowley has the strokes of Compton's poleaxe 'Cut out a *Life* and *Name* from *Fates* large *Booke*', the elegist has the earl

content to crowd into a page  
Rather than have his sacred Masters cause,  
For which he dyed, Religion and the Lawes,  
To bleed, ... (p. 3)

The earl escapes from the crowd of brambles to join the host of Royalist fallen, subordinate to the cause in which he died. The pamphlet similarly concludes with the reflection that '*were it*

---

<sup>56</sup>(1643; B1152), pp. 4, 5; see *CW*, p. 413n.

<sup>57</sup>(1643; B1152), pp. 6, 7.

*any cause under Heaven but this, that is, were not Religion, Honour, Learning, Lawes, Nobility, Gentry, Honesty, and all at stake, these Noble Lords and Gentlemen would not make their bloud so cheape*'.<sup>58</sup> Where Cowley aims for the commemoration of Compton's valour, the elegist, like many of the contributors to the Oxford volume, shares with the author of the pamphlet a desire to encourage action in his readers, and to intervene in the conflict in a manner worthy of Grenville or Compton.

Fletcher's elegy was not published until 1656; his poem concludes with the suggestion that Compton's death was such a loss to the cause that only the King's own death would provide a fitting '*Epilogue*'.<sup>59</sup> From this 'it can be inferred that the poem was not finished until 1649 or later', after Charles' execution.<sup>60</sup> This poem is notable for its comparison of Compton with Gustavus Adolphus:

Now (*Great Adolphus*) give me leave to stir  
The ashes of thy Urne and Sepulcher;  
And branch the flowers of the *Sweadish* glory ...  
Yet not impaire thy plumes by adding more  
To suit that splendor from a neighbour shore ...  
*An active soul in gallant fury hurl'd*  
*To club with all the worthies of the world.*<sup>61</sup>

The comparison with the dead Swedish monarch evokes the more militant poetry associated with his death in 1632; when it finally appeared in print in 1656, it may have been intended as a similar call to arms. Fletcher's poem employs similar conventional imagery to the many elegies on Adolphus, beginning by asking

WHat? The whole world in silence? Not a tear

---

<sup>58</sup>(1643; B1152), p. 8.

<sup>59</sup>R[obert] Fletcher, *Ex otio Negotium, Or, Martiall His Epigrams Translated* (London, 1656; Wing M831), p. 190.

<sup>60</sup>Robert Fletcher, *Poems and Translations*, ed. D. H. Woodward (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1970), p. 181n.

<sup>61</sup>Fletcher (1656; M381), pp. 187-8.

In tune through all the speechless *Hemisphaere*?  
... No Elegies  
But such as whine through th'organs of our eyes? (pp. 186-7)

The description of the silence that seems to follow Compton's death may mean that Fletcher was unaware of both the printed elegy and Cowley's epic, although he may simply employ convention. Like many of the elegists of Adolphus, Fletcher faces a potential struggle to reconcile his subject's '*gallant fury*' with the requirements of service to a cause, asking '*Death*' to describe the effect of Compton's entry into his kingdom:

Didst not thou feel an *Earth-quake* in thy bones?  
Such as rends Rocks and their foundations?  
No *Tertian* shivering, but an *Ague* fit  
Which with a burning Feaver shall commit  
The world to ashes? (p. 188)

Given the publication date of the poem, in 1656, it is unsurprising that the martial qualities of fury and forwardness become destructive forces, expressed in the imagery of apocalypse. Previously, Royalist elegists had avoided such imagery because of its connotations of rebellion. However, under the Cromwellian protectorate, the situation for those faithful to the Royalist cause was more desperate. It would require more force to free themselves from the yoke under which they laboured; as Fletcher reminds his readers of Compton's example, he seeks to inspire them to turn rebels against the new regime.

### III. LUCIUS CARY, VISCOUNT FALKLAND (1610-1643)

No single death more symbolised the fall of the country than that of 'Godlike Falkland', Lucius Cary, second Viscount Falkland, at the first battle of Newbury on 20 September 1643 (CW, III. 525). Falkland had served as a Member of Parliament in the Long Parliament and, in 1642, Charles appointed him Secretary of State. In life, he was noted for his friendship and learning, and was at the centre of a philosophical and literary circle at his home in Great Tew,

near Oxford; Cowley and Clarendon were among his noted friends at this time. Although not a soldier by vocation, Clarendon writes that 'in his natural inclination he acknowledged he was addicted to the profession of soldier';<sup>62</sup> he volunteered to serve under the earl of Holland in his Scottish campaign during the First Bishops' War in 1639. Similarly, upon the outbreak of civil war, although his official post gave him no military position, he volunteered for the King's army and was present at Edgehill. His death had a baleful influence on the Royalist cause; as Peter Young and Richard Holmes suggest 'the Cavalier who shot Hampden did not strike a more deadly blow than the Roundhead that slew Falkland'.<sup>63</sup> The most extended responses to his fall, Clarendon's long character in the History of the Rebellion, and Cowley's elegy at the conclusion of The Civil War, did not appear in print during the lifetimes of their respective authors.

It is perhaps in an attempt to contend with the fact of Falkland's death that Cowley's 'elegy' draws on the poetry written about him while he was alive. At his death, Cowley imagines that 'all the Graces wept, and Muses all' for Falkland (CW, III. 527), while in life, Edmund Waller had imagined the 'Graces and Muses' accompanying Falkland on his expedition to Scotland ('To my Lord of Falkland', ll. 3-4). Cowley reserves much anger in the poem for the fact that in Falkland a vastly learned man was killed by a creature with 'nothing of a Soule but Will':

They killd a Man, whose Knowledge did containe,  
All that the Apple promis'd us in vaine. (CW, III. 563-4)

He accords with Clarendon's claim that Falkland showed 'such an immenseness of wit and such solidity of judgement, ... a most logical ratiocination, such a vast knowledge that he was

---

<sup>62</sup>Clarendon, VII. 230.

<sup>63</sup>Young and Holmes, p. 149.

not ignorant in any thing'.<sup>64</sup> The reference to Genesis in Cowley's poem invites the reader to consider the death of Falkland as representing the fall of England from a state of innocence. Certainly, the description in The Civill Warre of the moment of Falkland's death seems to suggest an undoing of creation:

I see, I see each Virtue and each Art,  
Crowd through the gapeing Wound from out his Heart.  
In a long row through the glad aire they runne,  
Like Swarmes of guilded Atomes from the Sunne. (CW, III. 571-4)

Chaos and dissolution are the fruits of Falkland's fall.

Cowley imagines the news of Falkland's death coming to him on the wind:

I saw, meethoughts, the Conquering Angell fly  
From Newb'ury Feilds towards Oxford through the Sky; ...  
An æsterne wind from Newb'ury rushing came,  
It sigh'd, meethoughts, it sigh'd out Falklands Name.  
Falkland, meethoughts, the Hills all Eccho'ed round,  
Falkland, meethoughts, each Bird did sadly sound. (CW, III. 529-30, 541-4)

We see here that Cowley's poem 'suddenly collapses the necessary temporal and spatial distance between its own moment of composition and the events it addresses',<sup>65</sup> and reveals itself to be a nakedly partisan account of the battle, in a similar manner to Mayne's elegy on Grenville. The death of the transcendent Falkland, who stood for the possibility of unity, thus affects Cowley's poetics, which at this point turn away from ideas of reconciliation. Cowley makes the battlefield a symbolic landscape; he portrays Falkland's departed soul looking down on the still raging battle where he sees the Royalist army 'beat up Ign'orance by degrees / From Trenches, Hedges, Works, and Fastnesses' (CW, III. 581-2). A True and Impartiall Relation of the Battaile ... neere Newbury describes the Parliamentary army, as Cowley has it, the forces of 'Ign'orance', as 'fenced by hedges & ditches inaccessible' so that 'if beaten,

---

<sup>64</sup>Clarendon, VII. 220.

<sup>65</sup>Loxley, RP, p. 87.

might have a safe Retreat, into the adjoyning Fastnesses'.<sup>66</sup> Cowley laments the apparent paradox that 'Wee gain'd a Feild, and lost in him a World' (CW, III. 568), a statement that has a potent local significance because of the pamphlet's claim that the battle ended with 'our having gained the Field, Colours, Cannon, Store of Prisoners, from them'.<sup>67</sup> A True and Impartiall Relation begins and ends with the familiar pamphlet tactic of accusing opponents of claiming defeats as victories. In its opening paragraph, it points out sardonically that the Parliamentarians 'have hitherto still appeared able to make better use of defeates, then we of victories', and ends with the assertion that 'the remaining Rebels in hopes yet farther to abuse the people, by passing still upon them deliverances for Victories'.<sup>68</sup> Cowley adapts this rhetoric to make it more specific to the situation of Falkland's death:

The deaths of our slaine Heroes doe not boast;  
Their lives but not their Victories are lost. (CW, III. 637-8)

If anything, the tone of Cowley's lines fit closest alongside one of the Parliamentary accounts of the battle, which concludes that 'there is no *victory* in *Civill Warre* that can bring the *Conquerer* a perfect *triumph*'.<sup>69</sup>

Cowley's passage at times reads like a character of Falkland, and shows several similarities with Clarendon's long character in the History of the Rebellion. Cowley exclaims 'How dearely did hee love his Countrys peace!':

His greife was publick, and hee waild noe lesse  
His Enemies Sinne, then his good Kings distresse.  
His Sighs were common as the aire to all;  
Large as theise Stormes which our just sorrowes call. (CW, III. 605, 611-14)

---

<sup>66</sup>[Bristol] (1643; B4778), n. p.

<sup>67</sup>[Bristol] (1643; B4778), n. p.

<sup>68</sup>[Bristol] (1643; B4778), n. p.

<sup>69</sup>A true relation of the late expedition of His Excellency, Robert earle of Essex (London, 1643; Wing T2979), p. 21.

Clarendon writes of Falkland's desperation for an end to the conflict, observing that 'when there was any overture or hope of peace he would be more erect and vigorous' and that amongst friends he would 'after a deep silence and frequent sighs, ... ingeminate the word *Peace, Peace*'.<sup>70</sup> Similarly, as Falkland set off for Scotland, Waller writes of his fear that 'the all-knowing breast' will be exposed 'cheaply as the rest' in battle. At Newbury, Waller's fears are realised:

into too much danger now hee thrust  
His owne great head; himselfe hee us'd not then  
With the same rules hee us'ed towards other men. (CW, III. 602-4)

Cowley's syntax here encourages us to see an active Falkland who 'thrusts' himself into and is responsible for his 'use' of himself and others. Clarendon writes of him 'being so far from fear that he was not without appetite of danger;' and adds that from his behaviour at Edgehill he is judged to take the field 'only out of curiosity to see the face of danger'. At Newbury, in order to show that 'his impatiency for peace proceeded not from pusillanimity' he puts himself 'into the first rank' of Sir John Byron's regiment.<sup>71</sup> The idea that Falkland's body is a frail container for his knowledge suggests a comparison with another soldier. As Cowley imagines the flight of the angel bringing news of Falkland's death, he contemplates how

Hee made dull speed to tell the battle past,  
Like wounded Birds that fly with broken hast.  
Such I believe, such was his mournfull Flight  
Ore the pale Baltick from sad Lutzens flight. (CW, III. 535-8)

Cowley introduces an 'Adolphean' strand to his commemoration of Falkland, perhaps intending by it both that Falkland died bravely defending true religion, and that, like Adolphus, Falkland may have needlessly exposed himself to enemy fire. For a time after the

---

<sup>70</sup>Clarendon, VII. 233.

<sup>71</sup>Clarendon, VII. 230, 233, 234.



battle, it was uncertain whether Falkland was dead or alive; as he writes, Cowley, like many of the English elegists of Adolphus, languishes in a drought of news: ‘Some mighty man is slain there, ... / Something within will needes say Falkland’s Hee’ (CW, III. 539-40). For similar reasons, Cowley makes an implicit comparison between the deaths of Falkland and Sir Philip Sidney when he describes Falkland’s knowledge as surpassing even ‘the noblest draughts of Sidneys Wit’ (CW, III. 598). The legend surrounding the death of Sidney at the siege of Zutphen is most familiar from the ‘Dedication’ written by his friend Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, who writes that prior to the battle ‘the unspotted emulation of his heart to venture without any inequality made him cast off his cuisses, and so, by the secret influence of destiny, to disarm that part where God, it seems, resolved to strike him’. Being shot, Greville continues ‘he called for drink’ but seeing ‘a poor soldier carried along’, ‘took it from his head before he drank, and delivered it to the poor man with these words: “Thy necessity is yet greater than mine”’.<sup>72</sup> While much of this story is probably Greville’s invention, and did not appear in print until 1652, aspects of the legend were common knowledge in the seventeenth century; as early as 1590, Sir John Smythe complains that Englishmen have followed the continental example of abandoning battle armour, ‘the imitating of which ... unsoldierlike and fond arming cost that noble worthy gentleman Sir Philip Sidney his life, by not wearing his cuisses’.<sup>73</sup> The implication of the comparison may be at the very least that Falkland invited death. In his Memorials of the English Affairs, published in 1732, Bulstrode Whitelocke reports that on the eve of the battle Falkland remarked that ‘*he was weary of the times, and foresaw much Misery to his own Country, and did believe he should be out of it*

---

<sup>72</sup>Fulke Greville, A Dedication to Sir Philip Sidney (1652) in Prose Works, ed. John Gouws (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 76-7.

<sup>73</sup>Sir John Smythe, Certain discourses ... concerning the forms and effects of divers sorts of weapons (London, 1590; STC 22883), sig. B3r.

*ere night*'; Clarendon observes that, as the war progressed, 'a kind of sadness or dejection of spirit stole upon him which he had never been used to'.<sup>74</sup> Cowley finally seems to suggest that Falkland went to his death out of a combination of the melancholy that Clarendon perceives and a desire to prove his valour in a worthy cause:

But when hee found all sober hopes were past,  
Look'ed farre, and nought but ruin saw at last,  
Their madnes thus farre pleas'd him, that thereby  
H'ad got a just and handsome Cause to Dy. (CW, III. 619-22)

While elegies of Adolphus frequently rehearse his victories and conquests, Cowley's Falkland creates a less material empire:

The farthest lands of Art did hee invade,  
And widestretcht Nature was his Triumph made (CW, III. 565-6)

By expressing his achievements in philosophy in a military idiom, Cowley shows the extent to which the nature of his death affects perceptions of his whole life. Through dying a soldier, Falkland becomes a warrior in every sphere. As he ascends to heaven Cowley describes his achievement of omniscience:

There all things naked at one glance appeare,  
That cost his Soule discursive Journeys here.  
Like a full Vict'ory in an open Plane; ... (CW, III. 577-79)

Cowley expresses Falkland's acquisition of divine knowledge using a military simile, and one that seems singularly inappropriate to the drawn first battle of Newbury, making the comparison of Falkland's learning with the forces of 'Ign'orance' even more pointed. Yet, at the poem's conclusion, it seems that Cowley's thoughts, following Falkland's example, turn to peace, if not reconciliation. Some elegies of Royalist soldiers, we note, reject tears as inappropriate to mark a soldier's death, but at the end of The Civill Warre, Cowley implies

---

<sup>74</sup>See J. A. R. Marriott, The Life and Times of Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland (London: Methuen, 1907), p. 319; Clarendon, VII. 231.

that he is unable to control their flow. In an extravagant conceit, he finds himself unable to write:

The trowbled Muse fell shapelesse into aire,  
Instead of Inck dropt from my Pen a Teare. (CW, III. 547-8)

This recalls the other occasion when ‘tears’ interrupt the writing of his epic, following the double tragedy of the deaths of Godolphin and Grenville, suggesting a similar impact. The single death of Falkland, he admits, will ‘Cost us as much in Teares as them in Blood’ (CW, III. 554). It is not only in thought that Cowley follows Falkland, as in another conceit he admires the dead Cary’s capacity for sympathy:

Soe wide a Charity in each Teare was found,  
Each like a Sea compasst our Island round. (CW, III. 615-6)

There is a sense that the death of Falkland is too great a loss for either poetry or the war to support. In the closing lines, Cowley puts aside thoughts of difference, gathering the entire nation into a collective pronoun; addressing God, he asks

Let moist repentance his black Murd’ers save;  
Such milde revenge his peacefull Ghost would have. ...  
Wee have offended much, but there has binne  
Whole Hecatombs oft slaughtered for our Sinne.  
Thinke on our sufferings, and sheath then againe;  
Our Sinnes are great, but Falkland too is slaine. (CW, III. 641-2, 645-8)

The emphasis on ‘Sinne’ and ‘repentance’ creates a view of Falkland as a martyr, or even a Christ-like figure whose sacrifice will expiate the sins of the nation in its continual rush to war.

Cowley’s pleas did not find a contemporary echo. Falkland’s death was met by a silence in Royalist circles; as Wilcher points out, the sum of Mercurius Aulicus’ recognition of the event was a sentence in its report of the battle: ‘that noble and learned Lord , the L. Viscount *Falkland* being most unfortunately slaine there, with some other worthy Gentlemen

who were also hurt'.<sup>75</sup> Wilcher suggests that many in Oxford 'had little sympathy with Falkland's conciliatory temper and religious tolerance' and that 'his death and replacement as Secretary of State by Lord Digby strengthened the war party in Oxford'.<sup>76</sup> While Cowley was later to be associated with the war party of Jermyn and others, it is fitting that his civil war epic concludes with the death of Falkland, as it seems to mark, if only temporarily, a disillusionment with the ideals of militarism that cost his cause the life of one of the country's most gifted servants. His poem, like Falkland, 'became a casualty of the war itself'.<sup>77</sup> The Civill Warre documents an engagement and then a disenchantment with a military way of life. While at the poem's outset Cowley celebrates the forwardness of heroes like Rupert and Grenvile, as the war continues he does not endorse the calls to further action that some elegists of the Royalist fallen demand. Instead, the growth of the 'arts' of war that he distrusts, and the increasing prominence of soldiers by trade, more able to overcome the soldier possessed by a gentlemanly zeal, embodied by Grenvile and Falkland, mean that he turns away from the martial sphere; the costs to learning, poetry and the arts are too great for them to engage in the military world.

---

<sup>75</sup>(275. 138B), p. 529.

<sup>76</sup>Wilcher, WR, pp. 193-4.

<sup>77</sup>D. M. Rosenberg, 'Epic Warfare in Cowley and Milton', Clio 22:1 (Fall 1992): 67-80, 79.

‘MORE FORWARD IN A ROYALL GALLANTRIE’: ROYALIST ELEGY AND CONTINUED  
ENGAGEMENT 1644-1648

With the death of Falkland, Cowley takes leave of both The Civill Warre and the Civil War; he was not to write explicitly on the subject again. It fell to other writers to chronicle the subsequent fortunes of the Royalist cause. As the failure to gain a decisive victory at the First Battle of Newbury marks the point at which the Royalist war effort began to falter, then these writers document a series of defeats and reversals. The form that appears most suitable to the more difficult times, and to which they turn most frequently, is the elegy.

Many of the elegies that appear throughout the 1640s display a continuity with the poetry of the pre-war period. An example would be ‘*Elegie. On C[aptain] W[illiam] H[olles]. slaine at Newarke*’ by Martin Lluelyn, an Oxford academic, published in his collection Miracles. With Other Poems in 1646. This poem celebrates Holles’ achievements as both a soldier and a scholar, as he was a contemporary of Lluelyn’s at Oxford:

Treasure of *Armes* and *Arts*, in whom were set  
The *Sword* and *Bookes*, the *Campe* and *Colledge* met,  
Yet both so move, that in that mingled throng  
They *both comply*, and *neither neither* wrong.<sup>78</sup>

Lluelyn describes Holles in terms similar to those used by Cowley to describe Falkland in his poem of 1639. The main difference between the two poems is that Cowley, writing when the country was on the precipice of war, emphasises the mutual exclusiveness of the worlds of learning and warfare in his prayer for Falkland’s preservation, whereas for Lluelyn, writing in the midst of the conflict, the two spheres are coterminous:

And as our Perfumes mixt, do all conspire,  
And twist their Curles above the hallowed fire,  
Till in that Harmony of sweets combin’d,  
We can not *Muske* nor *single Amber* finde,  
But *Gummes* meet *Gummes*, and their delights so crowd,

---

<sup>78</sup>Lluelyn (1646; L2625), p. 118.

That they create *one undistinguisht Cloud*: ... (p. 119)

The various qualities mix in Holles in the same way as the different fragrances on a sacrificial altar; the extended simile here looks forward to Holles' death. Lluelyn emphasises the necessity of the amalgamation of these qualities in life, again in contrast with Cowley, who, in *The Civill Warre*, sees Falkland's death as resulting in the dissolution of his accumulated learning. Lluelyn's view that the academic and martial worlds complement each other accords with the claims made by Robert Ward in *Anima's versions of Warre*:

Nature is sooner perfect and ripe in some men, than in others; ... for if Strength be not the comfort of Age, and Wit the grace of Strength, and Vertue the guide of Wit, in all Souldiers, they are not to be allowed of, eyther young or old; for Streugth without Wit is dangerous, Wit without Vertue hurtfull and pernicious; so likewise Age without Strength is but tedious.<sup>79</sup>

The mixing of the virtues of scholar and soldier is for Lluelyn significant in that it achieves harmony and balance, so 'This just proportion'd flame more scorcht the Foes, / Then theirs that *rages*' (p. 119). Lluelyn attributes a furious passion to the Parliamentary soldiers, whereas in Holles 'The *Scholler* did direct, the *Souldier* fight', and his conduct is accordingly more deliberated: 'The hand that strucke, did first consult the braine' (p. 118). In portraying Holles' actions as measured and considered, Lluelyn may suggest that the tide has turned against the Royalist cause, with a consequent rejection of the images of elemental fury which figure success. Similarly, Lluelyn's images of moderation may also function as a tacit plea to the prevailing Parliamentary forces. Lluelyn has no need to compare Holles with the unconstrained force of nature, imagery that, for Royalists, is still associated disturbingly with that of rebellion:

*Learning and Courage* mixt, and temper'd so,  
The *Streame* could not *decay*, nor *overflow*. (p. 119)

---

<sup>79</sup>Ward (1639; 25025), Book I, p. 153.

Holles died during Prince Rupert's relief of Newark in March 1644, although, beyond naming the town, Lluelyn's elegy offers no particulars of the circumstances of his death. The conclusion explains the poem's earlier simile comparing Holles' character to incense burned on an altar, by suggesting that Holles gave himself in order to secure the defended town:

When *Victors* dye to rescue their Renowne  
Some leave a *Tombe*, but thou hast left a *Towne*. (p. 119)

The significance is that in his death, Holles does not leave an inert memorial of past glories, but instead continuing control of an important strategic stronghold, which in fact remained throughout the First Civil War. The elegy looks not to the past, but towards continuing Royalist success, and suggests that Holles, at least metaphorically, will persist in his intervention in the war.

The incitement to renewed action features prominently in the response to the death of Sir John Smith following the Battle of Cheriton on 29 March 1644. Smith had been knighted for his singlehanded recovery of the Royal Standard at Edgehill, and had since progressed to the rank of major-general in Lord John Stewart's regiment. In The Civill Warre, Cowley's account of Edgehill overlooks Smith's exploits, and in the different circumstances of 1644, there seems to be a reluctance to reflect on his death, as if his fall, like that of Falkland, was symbolic of a decline in Royalist fortunes.

The first published response to Smith's death was Edward Walsingham's chronicle of the knight's life, Britannicae Virtutis Imago, Or the effigies of true fortitude, published in Oxford in June 1644. This pamphlet celebrates Smith as the embodiment of the ideal Cavalier, and sees in his life a pattern of virtue that others should aim to emulate. As in Lluelyn's elegy on Holles, the emphasis throughout is on his discipline, his fortitude and his

temperate nature. Walsingham perceives that these qualities were present at the outset of Smith's adulthood, when he travels to the Low Countries:

he takes his books in hand, and againe he falls to his study: not without dayly conflicts with himselfe in overcoming his contrary inclination. But there he demonstrated his vertue, in conquering himselfe to satisfie the desires of his Parents and friends, declaring he knew as well how to master his passions, as his bodily enemies.<sup>80</sup>

The implication of this passage is not only that Smith possessed self-discipline as a young man, but also that he overcomes his passions and submits to authority, in this example represented by his parents. Walsingham links the passions that he overcomes to his 'bodily enemies', whom the reader will know to be the Parliamentary soldiers of the present. Smith's character thus corresponds to his political allegiance. Walsingham later commends Smith's 'contrary inclination' away from study as important in achieving the temperance necessary in a soldier:

This time he neglected not frequently to read and study books of Military Discipline and instruction; but those selected, and of the choycest sort: to these he added Histories, seeking to extract thence in short by Theory, what many yeares practise would hardly afford him. He did well discover the ignorance of such, as are onely trained up in the schoole of practise, under a few yeares experience; and confest, that *a meere practicall knowledge could not make a perfect Souldier, and that practise ought neither to march in obstinate blindnesse without speculatives of historicall knowledge, and examples; nor these againe without practise, but that both of them should be respected as necessary parts, to make a compleat Souldier.*<sup>81</sup>

Smith's natural inclination towards action combines with his disciplined study to create the loyal soldier of the King. Walsingham perhaps write against the earlier Royalist lionisation of the amateur soldier; the Parliamentarians were beginning to achieve success with 'professional' officers who attained their rank through merit and experience. If the forward

---

<sup>80</sup>Edward Walsingham, *Britannicae Virtutis Imago Or, the effigies of true fortitude* (Oxford, 1644; Wing W649), p.3.

<sup>81</sup>Walsingham (1644; W649), p. 9.



young Royalist is to follow Smith's example, then he must devote himself wholly to the life of a soldier.

The incidents of Smith's early life that Walsingham relates are intended to show that his service in the Royalist cause was continuous with his intuitive disposition. While still in the Low Countries, he encounters 'a Commotion in some sort resembling ours: where the dreggs and rude multitude of the City bandy against their Prince, Magistrates, and Nobility'. Smith leaves the college where he is studying and joins in the skirmish on the side of the latter, and succeeds in killing the '*Mechanicke Leader*', thus subduing the mob. The incident shows that 'he disdained to accommodate himselfe to Popular humors, choosing rather to suffer shipwrack with the nobler sort, then to stand idle and let them perish'. Furthermore, following the incident, Smith 'bids his books farewell, layes by his gowne, takes his sword in hand, repairing to the Campe'.<sup>82</sup> Study is again a necessary prelude to action. As the narrative turns to more recent events, Smith continues to appear as the '*Mirroure of Chivalry*'. At Edgehill, Smith encounters a troop of cuirassiers carrying off the Royal Standard, and armed only with a rapier, he demands the return of the banner, striking at the footman carrying it:

one of those *Curiassers* with a *pollax* wounded him in the necke through the Collar of his doublet, and the rest gave fire at him with their pistolls, but without any further then blowing some powder into his face.

The rapier of Smith outfaces the pistols of the Parliamentarians. Walsingham makes clear that, with this action, Smith becomes a paragon of valour; the King's army, 'seeing the *Standard* so neare lost, yet happily regained', come to believe that 'by the fortunate endeavour of such *Noble Heroes* ... the Kingdome might be recovered'.<sup>83</sup> The description of the circumstances of Smith's death seems intended to recall the fall of another paradigmatic

---

<sup>82</sup>Walsingham (1644; W649), pp. 3-4.

<sup>83</sup>Walsingham (1644; W649), p. 14.

soldier, Gustavus Adolphus. At Cheriton, Smith charges a troop of the enemy's cavalry, and comes under heavy musket fire, causing his horse to rear. It follows that 'one from amongst them clad in Armes like a *Lobster* ... with a Carbine gives him his third and mortall wound'. Walsingham notes with relish that a Royalist lieutenant 'rides up to the *Armed monster* and shoots him in the eye', adding that 'The Almighty was not pleased that any *miscreant* should live to glory in so foule an action', recalling the Swedish Intelligencer's judgement on the Imperialist who shot Adolphus.<sup>84</sup> Walsingham concludes his pamphlet with a character of Smith that recapitulates his virtues, which he imagines as a 'votive tablet' on Smith's tomb, 'thereby to incite the learned *Poets* of our Nation to imploy their *diviner pens* in so excellent a worke, as concurring to immortalize the memory of *so brave a Spirit*'.<sup>85</sup>

The poet who answered this exhortation was again Martin Lluelyn, although his elegy is curious in that it discusses Smith himself only in an oblique manner:

As Loadstones beckning steele on either hand,  
 Checke and compell its motion to a stand,  
 That while they both entice, and both dispute,  
 It knows not where to fixe its first salute, ...  
 So we, amaz'd, by Rayes, and lustre throwne,  
 From Predecessours deads and from thine owne,  
 Distract our Wonder, and must doubtfull be,  
 To seate it in thy *Ancestours*, or *Thee*.<sup>86</sup>

The loadstone is a familiar image in much writing on military matters in the seventeenth century. In writing of 'the true valour of subjects and souldiers in fort and field', Ward observes that

---

<sup>84</sup>Walsingham (1644; W649), p. 18; cf. (1634; 23525.2), sig. K4r.

<sup>85</sup>Walsingham (1644; W649), p. 26.

<sup>86</sup>Lluelyn (1646; L2625), p. 120.

As there is a vertue in the Load-stone to draw Iron or Steele to it, ... of the same nature is Valour, which in a valiant Commander, will draw all his Captaines, Officers, and common-Souldiers, to step the same paces to gaine honour and renowne.<sup>87</sup>

Similarly, Walsingham writes of Smith that 'every eye looked upon him as the *loadstarre* of their successe'.<sup>88</sup> Lluelyn makes different use of the figure, expressing it in a plural form, so that rather than applying to Smith, it represents the conflicting claims made on the reader's attention by Smith himself and by his ancestors. Lluelyn gives most of the poem over to consideration of Smith's forebears: 'First, let our Muse her wandring verse command, / To follow him that trac't the Holy-Land' (p. 120). The reference here is to 'Sir *Michael Carington*, Standard-bearer to our first *Richard* in the *Holy-land*'.<sup>89</sup> The elegy further alludes to another of Smith's martial forefathers:

Next to that *Hero*, we must ranke his Fame,  
That was to loose his *Loyalty* or *Names*  
That was compell'd, since *here* it could not stand,  
To ship his virtue o're to *another* Land  
Who in his *Names disguise* did still appeare,  
Till his disguise became his common weare. (p. 121)

Here, Lluelyn repeats every detail included in Walsingham's account of Smith's ancestor

John Carington,

Esquire to his Lord and Sovereigne King *Richard* the second, upon whose desposall he was forc't into *Italy*, where he grew famous for many brave and valiant acts: yet at his returne he chang'd his name to Smith, which all his Posterity have ever since retained.<sup>90</sup>

The significance of John Carington's history lies in the fact that he remained loyal to, and braved exile for, Richard II, a King, like Charles, assailed by rebellion. In Lluelyn's poem,

---

<sup>87</sup>Ward (1639; 25025), Book I, p. 174.

<sup>88</sup>Walsingham (1644; W649), p. 17.

<sup>89</sup>Walsingham (1644; W649), p. 1.

<sup>90</sup>Walsingham (1644; W649), loc. cit.

Smith bears 'an equall claime / Both to his *Loyalty & Name*' (p. 121) on account of his own bravery in similar circumstances.

Lluelyn's elegy emphasises the achievements of Smith's forebears to such an extent that it may scarcely seem to be a poem about Smith at all. He similarly appears absent from many accounts of the action at Cheriton, a fact which may have provoked Walsingham to issue his pamphlet as a corrective. Mercurius Aulicus does not mention him in its report of the battle, and refers to his death parenthetically the following week, although this may reflect the uncertainty surrounding his fate, and a reluctance to dwell on the death of someone who was a weather-vane of Royalist fortunes. Returning to Lluelyn's elegy, however, we see that Smith, though not mentioned by name, is central to the poem. Sir Michael Carington, like Smith, bore a standard for his monarch:

In his stout Arme the Conquering Standard stood,  
Which tooke fresh Crimson from the Pagans bloud ...  
The Royal Banner dreadfull was become  
By *him* abroad, as now by *Thee* at home. (p. 121)

Lluelyn's poem collapses the temporal and spatial distances between the Caringtons, so that Smith appears no less a crusader, fighting the '*nearer* Mahomet' of 'the *English Turkes*', a common Royalist slur on the Parliamentarian forces. Moving towards the conclusion of the poem, Lluelyn admits that he could dwell on the details of Smith's history and 'turne the *Chronicle to Elegy*' (p. 121), referring to Walsingham's book, and recalling Carew's distinction between prose and poetry in his answer to Townshend. Lluelyn, however, goes further and rejects both chronicle and elegy as 'weake Annals' of fame, claiming that Smith, 'wrot' the *fairest Story* with [his] *Sword*' (p. 122). In terms of the conflict, writing still serves as secondary to fighting in the field, and acts as a precursor to, not a substitute for, renewed action.

Further from the cultural centre of Royalism at Oxford, another poet took up the task of commemorating the Royalist fallen, in a less public, but no less engaged manner. Henry Vaughan, unlike many other Royalist poets, saw active service in the King's army during the First Civil War. Vaughan's friendship with Sir Herbert Price of Brecon Priory, a Royalist colonel, appears to have encouraged him to enlist following the King's stay with Price during August 1645. Vaughan fought in Price's regiment at the battle of Rowton Heath on 25 September 1645, and was present at the surrender of Beeston Castle on 16 November of the same year.<sup>91</sup> Vaughan's experience at Rowton Heath, and the loss of a friend, inspired 'An Elegie on the death of Mr. *R. W.* slain in the late unfortunate differences at *Routon* Heath, neer *Chester*, 1645', first published in *Olor Iscanus* in 1651, although Vaughan's professed struggle with 'a full years grieve' suggests a composition date in 1646.<sup>92</sup> The delay is again a result of uncertainty regarding the subject's fate, and Vaughan feels his 'sandy hopes' (l. 4) for his friend's survival shift beneath him. Once more, the individual's fate seems to represent the fortunes of a larger cause, as Vaughan mourns 'the untimely losse / Like that one day' (ll. 7-8); at Rowton Heath, the Royalist cavalry, hoping to relieve the besieged town of Chester, was routed decisively by the Parliamentary forces under Sydenham Poyntz. Vaughan compares the demise of *R. W.* to the felling of 'A well-built *Elme*, or stately *Cedar*' (l. 10), relating his death to larger concerns:

When unexpected from the angry *North*  
 A fatall sullen whirle-wind sallies forth,  
 And with a full-mouth'd blast rends from the ground  
 The *Shady twins*, which rushing scatter round,  
 Their sighing leafes, whilst overborn with strength,

---

<sup>91</sup>See F. E. Hutchinson, *Henry Vaughan: A Life and Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), pp. 64-5.

<sup>92</sup>Henry Vaughan, 'An Elegie on the death of Mr. *R. W.* slain in the late unfortunate differences at *Routon* Heath, neer *Chester*, 1645', l. 3, in *Poetry and Selected Prose*, ed. L. C. Martin (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 49-51.

Their trembling heads bow to a prostrate length;  
So forc'd fell he; ... (ll. 13-19)

Here, there may be an echo of Lucan's image of Caesar's army as a storm from the north (*Pharsalia*, I. 533-5), referring perhaps to the Parliamentary army of Poyntz, which had approached Chester from the north. Stevie Davies suggests that 'Vaughan is evidently alluding to the "twin oaks" of Virgil's *Aeneid* (IX. 679-82), conflated with Virgil's unforgettable description of the violent felling of the ash-tree (II. 626-31)'.<sup>93</sup> The Virgilian allusions are apposite; the 'twin oaks' are Pandarus and Bitias, who, contrary to Aeneas' wishes, open the gates of Latium to fight the Rutulians, leading to their own deaths, while the fall of the ash-tree marks the fall of Troy, and the climax of a successful siege.

In describing his friend's character, Vaughan displays a continuity with earlier conceptions of the ideal Royalist soldier. While not yet twenty, R. W. has a quick mind, though does not 'Wear [his] friends name for Ends and policie' (l. 34), suggesting a continued distrust of 'policie' or political manoeuvring. Instead, R. W. is ruled by 'Conscience and Honour' (l. 50), and shows himself 'More forward in a royall gallantrie' (l. 44). Vaughan offers a solid example of this valour as he describes his friend's conduct at Rowton Heath:

O that day  
When like the *Fathers* in the *Fire* and *Cloud*  
I mist thy face! I might in ev'ry *Crowd*  
See Armes like thine, and men advance, but none  
So neer to lightning mov'd nor so fell on ...  
... like *shott* his active hand  
Drew bloud, e'er well the foe could understand.  
But here I lost him. (ll. 50-54, 59-61)

---

<sup>93</sup>Stevie Davies, *Henry Vaughan*, Border Lines (Bridgend: Seren, 1995), p. 77.

Vaughan reflects R. W.'s forwardness in the continuing enjambement of these lines, until they are brought to a sudden halt with the end-stop that precedes the monosyllabic reflection 'But here I lost him'. The imagery of lightning contributes to the sensation of movement, and suggests that such momentum was achieved that R. W. becomes 'like *shott*', as if his own loss of personality parallels Vaughan's 'losing' of him. The concluding quotation from Virgil, '*Nomen & arma locum servant, te, amice, nequivi / Conspicere*-' suggests that 'Vaughan plays Aeneas to the fallen Deiphobus, the Trojan warrior whose slaughter the leader did not actually witness'.<sup>94</sup> The allusion to the '*Fire and Cloud*' that conceals God above Mount Sinai (Exodus 24: 15-17) reflects Vaughan's own crisis of certainty, both during the battle and afterwards, when the cause that he supports lacks direction and guidance.

In order to counter this overwhelming sense of loss, Vaughan looks to salvage some hope from his friend's death, first desiring that R. W.'s 'Courage' was 'such as scorn'd a base Reprieve' (l. 66). Vaughan may recall the story surrounding the earlier death of the Earl of Northampton, and imagines that his friend followed Northampton's example of an honourable overthrow. More significantly, the location of his friend's grave, like that of Northampton, remains unknown. Vaughan thinks of the 'Cheap pillow' (l. 78) on which R. W. must lie his head, and considers that his elegy

can do more  
To keep thy name and memory in store  
Than all those *Lordly fooles* which lock their bones  
In the dumb piles of Chested brasse, and stones.  
Th'art rich in thy own fame, and needest not  
These *Marble-frailties*, nor the *gilded blot*  
Of posthume honours; ... (ll. 79-85)

---

<sup>94</sup>Jonathan F. S. Post, Henry Vaughan: The Unfolding Vision (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), p. 36.

Vaughan here expresses the idea that to monumentalise the fallen is paradoxically to forget them. In creating an ostentatious memorial, the achievements of the deceased become inert, frozen at the point of their death, the '*Marble-frailties*' subject to the ravages of time, an observation lent more urgency by Puritan iconoclasm. The crucial detail is that such monuments are 'dumb', and cannot speak to succeeding generations. Conversely, Vaughan's elegy can address those that wait for 'better times', and hold up as an example his friend's 'gallant End' (ll. 97-98).

It is in the more desperate circumstances of the Second Civil War that Vaughan next takes up his pen to commemorate a fallen soldier. His elegy on 'R. Hall' is a less obviously martial poem than his elegy on R. W., probably because Vaughan did not fight alongside Hall in the renewed hostilities, and so was not with him at Pontefract when he met his death. The death of a friend again seems to presage a larger disaster for Vaughan:

Thou fell'st our double ruine, and this rent  
Forc'd in thy life shak'd both *Church and tent* ...<sup>95</sup>

Where before R. W.'s death is bound up with the fate of the army, here both the Church and the Royalist cause stand to be lost following Hall's demise.

Hall comes to represent both institutions because he dies 'the glory of the *Sword* and *Gown*' (l. 34). He is more obviously learned than R. W., and Vaughan, in common with other Royalist elegists, emphasises how, in Hall, the scholar complements the soldier, rather than detracting from him:

Learning in others steales them from the *Van*,  
And basely wise *Emasculates* the man,  
But lodged in thy brave soul the *bookish feat*  
Serve'd only as the light into thy *heat*; ... (ll. 27-30)

---

<sup>95</sup>Vaughan, 'An Elegie on the death of Mr. R. Hall, slain at Pontefract, 1648', ll. 25-6, in Poetry and Selected Prose, pp. 58-9.



Vaughan here reiterates a point made also by Lluelyn in his elegy on Holles, and Jasper Mayne in his elegy on Grenville, where the arts of war ‘Learnedly make Men Pusillanimous’. The difference here is that, in the context of the Second Civil War, Hall is distinct not only from the academic, but also from his fellows-in-arms, content to wait rather than to engage the Parliamentarians:

Thou wert no *Wool-sack* souldier, nor of those  
Whose Courage lies in *winking* at their foes,  
That live at *loop holes*, and consume their breath  
On *Match* or *Pipes*, and sometimes *peepe* at death; ...

In contrast to the indolent figures in this satiric vignette, Hall ‘lightning like (not coopt within a wall) / In stormes of *fire* and *steale* fell on them all’ (ll. 39-40). The imagery of lightning suggests Hall’s forwardness, as it does in the case of R. W., and accords with the idea of light combining with heat to form his character. Lightning also breaks out from within walls, and the image, often a troubling symbol of rebellion, takes on a new urgency in the context of Pontefract, where the Royalist army was penned in the town for several months. Vaughan writes of Hall’s preference for exercising his ‘fair and open valour’ in ‘the *defying field*’ (ll. 47-8), and we may infer that he was killed during a sortie from the town.

As with his earlier elegy on R. W., Vaughan concludes his poem with a quotation from the *Aeneid*: ‘-*Salve aeternum mihi maxime Palla! / Aeternumque vale!-*’ (‘hail thou for evermore, noblest Pallas, and for evermore farewell’). Post suggests this represents Vaughan’s greater esteem for Hall, as well as greater self-confidence, as ‘like Aeneas at the time of Pallas’s death, the poet seems to have a sure sense of his destiny’.<sup>96</sup> At the outset, the poet appears to possess a surer vision of his subject:

But I past such dimme Mourners can descrie

---

<sup>96</sup>Post, p. 39.

Thy fame above all Clouds of obloquie,  
And like the Sun with his victorious rayes  
Charge through that darkness to the last of dayes. (ll. 9-12)

Vaughan is able to perceive Hall's virtue despite the condemnation he may have aroused for resuming armed struggle. Where this vision becomes troubling is in its turn towards eschatology, with Hall's fame rushing forward towards apocalypse, 'the last of dayes'. As the elegy progresses, we see that, no less than before, however, Vaughan loses sight of his subject:

So though our weaker sense denies us sight  
And bodies cannot trace the *Spirits* flight, ...  
Since then (thus flown) thou art so much refin'd,  
That we can only reach thee with the mind, (ll. 65-6, 69-70)

Hall's virtue becomes a kind of Platonic ideal, and acts as an example to those left behind to face defeat. Hall soars above the reduced circumstances of the Royalist cause in 1648, and has moved beyond the divisions that plague the nation. Vaughan can only approach him by using his 'mind'; Hall has abandoned the physical reality of battle, and this may imply the necessity of a more inward resistance to the victorious Parliament, one that relies on thought, rather than action. Paradoxically, the escape from the world allows Hall 'to be read more high, more quaint, / In thy own blood a *Souldier* and a *Saint*' (ll. 73-4); the act of 'reading' his virtues in his blood recalls his own corporeal extinction. Furthermore, the physical act of spilling Hall's blood has a redemptive effect on the location of his death:

Thy blood hath hallow'd *Pomfret*, and this blow  
(Prophan'd before) hath Church'd the Castle now. (ll. 35-6)

In Vaughan's elegy, the death of a soldier during a siege is transformed into a '*Martyrdome*' (l. 18), and is established as a death that will shine above others as an example of right conduct in troubled times. While the idea of martyrdom would carry a greater charge for readers when the poem appeared in print in 1651, two years after the execution of King

Charles, it also relates to an event occurring elsewhere at the time of Hall's death: the 'martyrdom' of Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle.

## ‘PASSIVE WAR’: THE DEATHS OF SIR CHARLES LUCAS AND SIR GEORGE LISLE

The belief that poetry should encourage the reader to action finds heightened expression in the poems on the executions of Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle. The sense of outrage among Royalists at the circumstances of their death, as much as the deaths themselves, led to a febrile outburst of activity among poets and journalists, with eight printed responses appearing in the weeks following their executions. Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle were two of the most experienced Royalist officers in the conflict, Lucas having commanded a regiment at Edgehill, and Lisle an officer in Ralph Hopton’s army from the beginning of the war. Both men had a reputation for gallantry in the field and were noted for their particular loyalty to the King. Clarendon perceives in Lucas, the brother of the more famous Margaret, wife of William Cavendish, the Duke of Newcastle, ‘a nature not to be lived with, an ill understanding, a rough and a proud nature’, while in Lisle he sees ‘the softest and most gentle nature imaginable; loved all, and beloved of all, and without a capacity to have an enemy’.<sup>97</sup> Clarendon’s rhetorical dualism may echo the view of one of the contemporary elegies, which describes Lucas as possessor of a ‘stout *Majestick* fire’ with a capacity ‘To make none *Tremble*, yet make all *Obay*’, while Lisle is ‘*Soft* ev’n to *tears*, yet *stout* as *Adamant*’, yet like ‘*Oyle* drains in and heightens *Flame*’, so that together, the two men complement each other to create ‘A various mingled flame’.<sup>98</sup> The elegist emphasises the particular friendship between the two men, and their fortitude in meeting their deaths together.

It has been suggested that the deaths of Lucas and Lisle mark the end of the Second Civil War of 1648. This year was dominated by royalist uprisings against the Parliamentary government, and there were many pro-royalist riots and affrays, some of which developed

---

<sup>97</sup>Clarendon, XI. 108.

<sup>98</sup>An elegie, on the most barbarous, vnparalleld, vnsouldiery, murder ... Sir Charles Lycas (London 1648; Wing E424), pp. 6, 5.

into full-scale military revolts, first in Wales, where Pembroke Castle was seized in April, and then in Kent, where a rising broke out in May, fuelled partly by resentment at the attempted court-martial of civilians arrested during riots against the abolition of Christmas. At the end of the month, the insurgents had elected the Earl of Holland their leader, and resolved to march on London, where they faced the army of General Sir Thomas Fairfax. Fairfax succeeded in capturing around a thousand rebels at Blackheath, and drove the rest back towards Burham Heath in Kent, defeating the uprising and dispersing the rebels. Holland escaped and rode towards London, but, driven away, roamed the countryside with his troops until ending up at St. Neots. It was here on 30 July that Holland was finally arrested. Still, some of the rebels managed to escape, and, in June, entered Colchester, the domicile of Sir Charles Lucas. Lucas and Lisle emerged as leaders of these remaining troops as they sought to hold Colchester. Over the ensuing three months, Fairfax tried constantly to retake the town, without success, the besieged holding out in the hope that the invading Scots army would defeat Cromwell and relieve them. When this army was defeated at Preston on 17 August, the Royalists at Colchester tried several times to break out of the town, the last of which attempts failed because the rank and file believed that they would be deserted by their officers. The Royalist garrison surrendered on 28 August, and Fairfax immediately arrested Lucas, Lisle and Sir Bernard Gascoigne, a Tuscan mercenary, and committed them to court-martial for breaking the parole granted them at the end of the First Civil War. The men were found guilty the following afternoon, and on the evening of the 29 August 1648, they were executed by firing squad.

The two officers very quickly became martyrs, and the ensuing publishing activity in many ways conformed to the familiar Elizabethan genres commemorating martyrdom.<sup>99</sup> In the weeks following their death, four printed elegies appeared, two in quarto volumes and two broadsides. Sermons were preached condemning the ‘murder’ and quickly found their way into print. Printed accounts of the last words of the two ‘martyred’ officers, and short histories of the siege and of both men entered circulation. This outburst of popular outrage encouraged poets to both commemorate the fallen and to express their anger. John Quarles included an elegy on Lucas in his Fons Lachrymarum, Or A Fountayne of Teares, published the same year. It is because the Parliamentary success in the siege of Colchester effectively ended Royalist hopes of any positive outcome in the Second Civil War that the conventional opening lines of the elegies, professing the poet’s unsuitability for the task, take on a heightened significance. Quarles’ verse opens with the expression of his tears, and hopes to ‘mitigate this *showre*’ with the familiar conceit of the pen becoming a fountain:

Restore me to *my self*, and let my *Quill*  
 Weep for me: let it weep until it fill  
 Whole *volumes* with sad tears, ...

Quarles suggests his anxiety that these ‘tears’ should be set down and captured on the page, as ‘*Sorrow hates delay*’;<sup>100</sup> the sad event becomes the source of the fountain, and at the same time the source of the poetry. Quarles feels anguish at his inability to think clearly following the executions:

Have I betray’d my self? Am I o’retaken  
 With *folly*? Or has *Reason* quite forsaken  
 The *kingdom* of my mind? ... (p. 118)

---

<sup>99</sup>See John R. Knott, Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature 1563-1694 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), ch. 1 ‘John Rogers and the drama of martyrdom’, pp. 11-32.

<sup>100</sup>John Quarles, Fons Lachrymarum, Or a Fountayne of Teares (London, 1648; Wing Q127), p. 117.

The creative process becomes a microcosm of the nation; Quarles cannot write because reason has left both the kingdom of his mind and the kingdom as a whole.

Many of the printed elegies reflect the themes of the other literature inspired by the deaths of the officers. A pamphlet purporting to contain the last speeches of Lucas and Lisle claims that upon learning that he was to be executed following his surrender, Lucas' cry was 'Oh what mercy can there be in death, save onely that one kind is not so bitter as another'.<sup>101</sup> Lucas, who had first understood that he was to be shown mercy, infers that mercy is now synonymous with death, and the numerous printed responses all seem to offer a definition of mercy revised in the light of the executions. In one elegy, we read an address to Fairfax' army that declares 'All your *shot, fire, steele*, scarce mured one, / Your *Mercy* only was *destruction*'. The same poem also announces to Fairfax that 'Your *Charity*'s sin, your *mercy* will be *guilt*'.<sup>102</sup> Similarly, Quarles admits a concern at the evident results of this paradoxical view of mercy:

If this be *Mercy*, Heav'n protect us all  
From such a *Mercy*, so *tyrannical*. (Quarles, p. 119).

Yet if the definition of mercy in this context appears fluid, then for the elegists the meaning of loyalty remains unequivocal. One elegy cites as an example of the 'Strange Paradoxes' gripping the nation that

those who drench their Swords in Loyall Blood,  
Are the sole seekers of the Kingdomes good: ...<sup>103</sup>

It is the 'loyalty' of Lucas and Lisle that the printed responses insist upon, as the soldiers in their deaths become models of forbearance. Their deaths become the fulfilment of their lives;

---

<sup>101</sup> Sir Charles Lucas His Last Speech at the place of execution (London, 1648; Wing L3390), p. 2.

<sup>102</sup> An elegie on the death of Sir Charls Lucas and Sir George Lisle (n.p., 1648; Wing E379).

<sup>103</sup> An Elegie on the death of that most noble and heroick Knight, Sir Charles Lucas (n. p., [1648]; Wing E392).

The Loyall Sacrifice, an anonymous extended account of the circumstances of the execution received by Thomason on 30 November 1648, in a character of Lucas, states that

all his Expresses with what company soever he consorted, evermore tended to the advancement of *Loyaltie* ... *he preferred the style of Loyaltie, before any dignity that earth could confer upon him.*<sup>104</sup>

Elsewhere, he is the 'true MIRROR / Of *Loyalty*'. Their loyalty is fulfilled in their deaths when the Parliamentarians become guilty of 'murthering *Lucas* for his *Loyaltie*'. Lisle falls thinking 'I dyed a Loyal Martyr for my King'.<sup>105</sup> The emphasis is on a stable character; once embarked on a course, in this case devotion to the King, there can be no deviation as, Quarles suggests: 'His *Soul* was undivided, and could never / Ramble from *Loyalty*' (Quarles, p. 122), punning upon the Puritan stereotype of the 'rambling' Cavalier, that is, one given to debauchery. There is thus a straight road from life to death.

For Lucas and Lisle, loyalty to the King equates with steadfastness in the face of death. A detail on which several of the accounts focus is the resolution of the two men, holding to the ideal that, as one elegy puts it, 'The Valiant must *affright*, not be *affraid*'.<sup>106</sup> Another elegy makes this scene even more dramatic by portraying the knights

That had (undaunted) in so many fights  
Look'd grim Death in the face, demand from whom,  
The Parliament, or *Fairfax* came this doome?<sup>107</sup>

The pamphlet containing the soldiers' last speeches puts a similar phrase into the mouth of Lucas, and has him request of his executioners 'That *I* may see my accusers, and plead face to face: and have liberty to put in my Answer, and bee tryed by Indifferent Judges',<sup>108</sup> while The

---

<sup>104</sup>The Loyall Sacrifice (London, 1648; Wing L3364), p. 6.

<sup>105</sup>Two Epitaphs, Occasioned by the Death of Sr Charles Lucas and Sr George Lisle (n. p., 1648; Wing T3440), pp. 5, 7; ([1648]; E392).

<sup>106</sup>(1648; E424), p. 5.

<sup>107</sup>(1648; T3440), p. 7.

<sup>108</sup>(1648; L3390), p. 1.



Loyall Sacrifice has a defiant Lucas announce to Whalley, Ireton and Rainsborough '*that he had often lookt death in the face, both publique and private, and now they should see that he was not affraid to die*'.<sup>109</sup> Lucas and Lisle face up to death and their firing squad, as Royalist soldiers outfaced the musket with the sword or the pike. It further reports Lucas as saying before his execution that '*were life a thousand times preciouser than it is, I should scorne the estimate of it, being taken at your hands*', and claims that, following Lucas' execution, Lisle announced '*It is not death I fear, had I a thousand lives, I should willingly Sacrifice them all, to confirme my Lyoalty [sic]*'.<sup>110</sup> Quarles conflates both of these statements in a passage paying tribute to Lucas' fortitude:

though attended  
With troops of *dangers*, dangers that portended  
A thousand *deaths*: his *wisdom* could descry  
Both *life*, and *death*, with contented *eye*:  
*Life* was his Jewel, yet he did not prize  
That *life* at such a rate, as to despise  
A *noble Death*, he labor'd to express  
To both a very equal willingness.<sup>111</sup>

The cold-bloodedness of the execution is emphasised by several poets; another printed elegy states baldly '*Colchester's Bull* deales tamely in cold Blood',<sup>112</sup> the word 'tamely' implying both the cowardice and the calculated nature of the executions. The Royalist focus on the loyal fortitude of the soldiers, and the emphasis on the notion of 'blood', appear to have a different significance when placed in the context of the Second Civil War. In April 1648, the army council meeting at Windsor Castle elected to issue an indictment against Charles. The rhetoric of these debates was particularly charged; it was announced that 'it was the duty of

---

<sup>109</sup>(1648; L3364), p. 78.

<sup>110</sup>(1648; L3364), pp. 76, 80.

<sup>111</sup>Quarles (1648; Q127), 121-2.

<sup>112</sup>(1648; E379).

this day to go out and fight,’ and ‘to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to account for the blood he had shed, and mischief that he had done’.<sup>113</sup> The indictment that was issued went on to list the battles of the First Civil War at which the King had been present - Edgehill, Caversham, Gloucester, Newbury, Cropredy, Bodmin, Leicester, Naseby - announcing that Charles’ stubbornness had caused ‘the needless loss of much blood’, and as a result ‘much innocent blood of the free people of this nation has been spilt, many families undone ...’.<sup>114</sup> Many of the elegies on Lucas and Lisle seem to react to this rhetoric, referring pointedly to the idea of the killings redounding on the Parliament:

Though but a Rivelet, more strong then *Nile*  
 The Loyall Blood, that flow’d from him and *Lile*.  
 Like a huge torrent, beares Rebellion downe  
 To *Carisbrooke*, conveyning *Charles* his Crowne.<sup>115</sup>

Quarles adds that Lucas died in the ‘*Cause*’, and that he ‘*dy’d it with his crimson blood*’ (Quarles, p. 122). The spilling of blood becomes a mark of steadfastness and honour. At the same time, the spilt blood is now on the Parliament’s hands, and the frequency with which elegists connect this phrase with Lucas and Lisle suggests that they viewed Parliament’s accusations against Charles as hypocrisy.

The chief object of these accusations of hypocrisy is the Parliamentarian general Fairfax, criticised for his lack of restraint, and his actions are likened to those of a judge rather than a general:

He keeps a Sessions, when he takes a Towne,  
*Councels of War* are Juries, *Buff Coats* Gownds.  
 His *Standards* *Gibbets* are; ...  
 Th’head quarters alwayes are at *Tiburne*; all

---

<sup>113</sup>Patricia Crawford, ‘Charles Stuart, that Man of Blood’, *Journal of British Studies* 16:2 (Spring 1977), 41-61: 54.

<sup>114</sup>See Carlton, pp. 328-9.

<sup>115</sup>[[1648]; E392).

His power makes him but *Hangman Generall*.<sup>116</sup>

Another elegy presents a similar view of the motives behind the execution:

That from the booty gain'd, and wealthy prize,  
Not their *renowne*, but their *Indictments* rise.  
Whence they can naught but *Tyburne Triumphs* raise,  
And *Seßions-Laurell*, where the *Hemp's* the *Bayes*: ...<sup>117</sup>

Aside from disputing the legality of the executions, Royalist writers emphasise the disproportionate use of force by Fairfax. *The Loyall Sacrifice* describes the terms of surrender granted to the Royalists at Colchester as an 'expresse of MERCY ... writ, like *Draco's* Laws, in letters of blood'.<sup>118</sup> The pamphlet's rhetoric is echoed in a passage expressing foreboding at what this reveals of the nature of Fairfax's paymasters:

then the Raven stretcht his throate  
When both the Houses made this bloody Vote,  
That all who wag'd war for the Royal Cause  
Should suffer death by their Draconick Lawes.<sup>119</sup>

This anticipates the language of one of the more distasteful passages in *The Loyall Sacrifice*, which focuses on the 'disprovision' of the Royalist besieged by:

Sundry Jewish Anarchiall Synagogue Rookes (and those plumpe ones too) for they were Clerkes of the Treasury, and such as at a dead lift, could by the Chiminal application of a *white cement*, which they had ever in readinesse, strengthen the weake sinues of a decayed Army.<sup>120</sup>

The author appeals to the belief that the exchequer is in the hands of Puritans, and likens its clerks to 'Jewish ... Rookes' because of both their dark clothing and their allegedly rapacious nature. He also alludes to the perceived theological similarities between Puritans and Jews, in

---

<sup>116</sup>(1648; E379).

<sup>117</sup>(1648; E424), p. 1.

<sup>118</sup>(1648; L3364), p. 17.

<sup>119</sup>(1648; T3440), p. 7.

<sup>120</sup>(1648; L3364), p. 11-12.

so far as they might both be considered to hold the Old Testament above the New, and to adhere to a doctrine of vengeance rather than forgiveness. The alchemical imagery of a chemical application stiffening sinews refers to the payments (the ‘*white cement*’ may be silver coins) made to reserves sent to Colchester by the Parliament to reinforce the besieging forces. The poet comes to see the executions as a surrogate victory in battle for the Parliamentarians, claiming that in Lucas ‘only were ten thousands kild’. In turn, the poet sees Lucas become like a phoenix, ‘from *Lucas* Ashes *Lucases* shall rise’, and hopes that ‘*Samson*-like dead LUCAS shall kill more’. This glimpse towards ‘the after times’ suggests an escape from the immediate context:

*Tiberius* hated Histories, because  
 He knew his owne foule deeds done ‘gainst all Lawes  
 Should be recorded, and Truth telling Fame  
 Would speake his actions to the Actors shame: ...  
 Who not abhors *Wat Tiler* and *Jack Cade*?  
 That such comotions here in London made  
 (Base Levellers) who durst their Armies bring  
 By force to curbe, or take, or kill the King.<sup>121</sup>

By applying the contemporary label ‘Leveller’ to Tyler and Cade, the poet aims to collapse the distance between the historical circumstances; as the peasant leaders become Levellers, so the Parliamentarian generals become Tyler and Cade. As Loxley identifies, ‘the poem itself is taking on the role of “after times” in denouncing Fairfax’s brutal crimes’.<sup>122</sup>

A poem that engages in a similar activity is ‘An Elegy on Sir Charls Lucas, and Sir George Lisle’ by Henry King, Bishop of Chichester. This first appeared in print in the 1664 edition of King’s poems. As Margaret Crum points out, internal evidence suggests that King composed the poem in late 1648, as the reference to the assassination of Colonel Thomas

---

<sup>121</sup>(1648; T3440), pp. 5-6.

<sup>122</sup>Loxley, *RP*, p. 195.

Rainsborough at Pontefract (ll. 249-50) dates the poem after 29 October 1648, and the references to King Charles I (ll. 255-8) as still alive implies a date prior to January 1649.<sup>123</sup>

Nigel Smith describes King's verse as 'an unusual, rasping war poem' rather than an elegy,<sup>124</sup> suggesting something of the anger that suffuses the poem, although this does not preclude moments of poignancy. As the poem opens, King casts himself as a mourner, and his poem enacts the funeral of Lucas and Lisle:

With trayling Elegy and mournfull Verse  
I wait upon two Pearless Souldiers' Hearse: ...  
Nor can I, at my best Invention's cost,  
Sum up the Treasure which in them we lost: ... (King, 3-4, 7-8)

The poem takes on the features of a military funeral, the trailed pike and the muffled drum.<sup>125</sup>

The soldiers are 'Pearless' or 'pearl-less' in the sense that they are unlamented, as well as being beyond compare. King turns to the genre of tragedy in order to apprehend the deaths at Colchester. He continues with a theatrical metaphor that implies the tragic spectacle of the soldiers' deaths:

Had they with other Worthies of the Age,  
Who late upon the Kingdome's bloody Stage,  
For God, the King, and Laws, their Valour try'd, ... (King, 9-11)

Loxley notes that 'it is the manner of their deaths rather than the simple fact of their occurrence' which inspires King's poem on Lucas and Lisle.<sup>126</sup> This passage is the first that suggests King's acquaintance with The Loyall Sacrifice, which purports to offer 'the whole *Body of this Tragick Story*', as opposed to the limited view of 'lately published' elegies,<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup>King, p. 210n.

<sup>124</sup>Smith, LR, 287.

<sup>125</sup>I owe this point to Tim Langley.

<sup>126</sup>Loxley, RP, p. 194.

<sup>127</sup>(1648; L3364), n. p.

implying that the book's narrative will possess a tragic unity and will gather together the 'parts' of the lesser genre of the elegy. The book consistently portrays the executions as an acted tragedy, 'equally poized to their merits, *persons of quality*, and *patterns of Loyaltie*, who have acted their parts bravely upon the *Theatre of Honour*'.<sup>128</sup> Like the pamphlet, King sustains this generic 'take' on the events, in his description of Colonel Whalley, one of the Parliamentary officers who presided over the executions:

Twice guilty coward! first by Vote, then Eye,  
Spectator of the shamefull Tragedy. (King, 235-6)

This accords almost exactly with the description in The Loyall Sacrifice of how '*Ireton, Rainsborough, and Whaley ... came to be Spectators as well as Actors in this inhumane Tragedy*'.<sup>129</sup> The tragic motif is particularly apt, as the pamphlet also names Fairfax as 'an Actor of a cruell and bloody Tragedy', and suggests that Lucas' 'Gallantry at *MARSTON Moore*' gave Fairfax 'such a blow, as in revenge cost him his life'.<sup>130</sup> King identifies Lucas 'Critical Misfortune' at another point in his career:

Since he from Berkley Castle with such scorn  
Bold Rainsborough's first Summons did return, ... (King, 238-40)

It is important to note that the view of the executions as a tragic performance features in some of the elegies whose publication precedes that of The Loyall Sacrifice; one, concludes with Lucas and Lisle being led 'to the *Tragick Amphitheater*' to enact their '*Passive War*'.<sup>131</sup> King differs from the earlier elegists in making the whole kingdom the stage for the deaths of the two officers; perhaps the product of more sober reflection, he foregrounds the personal tragedies of the soldiers, deflecting attention from the lost situation in the wider country.

---

<sup>128</sup>(1648; L3364), p. 3.

<sup>129</sup>(1648; L3364), pp. 77-8.

<sup>130</sup>(1648; L3364), pp. 8, 42.

<sup>131</sup>(1648; E424) p. 5.

The spectacle of the tragedy is similar in many of the elegists' minds to that of the triumph, and they use the idea to pour scorn on the summary nature of the executions. King agrees that the killings act as arbitrary displays of power, in which the Parliament aims to emulate the conquests achieved by Royalists in the field:

You never must the Souldier's glory share,  
Since all your Trophies Executions are:  
Not thinking your Successes understood,  
Unless Recorded and Scor'd up in Blood. (King, 155-8)

The essence of King's complaint is that the Parliament's army cannot equal the more chivalrous achievements of Royalists, who implicitly kill officers in fair fight. King further alludes to the payments made by Parliament to the besieging army:

There needed no Granadoes, no Petard,  
To force the passage, or disperse the Guard.  
No, you good Masters sent a Golden Ramm  
To batter down the gates against You came. (King, 101-4)

The argument is not solely against the questionable honour of the executions, but also the inequity of the preceding battle. The Loyall Sacrifice also goes to some length to refute the Parliamentarian soldier's defence of the killings, which was that Lucas himself was guilty of 'Killing men in cold blood'.<sup>132</sup> King combines an implicit defence of Lucas and Lisle with an attack on Fairfax:

Ev'n these, not more undaunted in the Field  
Than mild and Gentle unto such as yield,  
Were, after all the shocks of battails stood,  
(Let me not name it) murder'd in cold blood. (King, 39-42)

It is Fairfax who murders 'in cold blood'; like several other elegists, King sees in the emergence of the New Model Army a new tyranny:

Who carry on and fashion your Design

---

<sup>132</sup>(1648; L3364), p. 58.

By Syllae's, Syllae's red proscription's Line,  
(Rome's Comet once, as You are Ours) for shame  
Henceforth no more usurp the Souldier's Name. (King, 77-80)

Sulla, the Roman general and later dictator, consolidated his power by confiscating property and executing his enemies without trial. Crum suggests that this history 'was probably familiar to King in Plutarch, read in the fifth form at Westminster'.<sup>133</sup> While King was almost certainly familiar with Plutarch, his remark that the executions set a 'sad President' (King, 64) indicates that the comparison between Fairfax and Sulla may have been suggested by The Loyall Sacrifice, which complains of

A singular and unpresidentall forme of Justice; to sentence him first, and accuse him after. Or as severe *Sylla*, used to practice upon his profest Foes; first to adjudge them to death, and then to invent such crimes as they were never guilty of, to attempter the quality of deaths, and convert his cruelty to an opinion of clemency: ...<sup>134</sup>

The ambiguity of 'mercy', it seems, is nothing new, and for Royalists, can be traced back to earlier times of military dictatorship and lost liberty. Furthermore, King follows another of the elegists in comparing the Parliamentary generals to 'The Butcher Cade, Wat Tyler, and Jack Straw' (King, 164). What emerges from both poems is a fear of the tyranny of the mob.

A dominant impulse in the commemoration of the dead of the Civil War is to inspire further action, and this King aims to achieve by adapting a conventional image to encourage feelings of injustice. He suggests that the reader should take leave of the bodies of Lucas and Lisle

Whose blood however yet neglected must  
Without revenge or Rites mingle with Dust;  
Nor any falling drop shall ever dry  
Till to a Weeping Spring it multiply,  
Bath'd in whose tears their blasted Laurell shall  
Grow green, and with fresh Garlands Crown their fall. (King, 265-70)

---

<sup>133</sup>King, p. 210n.

<sup>134</sup>(1648; L3364), pp. 59-60.



These lines beg the immediate question of why the blood *must* 'Without revenge or Rites mingle with Dust'. King seems so unwilling to provide the answer that he locates it in parentheses at the poem's conclusion:

Let loyal Colchester (who too late try'd  
To Check, when highest wrought, the Rebel's Pride,  
Holding them long, and doubtfull at the bay,  
Whilst we by looking on gave all away) (King, 309-12)

King consistently figures the execution of Lucas and Lisle as a spectacle, and the hard truth that he must here admit is that he, and other followers of the Royalist cause, stood by as mere spectators. Lucas and Lisle, we now understand, were 'Pearless' in that they died without their peers in the cause, alone and wanting support.

The nature of the deaths of Lucas and Lisle presents one important difficulty for the elegists, specifically, that they did not die in battle. This precludes the descriptions of valiant deaths conventional to martial elegy, and, with the siege confining them within the walls of Colchester, the poet is left to recount their past exploits. King asks the reader to remember Lucas and Lisle before they were by 'cruel want and coward fate / Penn'd up like famish'd Lions in a Grate' (King, 21-2). Another elegist draws out the heroism implicit in the manner of the execution using a corresponding simile, seeing them both as 'some *Libian* Lyon chast by Hounds' who

Disdaines to flye, and rearing without dread  
His crisped maine up, turnes oft about his head,  
And viewes the following Curres, then sure to dye,  
Act his last Exit with much Majestie.<sup>135</sup>

In the same image, Quarles can only add regretfully that 'stoutest *Lions* are at last o'rethrown / By *Natures Laws*' (Quarles, p. 122). The lion, as well as being the symbol of the English

---

<sup>135</sup>(1648; T3440), p. 7.

nation and of the King, was the popular soubriquet of Gustavus Adolphus, and the comparison between Lucas and Lisle and the Swedish monarch becomes even more pointed when one considers the exact nature of their execution:

They, whose bold charge whole Armies did amaze,  
Rendring them faint and heartless at the Gaze,  
To see Resolve and Naked Valour charmes  
Of higher proof than all their massy Armes: ... (King, 29-32)

King's marginal note on these lines reads '*Sir George Lisle at Newbury charged in his Shirt and Routed them*'. He refers specifically to a story that The Loyall Sacrifice repeats:

*In which service the Colonell had no Armour on, besides Courage and a good Cause, and an Holland Shirt, for as he seldome wore defensive Armes, so he now put off his very Buff-doublet, to animate his men, as may be presumed, that the commonest Souldier might see himself better Arm'd then his Colonell; or because 'twas darke, they might better discerne him from whom they were to receive both Direction and Courage.*<sup>136</sup>

This story was sufficiently well known for another elegy to refer to it:

Holland's to him a *Coate of Maile*; what crowds  
Did his *thin Newbery shirt* send to their shrowds?<sup>137</sup>

King is one of the authors to perceive a connection between Lisle's valour in the field and his courage in the face of execution. The phrase 'Naked Valour' implies a kind of unthinking heroism, as if it were natural to a soldier like Lisle. At the same time, it suggests a more honourable way to fight; rather than sheltering behind armour, Lisle presents himself to the enemy as if he were fighting a duel. According to The Loyall Sacrifice, Lucas faced his death with similar fortitude:

tearing open his *Doublet*, he exposed his naked Brest (where in such *matchlesse Valour* and *Loyall Honour* had been lodged) and crying out, *Now Rebels do your worst*, he was immediately dispatched.<sup>138</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup>(1648; L3364), p. 45.

<sup>137</sup>(1648; E379).

<sup>138</sup>(1648; L3364), p. 78.

Similarly, another printed elegy seems to link the circumstances of the death with their previous military achievements:

With nice *Dissectors* they must enter Lists,  
And *Naked* combate arm'd *Anatomists*.<sup>139</sup>

Again, the conduct in life provides the pattern of behaviour at death, and it is possible to perceive a direct continuity between the soldiers and the martyrs. At the same time, we might recall that King was the author of an elegy on Adolphus, and that in this detail there possibly lies a buried remembrance of the death of the Swedish hero, who charged into the battle at Lützen without armour, exposing his naked breast to his enemies, and died a Protestant martyr.

An important detail of the account of Lisle's action at Newbury is that, in the dark, his soldiers might better 'discerne' their guide for 'Direction and Courage'. It is this observation to which King possibly alludes when, in death, they, like Adolphus, become a constellation, so

That all fair Souldiers by Your sparkling light  
May find the way to Conquer when they Fight,  
And by those Paterns which from you they take  
Direct their course through Honou's Zodiak: ... (King, 277-80)

Many of the poems on the soldiers' executions include the familiar exhortation to the dead to provide an example to the living. Sir Edward Sherburne, for example, shows heaven so pleased with their defence of 'an Earthly Cittadell' that they now station 'the Celestiall Towres':

That to distrest Mortalitie  
They now might Guardian Angells bee.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup>(1648; E424), p. 5.

<sup>140</sup>BL MS Sloane 847, f. 58v.

Quarles sees Lucas as an almost mythic hero:

Times *full-mouth'd Herauld* will exactly tell  
How *Death* has rambl'd from his misty *Cell*.  
And with presumptuous *violence* hath shot  
A *Star*, whose *fall* will never be forgot.

'*Lucas* has conquer'd *Death*' is Quarles' cry (Quarles, pp. 117-8). His view of Lucas as a Sisyphean figure, who will rescue mortals from a tyranny, begins to strike a rather hollow note. The hopes of another elegist, who says of Lisle that 'Would but his *Ghost* walke, 'twould nigh clear the Towne', and foresees that 'Starv'd *Colchester* will soone be everywhere',<sup>141</sup> in their very desperation suggest that the cause is lost. With Colchester, and with Lucas and Lisle, the last resistance to the Parliament and its New Model Army fell, leaving Royalists only with hopes of a supernatural delivery from their new bondage.

---

<sup>141</sup>(1648; E379).

**EPILOGUE:**

**ENGLAND TURNED GERMANY?**

The Second Civil War ended in defeat for the Royalist cause, and this outcome was cemented by the execution of the King on 30 January 1649. Those Royalists who had expected a swift victory in 1642 were now forced to gaze upon a country that had changed utterly in the space of six years. For the first time in its history, England would be ruled without a king. At as profound a level, war too had changed the country. In the form of the New Model Army, the state possessed something approaching a standing army. The years of conflict and the ensuing breakdown of authority had given space and freedom to many radical voices who demanded further change with increasing militancy. A large proportion of the population, perhaps as many as one in four of the adult male population, had experienced battle at first hand.<sup>1</sup> These experiences certainly had a profound impact on society, but did they fulfil the gloomiest predictions of the many Jeremiahs writing at the outset of the conflict? As the historian Ian Roy asks, adapting a contemporary commonplace, had 'England turned Germany'?

In terms of a direct comparison between the impact of the Civil War on the British Isles and the Thirty Years War on Germany, Britain does not appear to have suffered too greatly. Recent scholarship on the Thirty Years War has revised the traditional view of that conflict as an apocalyptic, all-destructive struggle, and the British experience does resemble that of Germany, in that the war was regionalised, and, while some regions suffered more than others, devastation was not widespread or uniformly distributed. Yet Britain did not experience the famine, depopulation or mass migration that afflicted some regions of

---

<sup>1</sup>Carlton, p. 340. Carlton bases this estimate on his own estimates of the number killed in battle during the conflict, and the number taken prisoner on both sides.

Germany, and the six years of the English Civil War do not seem to have slowed the growth of the British economy in the seventeenth century to the same extent as that of Germany.<sup>2</sup>

At the same time, as Roy points out, there are other ways in which England could be said to have turned Germany. The most direct impact that the continental situation had upon Britain's domestic affairs, and one that was much remarked upon at the time, was in the return of English and Scottish soldiers who had served on either side in the Thirty Years War. Veterans of European campaigns achieved positions of prominence in both the Royalist and Parliamentary armies, and brought with them both arms, introducing new weapons technology to British warfare, and also expertise. Many of these men, such as Robert Monro and Sir James Turner, wrote manuals explaining the latest military thinking and practice as experienced on the continent. The Thirty Years War, it has been argued, was the catalyst for reform in the armies of many European powers, who switched from a defensive posture based on strongholds and garrisons, to a system which relied more heavily on larger armies in the field. The English Civil War saw the beginnings of this 'military revolution' in Britain, manifested particularly in the rise of the New Model Army and the replacement of mediaeval fortifications with earthworks more resistant to improved artillery. In order to suggest some of the ways in which the process of 'militarisation' described in this thesis had affected British culture, I will turn to Andrew Marvell's 'An Horatian Ode Upon Cromwel's Return From Ireland'.

As well as being perhaps the most famous poem of the English Civil War, the 'Horatian Ode' is also one of the most controversial poems of the seventeenth century, and continues to be so to this day. It was removed from the first printed edition of Marvell's

---

<sup>2</sup>Ian Roy, 'England Turned Germany? The Aftermath of the Civil War in its European Context' (1978), repr. in Peter Gaunt ed., The English Civil War: The Essential Readings (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 249-267: 251.

Miscellaneous Poems along with two other poems, presumably because of the offence that the three poems might have given to the restored monarchy.<sup>3</sup> In the first half of the twentieth century, the poem became 'a privileged text of the apolitical', celebrated because of its awareness of 'complexity, subtlety, ambiguity, irony, and avoiding a final commitment'.<sup>4</sup> The consensus on the poem's ambivalence has in turn become controversial for critics who wish to stress the political commitment of the ode, or who wish to place it in its historical context.<sup>5</sup> While the Ode has now regained its status as a political poem, the extent to which it is a martial poem is still overlooked. The view popular in the 1630s that England was isolated from the wars that ravaged the continent has proved remarkably persistent. The English still prefer to see victory in the Civil War as belonging not to 'mercenaries of foreign origin but Puritan squires-in-arms, like Oliver Cromwell himself, whose approach to warfare was contrasted favourably with that of continental soldiers of fortune'.<sup>6</sup> If Cromwell is not considered to have been a soldier, it follows that Marvell's Ode cannot be a military poem.

Certainly, the title of Marvell's poem would have led a seventeenth century reader to expect a poem of peace. The characterisation of the poem as 'An Horatian Ode' immediately recalls Horace's celebration of the peace achieved by the emperor Augustus after years of civil strife. Sir Richard Fanshawe, himself a translator of Horace, was aware of the parallels

---

<sup>3</sup>See The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, revised by Pierre Legouis with Elsie Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 214.

<sup>4</sup>Michael Wilding, Dragon's Teeth: Literature in the English Revolution (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 113, 115.

<sup>5</sup>See in particular Wilding, Dragon's Teeth, chapter 5; Blair Worden, 'Andrew Marvell, Oliver Cromwell, and the Horatian Ode' in Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker edd., Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 147-80; David Norbrook, 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode" and the politics of genre' in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday edd., Literature and the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 147-69; and Norbrook, Writing the English Republic (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chapter 6.

<sup>6</sup>Roy, 'England Turned Germany?', p. 251.



between his situation and that of the Roman poet when he addressed his Ode of 1632 to Charles, commemorating the achievement of a *pax Carolina*. The idea of a return would similarly have suggested a poem of peace in the mid-seventeenth century. Marvell bases his poem upon the classical genre of *prosphonetikon*, or *epibaterion*, a panegyric oration celebrating the return of a hero. Poems belonging to this genre had proliferated in the early decades of the seventeenth century, most often with reference to the return of Charles, whether he were returning from Spain in 1623, or Scotland in 1633 and 1641. The idea of the royal return is in these poems linked with themes of the return and the renewal of a lost golden age.<sup>7</sup>

A poem of peace is not what Marvell's readers get. From its opening lines, the poem endorses a militaristic stance:

The forward Youth that would appear  
Must now forsake his *Muses* dear,  
Nor in the Shadows sing  
His numbers languishing.  
'Tis time to leave the Books in dust,  
And oyl th' unused Armour rust:  
Removing from the Wall  
The Corslet of the Hall.<sup>8</sup>

These lines return the reader to the atmosphere of the 1630s, when innumerable poems debated the opposition between the arts of peace and the arts of war. The imperative 'must' suggests a definite shift to a war footing, although the qualifying 'now' means that the reader should not infer Marvell's approval of this situation, only his recognition of the changing times. The changing times saw Oliver Cromwell, the successful general of the New Model Army, lead an expedition to Ireland in the summer of 1649, in order to suppress an alliance of

---

<sup>7</sup>See Norbrook, 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode"', p. 149.

<sup>8</sup>'An Horatian Ode upon Cromwel's Return From Ireland' in The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell, pp. 91-4, ll. 1-8.

Royalist and Catholic forces. The massacres at Drogheda and Wexford enhanced his reputation among his supporters, and his notoriety among his enemies. In concluding the protracted siege of Clonmel in 1650, he not only ended a successful campaign, but appeared to have resolved the situation in Ireland that had been ongoing since Charles' abortive attempts to suppress the rebellion there in 1641. These were the circumstances of Cromwell's return that Marvell celebrates.

In these changed circumstances, the 'forward Youth' must turn away from the civilizing arts represented by the '*Muses*'. The new life that he must embrace is one characterised by active militarism. The ceremonial armour that has kept the memory of arms alive is to be preferred to his 'numbers languishing'; the word 'languishing' implies love poetry, and suggests a return to the opposition between Mars and Venus elaborated in the 1630s, although Mars now has the upper hand. In taking down the unused armour, the youth reverses the Virgilian topos that sees armour become nests, and weapons become agricultural tools. The rejection of poetry in these lines derives from the Roman distrust of the '*vita umbratilis*' in times of war, and from the strain of republican thought that associates monarchy with ease and languor.<sup>9</sup> Yet this attitude was not a peculiarly Parliamentary one, as numerous Royalist poems of the latter years of the Civil War praise those who choose active service of the King, and in 1650 the Royalist newsbook *Mercurius Elenctius* tried to incite activity in its readers through its portrayal of the 'afflicted and languishing soul' of the defeated follower of the King, who sits 'Musing on [his] restless bed'.<sup>10</sup> While the youth is advised to leave books in the dust, as one 'whose genius leads them to the sword, and who desire introduction in the art military', in the pages of the government newsbook *A Brief*

---

<sup>9</sup>See Norbrook, 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode"', p. 153, and Worden, pp. 167-8.

<sup>10</sup>See Worden, p. 170.

Relation, he would find himself urged to read Richard Elton's Compleat Body of the Art Military, a military manual addressed to 'the apt and forward soldier' and to 'the young soldier'.<sup>11</sup> Elton's book is based on his own experiences in the Civil War as a captain of the London militia, and it is the same focus on active experience of war over passive reflection that Marvell emphasises.

The opening lines also recall several passages from Lucan, whose influence pervades the ode to such an extent that one critic describes it as a 'mini-Pharsalia'.<sup>12</sup> 'Th' unused Armours rust' recalls the long disused weapons removed from household shrines by the inhabitants of Arminium as Caesar takes their city (Pharsalia, I. 239-43). Marvell's poem continues with its portrait of Cromwell:

So restless *Cromwel* could not cease  
In the inglorious Arts of Peace,  
But through adventrous War  
Urged his active Star.  
And, like the three-fork'd Lightning, first  
Breaking the Clouds where it was nurst,  
Did thorough his own Side  
His fiery way divide. (ll. 9-16)

These lines apply to Cromwell some of the features of Lucan's description of Caesar (Pharsalia, I. 143-55). Marvell's Cromwell rejects the 'inglorious' arts of peace, which refers both to the arts and poetry abandoned by the forward youth, as well as the political arts of compromise and persuasion, just as Lucan's Caesar considers it shameful to conquer without fighting. Lucan famously compares Caesar to a bolt of lightning in the same passage, and, in transferring the description to Cromwell, Marvell suggests both the speed of his ascendancy and the force of his armies on the battlefield. In drawing the comparison between Cromwell

---

<sup>11</sup>See Worden, pp. 157-8.

<sup>12</sup>Norbrook, WR, p. 261.

and Lucan's Caesar, Marvell is not necessarily making a judgment on Cromwell's character. Rather, the importance of the allusion lies in its context. Lucan precedes his description of Caesar with a passage likening Pompey to an old oak tree; the implication is that Caesar will topple Pompey. Marvell can leave unstated a comparison between Charles and Pompey, instead relying on the reader's awareness of this context to suggest that Cromwell is a similarly dynamic force who represents a new age in which military success will be more important than a veneration based on tradition.

It appears that Marvell seeks to assuage the doubts of the reader, Royalist or Parliamentarian, who might be troubled by the comparison of Cromwell and Lucan's Caesar. In the first third of the poem, Cromwell is likened to the destructive power of lightning and thunderstorms, in a rhetorical tactic intended to inspire awe, so that the poet can remark to the unconvinced reader that "'Tis Madness to resist or blame / The force of angry Heavens flame' (ll. 25-6). The reader's objections become irrelevant in the face of the inevitability of Cromwell's rise to prominence. In the poem's final third, the emphasis changes and, far from seeing Cromwell as an irresistible force, the imagery works to suggest his obedience and flexibility:

Nor yet grown stiffer with Command,  
But still in the *Republic's* hand:  
How fit he is to sway  
That can so well obey. (ll. 81-4)

Cromwell's successful generalship has not yet made him unyielding, and he still sits in the Parliament's hand like a falcon, subject to their control:

So when the Falcon high  
Falls heavy from the Sky,  
She having kill'd, no more does search,  
But on the next green Bow to pearch;  
Where, when he first does lure,  
The Falckner has her sure. (ll. 91-6)

There is a continuity from the first to the last third of the poem. Like lightning, the falcon strikes suddenly and with deadly effectiveness. Both act as instruments of divine will, the lightning being 'Heavens flame', while falcons were known as Jove's servant.<sup>13</sup> The difference is that the lightning represents an unrestrained force of nature, whereas the falcon is subject to earthly control. There is, however, a subtlety in Marvell's use of the falcon imagery, as falcons do not always respond to human control. A similar observation might be made about the ode's apparently reassuring formal qualities. In choosing for his poem the regular rhythm and rhyme scheme of the Horatian ode, rather than the looser form of the Pindaric ode, Marvell may wish to demonstrate how Cromwell can conform to a controlling pattern. At the same time, the number of run-on lines may suggest that the phenomenon of Cromwell will always be able to evade constraints.

The importance of Cromwell's responsiveness to control becomes clear in the final section of the ode, which looks forward to his planned expedition to Scotland to suppress the English Parliament's erstwhile allies in the Scottish Covenant, who were now offering support to Prince Charles. The Parliament's commander, Sir Thomas Fairfax, had resigned over the decision to go to war with the Scots, and Cromwell had been appointed to fulfil his post.<sup>14</sup> The ode does not give a voice to the opponents of the war with Scotland, and the description of the Scots as barbarous Picts of a 'party-colour'd Mind' (l. 106) seems to justify Cromwell's command of an expedition that had been voted for by the Parliament. The concluding lines seem to serve as a call to arms for this campaign:

But thou the Wars and Fortunes Son  
March indefatigably on;  
And for the last effect

---

<sup>13</sup>See Wilding, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 125.

<sup>14</sup>See Wilding, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 134.

Still keep thy Sword erect:  
Besides the force it has to fright  
The Spirits of the shady Night,  
The same *Arts* that did *gain*  
A *Pow'r* must it *maintain*. (ll. 113-20)

In these last lines, the Lucanian imagery surrounding Cromwell gives way to an allusion to Virgil. In Aeneas' descent into the underworld, he draws his sword to keep the ghosts of the dead at bay (*Aeneid*, VI. 294). Depending on the point of view of the reader, Cromwell keeps his sword drawn either to preserve his position against those who seek revenge on behalf of those that he has killed, most obviously supporters of the King, or because he is embarking on a unpleasant but necessary task in order to forge a new nation. Furthermore, these lines may allude to the most famous of Renaissance military theorists, Niccolo Machiavelli. The links between Marvell's ode and Machiavelli's *Il Principe* have been often explored, most recently by Brian Vickers.<sup>15</sup> Vickers points to the similarities between the careers of Marvell's Cromwell and Machiavelli's Hiero of Syracuse, who 'indur'd much trouble in gaining [his kingdom], and suffered but little in maintaining'.<sup>16</sup> There are further similarities with the eighth chapter of *Il Principe*, '*Concerning those who by wicked meanes have attained to a Principality*':

the usurper thereof ought to runne over and execute all his cruelties at once, ... Hee that carries it otherwise, either for fearefullnesse, or upon evill advice, is always constrained to hold his sword drawne in his hand.<sup>17</sup>

Again, there is an ambivalence in this allusion. Does Cromwell go to Scotland to execute all his cruelties at once? Or does his submission to the Parliament's control mean that he will be constrained to keep his drawn sword in his hand? In these final lines, Marvell's ode

---

<sup>15</sup>Brian Vickers, 'Machiavelli and Marvell's "Horatian Ode"', *Notes And Queries* 234 (1989), 32-8.

<sup>16</sup>*Nicholas Machiavel's Prince*, trans. E[dward] D[acres] (London, 1640; STC 17168), p. 40.

<sup>17</sup>(1640; 17168), pp. 70-1.

approaches the Horatian poem of peace, although it is under no illusion as to what means will be necessary in order to preserve the nation's security.

The ambivalence towards Cromwell is central to the effect of 'a pro-Cromwellian poem that seems to have been intended for a royalist audience'.<sup>18</sup> The ode ends with Cromwell preparing for his Scottish expedition, and similarly begins with the forward youth taking down the arms to prepare for war. The poem seems to be beating a drum to recruit men to the nation's martial endeavours, in the immediate context the Scottish campaign, although the poem takes a longer view:

A *Caesar* he ere long to *Gaul*,  
To *Italy* an *Hannibal*,  
And to all States not free  
Shall *Clymacterick* be. (ll. 101-4)

These lines suggest a resurgence of support for an active Protestant imperialism, exemplified by Sir Philip Sidney, who, according to Fulke Greville, had imagined a united Protestant army whose 'passage ... over the Alps would have been ... more easy than Hannibal's was'.<sup>19</sup> The hope is that Cromwell's military success can export political liberty to other nations in Europe. The appeal is to a nationalist, rather than a narrowly partisan, emotion in the reader. The idea recalls the conclusion of Waller's poem to Falkland, where it is hoped that the Scottish expedition of 1639 will be a prelude to Britain's military reassertion of herself on the continent. Marvell characterises Cromwell as a Caesar conquering Gaul rather than as the villain in Lucan's version of the Roman civil war. Guild suggests that the allusion to the Pharsalia that opens Marvell's ode places the forward youth in the position of a citizen of

---

<sup>18</sup>Nicholas Guild, 'The Context of Marvell's Allusion to Lucan in "An Horatian Ode"', Papers On Language And Literature 14 (1978), 406-13: p. 411.

<sup>19</sup>Greville, p. 27; see Worden, p. 161.

Arminium, preparing himself to face a threat from the north.<sup>20</sup> The poem finally sees that it is Prince Charles, rather than Cromwell, who is the Caesar threatening the English state.

The similar emotions expressed in Marvell's ode and Waller's poem to Falkland may point to the ways in which Britain's situation in 1650 resembled its position in the 1630s. In both cases, the country was split between a war party who advocated military intervention at home and abroad, and a more pacific party who believed that the nation should enjoy the benefits of peace. The situation in Scotland and Ireland presented difficulties for the English Parliament. The country was expected to provide military support for their coreligionists on the continent. The genre of Marvell's Horatian ode, the *prosphonetikon*, recalls many poems of the 1630s. In particular, Marvell's poem on the return of Cromwell from Ireland seems to relate to Cowley's poem on the return of Charles from Scotland in 1639. That poem ends with the renunciation of arms:

The *Armour* now may be hung up to sight,  
And onely in their *Halls* the *Children* fright. (Cowley, p. 23)

The contrast with the opening of the 'Horatian Ode' is obvious. The influence of this poem upon Marvell's may remind us of the return of a third figure. Cowley's poem exhorts Charles to become 'a new *Gustavus*', and the Swedish king is an implicit presence in Marvell's poem on Cromwell. In the many elegies on Adolphus, he is likened to a force of nature, becoming a whirlwind, a thunderbolt, a volcano. In Henry King's elegy, Adolphus becomes the falcon that cuffs the Imperial eagle, an image that carries many of the same implications as it does in Marvell's poem. Similarly, King's elegy on Adolphus ends with the Protestant hero becoming 'a *Starre*, / Whose Influence may crowne Thy Glorious Warre'. The star resumes its forward motion in the form of Cromwell, who 'through adventurous War / Urged his active Star'. The

---

<sup>20</sup>See Guild, pp. 412-3.



poems of King and Aurelian Townshend in response to Adolphus' death ask who will emerge as a successor to the Swedish general. The implication is that King Charles should take up the mantle. 'An Horatian Ode' asserts that a fit successor to Adolphus' role as Protestant champion has been found in Cromwell, and that Britain is ready to assume the role of a beacon to Protestant Europe.

There is a sense, then, in which the story of the changing attitudes to warfare in English poetry in the mid-seventeenth century is a circular one. At the beginning of the 1630s, the English saw themselves as enjoying a splendid isolation from the wars that plagued Europe. Having succumbed to warfare in the 1640s, the country now finds itself in a healthier, more vigorous condition, ready to export the virus of militarism back to continental Europe. The most famous poem on the triumphant Parliamentary general thus shares many features with poems rejecting the achievements of a foreign monarch in favour of the preservation of England's peace. The many critics who point to the central role that Charles occupies in 'An Horatian Ode' might pause to consider that he similarly occupies a central position in Carew's 'Answer To Aurelian Townshend', and yet that too is a poem dominated by the figure that surrounds him, Adolphus. There is, however, an important shift that can be measured in the difference between Carew's and Marvell's poems. It was finally English, rather than German guns that drowned out the viols of Carew's pastoral idyll. In the intervening years, a military revolution took hold in the minds of Englishmen, with the consequence that in 1650, the forward youth is ready and eager to follow his leader to the battlefield.

## **LIST OF WORKS CITED**

## I: PRIMARY SOURCES

### A: MANUSCRIPTS

BL Additional MS 21935

BL Harleian MSS 163, 3783, 6918

BL Lansdowne MS 817

BL Royal MS 12A58

BL Sloane MS 847

### B: NS SERIALS

A Continuation of Certain speciall and remarkable Passages 57.2.

A Continuation of Certain speciall and remarkable Passages 58.1.

England's Memorable Accidents 579.08; 579.10; 579.11.

The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer 214.017; 214.021.

Mercurius Aulicus 275.101B; 275.109; 275.110B; 275.114; 275.118; 275.124A; 275.127;  
275.138B; 275.141B.

Mercurius Britanicus 286.017.

Mercurius Civicus, Londons Intelligencer 298.004.

A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament 511.48B

Speciall Passages 605.08; 605.14; 605.15A; 605.35; 605.42.

Wednesday's Mercury / Speciall Passages Continued 669.1; 669.3; 669.4.

C: STC BOOKS

William Barrieffe, Military Discipline: or, the Yong Artillery Man (London, 1635; STC 1506).

Richard Bernard, The Bible-Battells, Or The Sacred Art Military (London, 1629; STC 1926).

Giovanni Botero, The travellers breuiat, or an historicall description of the most famous kingdomes (London, 1630; STC 3404).

John Cruso, Militarie instructions for the cavallrie (Cambridge, 1632; STC 6099).

E[dward] D[acres], trans., Nicholas Machiavel's Prince (London, 1640; STC 17168).

Thomas Fisher, The Warlike Directions, or the Souldiers Practice (London, 1634: STC 10918.5).

John Florio, Queen Anna's New World of Words or Dictionarie of the Italian and English Tongues (London, 1611; STC 11099).

Henry Hexham, The Principles of the Art Militarie (London, 1637; STC 13264).

Instructions for Musters (London, 1623; STC 7683).

Sir Thomas Kellie, Pallas Armata, or Militarie Instructions for the Learned (Edinburgh, 1627; STC 14906).

Lodovick Lloyd, The practice of policy (London, 1604; STC 16627).

Thomas May, trans., Lucans Pharsalia (London, 1627; STC 16887).

Francis Markham, Five Decades of Epistles of Warre (London, 1622; STC 17332).

Gervase Markham, The Souldiers Exercise (London, 1639; STC 17390).

-, The Souldier's Grammar (London, 1626; STC 17391).

Robert Monro, Monro his expedition with the worthy Scots regiment (London, 1637; STC 18022).

Martin Parker, A briefe dissection of Germaines Affliction (London, 1638; STC 19222).

John Russell, An Elegie Upon The Death Of The Most Illustrious Gustavus Adolphus (n.d.; STC 20573).

-, The Two Famous Pitcht Battels of Lypsich, and Lutzen  
(Cambridge, 1634; STC 21460).

Sir John Smythe, Certain discourses ... concerning the forms and effects of divers sorts of weapons (London, 1590; STC 22883).

The Swedish Intelligencer, compleat all 4 parts, with the Discipline  
(London, 1634; STC 23525.2).

Henry Valentine, God Save The King (London, 1639; STC 24575).

Philip Vincent, The lamentations of Germany (London, 1638; STC 24671).

Robert Ward, Anim'adversons of Warre (London, 1639; STC 25025).

D: WING BOOKS

Richard Aldworth, The Copie of a Letter Sent From the Maior of Bristoll  
(London, 1643; Wing A901A).

An Answer To Prince Ryperts Declaration (n. p., 1643; Wing A3373).

Richard Atkyns, The vindication of Richard Atkyns (London, 1669; Wing V489).

T. B., Observations vpon Prince Ruperts White Dog. Called Boy (n. p., 1643; Wing B195).

The Battaile on Hopton-Heath (Oxford, 1643; Wing B1162).

George Digby, Earl of Bristol, A True and Impartiall Relation of the Battaile ... neere Newbery  
(Oxford, 1643; Wing B4778).

Sir John Byron, Sir John Byrons Relation (York, 1643; Wing B6409A).

Thomas Case, Gods Rising, His Enemies Scattering (London, 1644; Wing C380).

[John Cleveland], The Character of a London-Diurnall With Severall Select Poems  
(London, 1646; Wing C4662).

T[homas] C[ompton?], A More True and an Exacter Relation of the Battaile of Keynton (London,  
1642; Wing C137).

A[ndrew] C[oooper], [Stratologia], or the History of the English Civil Vvars  
(London, 1660; Wing C6049).

A Copie of the Articles Agreed upon at the surrender of the City of Bristol  
(London, 1643; Wing C6203).

Oliver Cromwell, The Copy of a Letter Written by Colonel Cromvvell To the Committee at  
Cambridge (London, 1643; Wing C7051).

A Declaration of The Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. In Answer to His Majesties  
Declaration (London, 1642; Wing E1422).

A Declaration or The valiant Resolution of the Famous Prentices of London  
(London, 1642; Wing D774).

[William Dugdale?], A Relation of the Battaile lately fought between Keynton and Edgehill  
(Oxford, 1642; Wing R815).

N. E., The Truth of our bad Newes from Exeter (London, 1643; Wing E22).

Eight Speeches Spoken in Guild-Hall, Upon Thursday night, Octob. 27. 1642  
(London, 1642; Wing E262).

An elegie on the death of Sir Charls Lucas and Sir George Lisle (n. p., 1648; Wing E379).

An Elegie on the death of that most noble and heroick Knight, Sir Charles Lucas  
(n. p., [1648]; Wing E392).

An elegie, on the most barbarous, vnparalleld, vnsouldiery, murder ... Sir Charles Lvcas  
(London, 1648; Wing E424).

An elegy on the death of the right honourable Spencer, Earle of Northampton  
(Oxford, 1643; Wing E407).

Richard Elton, The compleat body of the art military (London, 1650; Wing E653).

An Exact and True Relation of the Battell Fought on Saturday last at Acton  
(London, 1642; Wing E3614).

An Exact and True Relation of the Dangerous and Bloody Fight Between His Majesties Army,  
and the Parliaments Forces, near Kyneton (London, 1642; E3617).

An exact description of Prince Ruperts Malignant She-Monkey, a great Delinquent  
([London], 1642; Wing E3639).

Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, A Letter Sent from the Lord Falkland, Principal Secretarie to  
His Majestie ([Oxford], 1642; Wing F321).

Nathaniel Fiennes, Colonell Fiennes Letter to my Lord Generall concerning Bristoll  
(London, 1643; Wing F874).

-, A most True and Exact Relation of Both the Battels fought by his Excellency and his  
forces against the bloudy Cavalliers (London, 1642; Wing F875).

R[obert] Fletcher, Ex otio Negotium, Or, Martiall His Epigrams Translated  
(London, 1656; Wing M831).

Henry Foster, A True Relation of the Marchings of the ... Red & blew Regiments  
(London, 1643; Wing F1625A).

A Full Relation of the great defeat given to the Cornish Cavalliers (London, 1643; Wing N81).

Good and Joyfull Nevves ovt of Buckinghamshire (London, 1642; Wing G1035).

A Great Wonder in Heaven, showing the Late Apparitions scene on Edge-Hill  
(London, 1642[3]; Wing G1787).

Henry Hammond, To the Right Honourable, The Lord Fairfax, and his Councill of Warre  
(London, 1649; Wing H607).

[Peter Heylyn], A Briefe Relation of the Remarkable occurrences in the Northerne parts  
(Oxford, 1643; Wing H6186).

His Majesties Declaration To all His loving Subjects after His late Victory against the Rebels  
(London, 1642; Wing C2223).

James Howell, The True Informer (Oxford, 1643; Wing H3122).

G. I. (i.e. William Ingoldsby), The doctrine of the Church of England established by Parliament  
against disobedience and wilful rebellion (London, 1642; Wing I188).

Joyfull Newes From Plimouth (London, 1643; Wing J1141).

Joyfull Nevves From Sea: Or good tidings (London, 1642; Wing J1144).

A Letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus ([London], 1643; Wing L1489B).

A Letter Written from Walshall (London, 1643; Wing L1764).

Martin Lluelyn, Men-Miracles. With Other Poemes (Oxford, 1646; Wing L2625).

The Loyall Sacrifice (London, 1648; Wing L3364).

Sir Charles Lucas His Last Speech at the place of execution (London, 1648; Wing L3390).

Donald Lupton, A warre-like treatise of the pike (London, 1642; Wing L3496).

Thomas May, The History of the Parliament of England (London, 1647; Wing M1410).

Military Orders of Articles Established by his Majesty ([Oxford], 1642; Wing C2495).

A most true Relation of divers notable Passages of Divine Providence  
(London, 1643; Wing M2928).

Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria (Oxford, 1643; Wing O903).



The New Yeares Wonder Being a relation of the disturbed inhabitants at Keinton and other villages neere unto Edge-Hil, in which place is heard & seene fearfull and strange apparitions of spirits (London, [1643]; Wing N281).

William, Baron Paget, The Copy of the Letter sent from The Right Honourable The Lord Paget unto The Honourable House of Parliament ([London], 1642; Wing P170).

Henry Parker [?], The Manifold Miseries of Civill Warre (London, 1642; Wing P406).

The Petition of the Gentry, Ministers and Commonalty of Kent (London, 1642; Wing P1064).

Robert Porter, A True Relation of Prince Ruperts Barbarous Cruelty against the Towne of Brumingham (London, 1643; Wing P2987A).

Prince Roberts Message to my Lord of: Essex (London, 1642; Wing R3204).

Prince Rupert His Reply To A Pamphlet Entituled The Parliaments Vindication (Oxford, 1642; Wing R2306).

Prince Rvpert His Declaration (Oxford, 1642; Wing R2290).

Prince Rvperts Burning love to England (London, 1643; Wing P3489).

John Quarles, Fons Lachrymarum, OR a Fountayne of Teares (London, 1648; Wing Q127).

H. R., Exploits Discovered (London, 1643; Wing R21).

John Randolph, Honour Advanced (London, 1643; Wing R329).

John Raynsford, The Yong Soldier (London, 1642; Wing R419D).

The Round-Heads Remembrancer ([Oxford], 1643; Wing R2009).

W. S., A True Declaration of the care of the Rt. Hon. Isaac Pennington (London, 1643; Wing S207).

Edwin Sandys, A Vindication from Colonell Sands (London, 1642; Wing S670).

-, A Vindication of Colonell Sandys His Honour and Loyalty (London, 1642; Wing S671).

-, The Declaration of Col: Edwin Sandys (London, 1642; Wing S688).

The Soldier's Language (London, 1644; Wing S4426).

Strange Newes From Kent (London, 1642; Wing S5894).

Edward Symmons, A Militarie Sermon ... Preached at Shrewsbury ... To His Majesty's Army (Oxford, 1644; Wing S6346).

A true and exact Relation of the manner of his Majesties setting up of His Standard at Nottingham (London, 1642; Wing T2452).

A True and Perfect Relation of the Barbarous and Cruell Passages of the Kings Army, at Old Braineford (London, 1642; Wing T2251).

A True and Perfect Relation of the Barbarous and Cruell Passages of the Kings Army, at Old Braineford (London, 1642; Wing T2251).

A True Relation of a famous victory obtained against Prince Robert, and twelve troopes of the Cavaliers at the City of Worcester (London, 1642; Wing T2876).

A True Relation of the chiefe passages in Middlesex (London, 1642; Wing T2252).

A true relation of the late expedition of His Excellency, Robert earle of Essex (London, 1643; Wing T2979).

Two Epitaphs, Occasioned by the Death of Sr Charles Lucas and Sr George Lisle (n. p., 1648; Wing T3440).

Valour Crowned (London, 1643; Wing R2339).

Verses on the Death of the Right Valiant Sr Bevill Grenvill, Knight ([Oxford], 1643; Wing O990).

John Vicars, Jehovah-Jireh, God In The Mouvnt, or, Englands Parliamentarie-Chronicle (London, 1644; Wing V616).

S. W., The Parliaments Vindication in Answer To Prince Ruperts Declaration (London, 1642; Wing W110).

Clement Walker, The Severall Examinations and Confessions of The Treacherous Conspirators (London, 1643; Wing W3360).

Edward Walsingham, Britannicae Virtutis Imago Or, the effigies of true fortitude (Oxford, 1644; Wing W649).

A Worthy Speech Made by The Right Honourable the Lord Brooke, at the election of his Captaines and Commanders at Warwick Castle (London, 1643; Wing B495).

#### E: OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES

- John Aston, 'The Journal of John Aston, 1639' in J. C. Hodgson, ed., Six North Country Diaries, Publications of the Surtees Society, CXVIII (1910).
- John Aubrey, Brief Lives, ed. John Buchanan-Brown (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000).
- Thomas Birch, ed., The Court and Times of Charles the First, 2 vols. (London: Henry Colburn, 1848).
- Alexander Brome, Poems, ed. Roman R. Dubinski, 2 vols. (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1982).
- Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, Prose Works, ed. John Gouws (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).
- Samuel Butler, Hudibras, ed. John Wilders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).
- Thomas Carew, Poems and Masques, ed. Rhodes Dunlap (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949).
- John Chandler, ed., Travels Through Stuart Britain: The Adventures of John Taylor, the Water Poet (Stroud: Sutton, 1999).
- George Chapman, Chapman's Homer: The Iliad, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998, pbk. ed.).
- Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon, The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon ... Written by Himself, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1759).
- , History of the Rebellion, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888, repr. 1958).
- John Cleveland, Poems, eds. Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).
- Richard Corbett, Poems, eds. J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).
- Abraham Cowley, The Civill Warre, in Thomas O. Calhoun, Laurence Heyworth and Allan Pritchard, eds., The Collected Works of Abraham Cowley, 2 vols. (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989- ).
- , English Writings, ed. A. R. Waller, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905).

- , The Essays and Other Prose Writings, ed. A. B. Gough (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915).
- Sir William Davenant, The Shorter Poems. And Songs From The Plays And Masques, ed. A. M. Gibbs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
- Peter Davidson, ed., Poetry and Revolution: An Anthology of British and Irish Verse 1625-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- Daniel Defoe, Memoirs Of A Cavalier, ed. James T. Boulton (1972: repr. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 1991).
- Sir John Denham, Cooper's Hill, in Expans'd Hieroglyphicks, ed. Brendon O'Hehir (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969).
- , Poetical Works, ed. Theodore Howard Banks, Jr. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1928).
- Robert Fletcher, Poems and Translations, ed. D. H. Woodward (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1970).
- Roger Granville, The History of the Granville Family (Exeter: William Pollard, 1895).
- Homer, The Iliad, trans. Robert Fagles (New York: Viking, 1990).
- Ralph Lord Hopton, Bellum Civile, ed. C. E. H. Chadwyck-Healey (Taunton: Somerset Record Society, 1902).
- Sir Richard Fanshawe, Poems and Translations, ed. Peter Davidson, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).
- Bishop Henry King, Poems, ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).
- Letters And Memorials Of State ... Faithfully transcribed from the Originals at Penshurst Place, ed. Arthur Collins, 2 vols. (London, 1746).
- Richard Lovelace, Poems, ed. C. H. Wilkinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930).
- Edmund Ludlow, The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, ed. C. H. Firth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894).
- Andrew Marvell, Poems and Letters, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, revised by Pierre Legouis and Elsie Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
- The Oxinden Letters 1607-1642, ed. Dorothy Gardiner (London: Constable, 1933).

The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642-1670, ed. Dorothy Gardiner (London: Sheldon Press, 1937).

Clement Paman, Poems (Burton Salmon: Foundling Press, 2002).

Thomas Phaer and Thomas Twyne, trans., The Aeneid, ed. Stephen Lally (New York: Garland, 1987).

Sydenham Poyntz, The Relation of Sydnam Poyntz 1624-1636, ed. T. S. Goodrick (Camden Society, Third Series, vol. 14, 1908).

The Pythouse Papers, ed. W. A. Day (London: Bickers and Son, 1879).

Thomas Raymond, The Autobiography of Thomas Raymond, ed. G. Davies (Camden Society, Third Series, vol. 28, 1917).

John Rous, The Diary of John Rous, ed. M. A. E. Green (Camden Society, 1856).

Nicholas Rowe, trans., Lucans Pharsalia (1719), eds. Sarah Annes Brown and Charles Martindale (London: Everyman, 1998).

Sir Henry Slingsby, 'Memoirs of Sir Henry Slingsby, Bt.' in Original Memoirs, Written During The Great Civil War, ed. Sir Walter Scott (Edinburgh, 1806).

Sir John Suckling, Works: The Non-Dramatic Works, ed. Thomas Clayton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

Trevelyan Papers, Part III, eds. Sir W. C. Trevelyan and Sir C. E. Trevelyan (Camden Society, 105; 1872).

Sir James Turner, Memoir of His Own Life And Times (Edinburgh, 1829).

Henry Vaughan, Poetry And Selected Prose, ed. L. C. Martin (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).

Edmund Waller, Poems, ed. G. Thorn Drury, 2 vols. (London: Dent, 1905).

-, selected poems, in Julia Griffin, ed., Selected Poems of Abraham Cowley, Edmund Waller and John Oldham, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1998).

David Wootton, ed., Divine Right and Democracy: An Anthology of Political Writing in Stuart England (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986).

Memoirs of the Verney Family ... from the papers ... at Claydon House, eds. F. P. and M. M. Verney (Third Edition, London: Longmans, 1925).

## II: SECONDARY SOURCES

- John Adair, By The Sword Divided: Eyewitness Accounts of the English Civil War (Stroud: Sutton, 1998).
- J. S. A. Adamson, 'The Baronial Context of the English Civil War', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5<sup>th</sup> series, 40 (1990), 93-120.
- , 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, Problems In Focus (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 161-197.
- Frederick M. Ahl, Lucan: An Introduction (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976).
- , 'Form Empowered: Lucan's Pharsalia' in A. J. Boyle, ed., Roman Epic (London: Routledge, 1993), 125-142.
- Joanne Altieri, 'Responses to a Waning Mythology in Carew's Political Poetry', Studies In English Literature 26 (1986), 107-124.
- Raymond A. Anselment, 'Thomas Carew and the "Harmlesse Pastimes" of Caroline Peace', Philological Quarterly 62:2 (Spring 1983), 201-219.
- , Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988).
- Robert Ashton, The English Civil War: Conservatism and revolution 1603-1649, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989).
- G. E. Aylmer, 'Collective Mentalities in Mid Seventeenth-Century England', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5<sup>th</sup> series, 37 (1987), 1-30.
- Diane Benet, 'Carew's Monarchy of Wit', in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., "The Muses Common-Weale": Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988).
- P. Bjurstrom, 'Rubens' "St. George and the Dragon"', Art Quarterly (Spring 1955), 27-42.
- J. C. Bramble, 'Lucan' in E. J. Kenney, ed., The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, II: Latin Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 533-557.
- John Channing Briggs, 'Chapman's Seaven Bookes of the Iliades: Mirror for Essex', Studies In English Literature 21:1 (Winter 1981), 59-73.

Alfred H. Burne and Peter Young, The Great Civil War: A Military History of the First Civil War 1642-1646 (1959; repr. Moreton-in-Marsh: The Windrush Press, 1998).

Colin Burrow, Epic Romance: Homer To Milton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

-, 'Virgil in English Translation', in Charles Martindale, ed., The Cambridge Companion to Virgil (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 21-37.

Charles Carlton, Going To The Wars: The Experience of the British Civil Wars, 1638-51 (London: Routledge, 1994).

-, 'Civilians', in John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds., The Civil Wars of England: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland 1638-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 272-305.

Carl von Clausewitz, On War, transl. and eds. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (1976; repr. London: Everyman, 1993).

Mary Coate, Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum 1642-1660 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933).

M. J. D. Cockle, A Bibliography of English Military Books up to 1642 (London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1900).

Patrick Collinson, The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1989).

-, 'Biblical rhetoric: the English nation and national sentiment in the prophetic mode' in Claire McEachern and Debora Shuger, eds., Religion and Culture in Renaissance England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 15-45.

Thomas N. Corns, Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature 1640-1660 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

-, 'Thomas Carew, Sir John Suckling, and Richard Lovelace' in Corns, ed., The Cambridge Companion To English Poetry, Donne To Marvell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 200-220.

Patricia Crawford, 'Charles Stuart, that Man of Blood', Journal of British Studies 16:2 (Spring 1977), 41-61.

Richard Cust, 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England' (1986) in Margo Todd, ed., Reformation To Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England (London: Routledge, 1995), 232-251.

Stevie Davies, Henry Vaughan, Border Lines (Bridgend: Seren, 1995).

Derby and the Great Civil War: Catalogue of Exhibition, 2-23 October 1971 (Derby: Derby Museum, 1971).

O. A. W. Dilke, 'Lucan's Political Views and the Caesars', in D. R. Dudley, ed., Neronians and Flavians: Silver Latin I (Greek And Latin Studies, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), 62-82.

-, 'Lucan and English Literature', in D. R. Dudley, ed., Neronians and Flavians: Silver Latin I (Greek And Latin Studies, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), 83-112.

Barbara Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', Past and Present 118 (1998), 65-95.

-, 'Casualties of war: treatment of the dead and wounded in the English Civil War', in Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden, eds., Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 114-132.

Alan Everitt, The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660 (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966).

Dagmar Friest, Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London 1637-1645 (London: Tauris, 1997).

C. H. Firth, Cromwell's Army, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Methuen, 1962).

A. J. Fletcher, 'Honour, Reputation and Local Officeholding in Elizabethan and Stuart England', in Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson, eds., Order And Disorder In Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 92-115.

Peter France, ed., The Oxford Guide To Literature In English Translation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

William Frost, 'Translating Virgil, Douglas To Dryden: Some General Considerations' in Maynard Mack and George deForest Lord, eds., Poetic Traditions of the English Renaissance (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 271-286.



- Ian Gentles, 'The Civil Wars in England', in John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds., The Civil Wars of England: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland 1638-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 103-155.
- , 'The Iconography of Revolution: England 1642-1649', in Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden, eds., Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 91-113.
- K. W. Gransden, Virgil's Iliad (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
- S. J. Greenberg, 'Dating Civil War Pamphlets, 1641-1644', Albion 20:3 (Fall 1998): 387-401.
- Nicholas Guild, 'The Context of Marvell's Allusion to Lucan in "An Horatian Ode"', Papers On Language And Literature 14 (1978), 406-13.
- J. R. Hale, 'Incitement to Violence? English Divines on the Theme of War, 1578 to 1631', in Renaissance War Studies (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), 487-517.
- Gerald Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', Proceedings of the British Academy 71 (1985), 203-34.
- James Holly Hanford, 'Milton and the Art of War', in John Milton: Poet and Humanist (Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1966).
- Bob Harris, Politics and the Rise of the Press: Britain and France 1620-1800, Historical Connections (London: Routledge, 1996).
- David Howarth, Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649 (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997).
- F. E. Hutchinson, Henry Vaughan: A Life and Interpretation (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947).
- Ronald Hutton, 'The Royalist War Effort', in John Morrill, ed., Reactions To The English Civil War 1642-1649, Problems In Focus (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1982), 51-66.
- George Fenwick Jones, "'Lov'd I Not Honour More": The Durability of a Literary Motif', Comparative Literature 11:2 (Spring 1959), 131-143.
- Dennis Kay, Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

- John Kenyon, The Civil Wars of England (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988; repr. London: Phoenix, 1996).
- John Kenyon with Jane Ohlmeyer, 'The Background to the Civil Wars in the Stuart Kingdoms', in John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds., The Civil Wars of England: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland 1638-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 3-40.
- G. S. Kirk, 'Homer', in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, eds., The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, I: Greek Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- John R. Knott, Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature 1563-1694 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Peter Lindenbaum, Changing Landscapes: Anti-Pastoral Sentiments in the English Renaissance (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986).
- James Loxley, Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997).
- Gerald M. Maclean, Time's Witness: Historical Representation in English Poetry, 1603-1660 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990).
- H. M. Margoliouth, review of C. H. Wilkinson, ed., The Poems Of Richard Lovelace, Review of English Studies, 3 (1927), 89-95.
- J. A. R. Marriott, The Life and Times of Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland (London: Methuen, 1907).
- J. G. Marston, 'Gentry, Honor and Royalism in Early Stuart England', Journal of British Studies 13:1 (November 1973), 21-43.
- Charles Martindale, 'The Politician Lucan', Greece and Rome 31:1 (April 1984), 64-79.
- , John Milton and the Transformation of Ancient Epic (London: Croome Helm, 1986).
- Jamie Masters, Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- John Morrill, The Revolt of the Provinces, Historical Problems (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1976).

- Carolyn Nelson and Matthew Seccombe, British Newspapers and Periodicals 1641-1700: A Short-Title Catalogue of Serials Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, and British America (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1987).
- P. R. Newman, Atlas of the English Civil War (1985; repr. London Routledge, 1998).
- , 'The King's Servants: Conscience, Principle, and Sacrifice in Armed Royalism', in John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf, eds., Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 225-242.
- , The Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).
- Scott Nixon, 'Carew's Response to Jonson and Donne', Studies in English Literature 39:1 (Winter 1999), 89-109.
- David Norbrook, 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode" and the politics of genre', in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday, eds., Literature and the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 147-69.
- , Writing the English Republic (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- , 'The English Revolution and English historiography', in N. H. Keeble, ed., The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 233-250.
- Brooks Otis, Virgil: A Study in Civilised Poetry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).
- Geoffrey Parker, The Military Revolution: Military innovation and the rise of the West, 1500-1800, rev. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Michael P. Parker, 'Carew's Politic Pastoral: Virgilian Pretexts in the "Answer to Aurelian Townshend"', John Donne Journal 1 (1982), 101-16.
- , "'To My Friend G. N. From Wrest": Carew's Secular Masque' in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., Classic and Cavalier: Essays on Jonson and the Sons of Ben (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982), 171-191.
- Annabel Patterson, Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).
- , Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

-, 'The very name of the game: theories of order and disorder', in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday, eds., Literature and the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 21-37.

John Peacock, 'The Politics of Portraiture', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, Problems In Focus (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 199-228.

-, 'The visual image of Charles I' in Thomas Corns, ed., The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 176-239.

Donald Pennington, 'The War and the People', in John Morrill, ed., Reactions To The English Civil War 1642-1649, Problems In Focus (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1982), 115-135.

J. G. A. Pocock, 'Thomas May and the narrative of Civil War', in Derek Hirst and Richard Strier, eds., Writing and political engagement in seventeenth-century England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 112-144.

A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland: And of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640, 3 vols., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1976-1991).

Jonathan F. S. Post, Henry Vaughan: The Unfolding Vision (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).

Lois Potter, Secret Rites and Secret Writing (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Diane Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering: The English Civil War and Male Identity', in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 220-241.

David Quint, Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

Claude Rawson, Satire and Sentiment 1660-1830 (1994; repr. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

Timothy Raylor, Cavaliers, Clubs and Literary Culture (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994).

Joad Raymond, The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

- Dosia Reichardt, 'Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts', Notes and Queries 49 (2002), 336-338.
- Christopher Ricks, 'The Wit and Weight of Clarendon', in Essays In Appreciation (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 51-66.
- Graham Roebuck, 'Cavalier', in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 9-26.
- Ivan Roots, The Great Rebellion 1642-1660, rev. ed. (Stroud: Sutton, 1995).
- D. M. Rosenberg, 'Epic Warfare in Cowley and Milton', Clio 22:1 (Fall 1992): 67-80.
- Ian Roy, 'England Turned Germany? The Aftermath of the Civil War in its European Context' (1978), repr. in Peter Gaunt, ed., The English Civil War: The Essential Readings (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 249-267.
- Alan Rudrum, 'Resistance, Collaboration and Silence: Henry Vaughan and Breconshire Royalism', in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 103-118.
- , 'Royalist lyric', in N. H. Keeble, ed., The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 181-197.
- Harry Rusche, 'Abraham Cowley's "Wand'ring *Spirits of Rebells Dead*"', American Notes and Queries 21:7-8 (March / April 1983), 99-101.
- R. B. Rutherford, Homer, Greece and Rome New Surveys In The Classics, 26 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Classical Association, 1996).
- Jonathan Sawday, "'Mysteriously divided": Civil War, madness and the divided self', in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday, eds., Literature and the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 127-143.
- Paul S. Seaver, Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985).
- Kevin Sharpe, Criticism And Compliment: The politics of literature in the England of Charles I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

- Nigel Smith, Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).
- R. Malcolm Smuts, Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).
- Robin Sowerby, The Classical Legacy In Renaissance Poetry (Harlow: Longman, 1994).
- David Stevenson, The Scottish Revolution, 1637-1644: the triumph of the covenanters (Newton Abbot: David and Charles, 1973).
- John Tanner, 'Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland: Cavalier or Catalyst', Royal Stuart Papers 5 (1974).
- Oliver Taplin, Homeric Soundings The Shaping of The *Iliad* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- P. W. Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).
- , 'The Impact on Literature', in John Morrill, ed., The Impact of the English Civil War (London: Collis and Brown, 1991), 123-142.
- David Trotter, The Poetry of Abraham Cowley (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1979).
- David Underdown, Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).
- F. J. Varley, Cambridge during the Civil War, 1642-1646 (Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1935).\
- Brian Vickers, 'Machiavelli and Marvell's "Horatian Ode"', Notes And Queries 234 (1989), 32-8.
- C. V. Wedgwood, Velvet Studies (London: Jonathan Cape, 1946).
- , The King's Peace 1637-1641 (1955; repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2001).
- , The King's War 1641-1647 (1958; repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2001).
- Simone Weil, The Iliad, or The Poem of Force, transl. Mary McCarthy (Wallingford: Pendle Hill, 1956).

- Richard Wendorf, William Collins and Eighteenth-Century Poetry (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981).
- Robert Wilcher, The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Michael Wilding, Dragon's Teeth: Literature in the English Revolution (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).
- M. M. Willcock, 'Battle Scenes in the Aeneid', Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, n. s. 29 (1983): 87-99.
- Edgar Wind, Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968).
- Donald Wing, Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books printed in Other Countries 1641-1700, 3 vols., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1972-1994).
- Austin Woolrych, Britain in Revolution 1625-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Blair Worden, 'Andrew Marvell, Oliver Cromwell, and the Horatian Ode', in Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, eds., Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 147-80.
- B. H. G. Wormald, Clarendon: Politics, Historiography and Religion 1640-1660 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951; repr. 1989).
- C. J. Wortham, 'Richard Lovelace's "To Lucasta, Going To the Warres": Which Wars?', Notes And Queries 26 (1979), 430-1.
- Peter Young, Edgehill 1642: The Campaign and the Battle (1967; repr. Moreton-in-Marsh: The Windrush Press, 1995).
- Peter Young and Richard Holmes, The English Civil War: A Military History of the Civil Wars 1642-1651 (London: 1974, repr. Ware: Wordsworth Military Library, 2000).
- Steven N. Zwicker, Lines Of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture 1649-1689 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).